1-1-2014

Predictors Of School Administrator Responses In Bullying Situations: Implications For Bullying Prevention Programs

Aguib Diop
Wayne State University,

PREDICTORS OF SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSES IN BULLYING SITUATIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR BULLYING PREVENTION PROGRAMS

by

AGUIB DIOP

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2015

MAJOR: EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

Approved by:

_____

Advisor Date

_____

_____

_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I offer my gratitude and appreciation to all of those who have supported me through this journey. To all of my committee members, Drs. Marjorie Beeghly, Stephen Hillman, Cheryl Somers, and especially my advisor, Dr. Jina Yoon. Thank you for your tireless support and feedback that has helped me develop my professional abilities.

I'd like to thank the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principal Association for endorsing my study and making it available to principals across Michigan. I also give my thanks to all of the principals who took time out of their busy schedules to participate in my study.

To my wife, Jennifer, words cannot express how much your love, patience and support have meant to me throughout this process. Lastly, to my parents, Bernice and Seydou Diop, without your love, encouragement, care and wisdom throughout my life this accomplishment would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER 1

Bullying has been defined by repeated acts of aggression, intimidation and/or coercion against a victim who is weaker than the perpetrator in terms physical size, social/psychological power, or any other factor resulting in a power differential (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Merrell, Gueldner, Ross & Isava, 2008; Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). The key features of bullying include intent to harm, repeated harmful acts, and a power differential between the victim and the perpetrator (Merrell et al., 2008). In general, findings have highlighted serious, negative consequences for both perpetrators and victims. Victims are at risk for psychosocial and academic difficulties including anxiety, low self-esteem, peer rejection, truancy and school dropout (Dupper & Meyer-Adams, 2002; Hanish, Ryan, Martin & Fabes, 2005; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002). Similarly, perpetrators are at risk substance abuse, criminal behavior, and peer rejection as they get older (Merrell et al., 2008).

Olweus (1993), a Norwegian researcher who began studying this phenomenon in the 1980's as its interest grew in Scandinavian countries, identified three types of bullying: physical, verbal and social exclusion. *Physical bullying* involves physically aggressive acts such as intentional hitting, kicking and/ or destruction of property. *Verbal bullying* involves taunting, teasing and/or name-calling. Collectively, some have referred to physical and verbal bullying as *direct bullying* because they involve overt acts committed by one or more perpetrators against a victim. In contrast, some acts of bullying also consist of more coverts acts such as social exclusion or rumor-spreading, which involve the manipulation of the social status of an individual within a peer group. These behaviors have been referred to as *indirect bullying* behaviors. Similar to this definition is the term *relational aggression*, which encompasses a wider range of indirect acts of aggression where the perpetrator harms through manipulation of relationships, threat or damage to them or both (Crick, Casas & Nelson, 2002).

Bullying and the Social-Ecological Model

The social-ecological perspective emphasizes the role of multiple environments that influence the behavior of individuals within a particular setting. Largely based on Bronfenbrenner's (1979) ecological model for human development, bullying behavior is said to be influenced by several contextual factors. Specifically, the behavior of victims and perpetrators is encouraged and/or inhibited as a result of an interplay between the individual, family, peer group, school, community and culture (Swearer & Espelage, 2004).

The individual, who may be the bully, victim or bystander, is at the center of the social-ecological model. Individual factors influence the participation in bullying and the likelihood being victimized (Swearer & Espelage, 2004). Yet individual factors are influenced by a larger context that includes factors related to the family/home environment (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) such as the modeling of bullying behavior and/or lack of empathy for victims of bullying in home settings. Within a larger context are the influences of the peer group and school characteristics. Bullying literature has identified several school variables that have been found to either perpetuate or discourage bullying behaviors (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Orpinas, Horne & Staniszewski, 2003; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). There is also evidence that exposure to violence within a family system (e.g. inter-parental violence) has been associated with bullying behaviors in children (Holt & Espelage, 2007; Hong & Espelage, 2012; Orpinas & Horne, 2006;Swearer & Espelage, 2004). While the individual, family, school and peer factors are all influencing bullying behavior, the community and culture are the broadest contexts within the social-ecological framework. Municipal authorities, public health and religious institutions are all examples of community agents that influence the attitudes and/or behavior of schools, peers, families and individuals. The broadest contextual factor is the culture, which encompasses all others. It is the culture that establishes the norms and beliefs, which may perpetuate or inhibit bullying behavior.

Grounded in the social-ecological perspective, bullying prevention programs have emphasized a vast range of interventions that occur at the individual, family school/peer, community, and cultural contexts. Such interventions have attempted to restructure school environments to promote pro-social behaviors, and empower peer groups, professionals, families and community leaders to address bullying. For example, Orpinas and Horne's (2006) School Social Development and Bullying Prevention Model discusses the need for positive school environments that discourage bullying behaviors and curriculums that increase social competence skills in students. Similarly, the Olweus Bullying Prevention program addresses the individual, classroom and school levels of social ecology (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Hong, 2009; Kallestead & Olweus, 2003).

School Administrator Involvement in School-wide Initiatives

There is evidence that school administrators play an integral leadership role in the development and implementation of school-wide initiatives (Kose, 2009; Sprague, Smith & Stieber, 2002). For example, school administrators are responsible for developing a consensus that a school-wide initiative is necessary and should be implemented as part of a school's mission. They are also responsible for the management of resources, facilitating professional development opportunities and maintaining an environment that supports school-wide initiatives (Kose, 2009). In addition, one of the most important functions of a school administrator is the supervision and leadership of teaching staff (Glickman, 2002; Walker & Slear, 2011). Moreover, maintenance of student discipline, building appropriate relations with parents and promoting a safe environment conducive to learning are also noted characteristics of effective school administrators (Astor et al., 2009; Hallinger & Heck, 2010). School administrators are often responsible for investigating bullying situations, disciplining the perpetrator (s), meeting with the parents of those involved and collaborating with other school personnel to prevent future incidents. For these reasons school administrators are often the leaders of school-wide anti-

violence initiatives (Astor et al., 2009). As a result, decisions to adopt, structure and monitor bullying prevention initiatives are often made by school administrator.

School Administrator Perceptions of Bullying and Bullying Prevention Initiatives

Findings suggest that some school administrators underestimate the prevalence of bullying in their schools. Some have perceived that bullying is more prevalent in other U.S. schools than their own (Dake, Price, Telljohann & Funk, 2004) while others were less aware of locations where bullying most often occurs (Harris & Hawthorn, 2006). This lack of awareness may affect their willingness to adopt bullying prevention programs. Despite evidence supporting whole-school bullying prevention initiatives, some school administrators have either questioned their feasibility or preferred approaches that have little or no empirical support.

Generally, schools have not adopted evidence-based approaches due to limited resources, absence of teacher training, bureaucratic barriers or some combination of these reasons (Cunningham & Henggeler, 2001; Hong, 2009). Others have endorsed reactive rather than proactive initiatives (e.g. calling parents of perpetrators and victims following the incident vs. establishing a bulling prevention committee) and have gauged their effectiveness by word of mouth testimonials rather than empirical support (Dake et al., 2004). In addition, some have identified a cluster of cost-sensitive educators, who show a stronger preference for minimizing costs, training and implementation demands when choosing bullying prevention programs (Cunningham, Vaillancourt, Rimas, Deal, Cunningham, Short & Chen, 2009). This group was less likely to see bullying prevention as their responsibility and more likely to agree that bullying prevention was the responsibility of parents (Cunningham et al., 2009). While parental involvement is a component of bullying prevention initiatives, cost-sensitive school administrators may fail to address the school level variables that contribution to victimization.

Thus, some school administrators may endorse non-evidence-based approaches, underestimate the prevalence of bullying and respond to bullying situations in ways that are less

effective for preventing victimization. In summary, these findings suggest that school administrators vary in their attitudes toward school bullying and their responses to bullying incidents. The purpose of the current study is to examine school administrators' attitudes and responses to bullying situations. As bullying prevention initiatives occur in school settings, it is important to understand school administrators' beliefs about perpetrators, victims and causes of victimization. Understanding differences in school administrator attitudes and their responses may enhance professional development of administrators within bullying prevention programs.

School Personnel's Responses to Bullying

Literature is limited on school administrator attitudes and their responses in bullying situations. However, since school administrators often begin their education careers as teachers, insight can be gained from examining literature on teacher responses to bullying situations. A few studies have explored teacher attitudes and responses (Yoon, 2004; Yoon & Kerber, 2003; Kallestad & Olweus, 2003) and have identified a number of important variables that may be relevant to school administrators. Teacher responses have been associated with their level empathy towards bullying victims. In addition to efficacy in behavior management, Yoon (2004) found that empathy towards victims and perceived seriousness of bullying were factors in predicting the likelihood of intervention by teachers. Similar findings were obtained when investigating the implementation of the Olweus bullying prevention program. Kallestad and Olweus (2003) found that teachers with greater empathy and with a history of victimization as children were more likely to implement classroom level bullying prevention measures. There is evidence that differences in empathy may be a function of the type of bully situation. Yoon and Kerber (2003) found that teachers viewed social exclusion less seriously than verbal and physical bullying, showed more empathy for verbal and physical bullying victims and were more likely to intervene in these types of situations than those involving social exclusion. Jacobsen and Bauman (2007) replicated this study with school counselors and obtained similar findings. These

findings suggest that those showing more empathy towards bullying victims are more likely to respond to bullying incidents. Others have examined educators' beliefs about the causes of victimization as predictors of their responses in bullying situations. Troop and Ladd (2002) discuss three general beliefs in teachers that influence their management strategies in bullying situations: 1) assertiveness beliefs (i.e.., children can avoid victimization if they stand up for themselves), 2) avoidant beliefs (i.e.., children can avoid victimization by avoiding perpetrators), and 3) normative beliefs (i.e., bullying is a normative behavior that helps children learn social norms). Using this paradigm, Kochenderfer-Ladd and Pelletier (2008) found that teachers were less likely to intervene when they perceived bullying as a normative behavior but more likely to do so when they believed that victims needed to more assertive or needed to avoid perpetrators. In addition, when compared to those with normative or assertive beliefs, teachers with avoidant beliefs were more likely to become actively involved in preventing perpetrators from having contact with victims. This finding suggests that educators with avoidant beliefs may intervene in more effective ways. In this study teachers viewed bullying differently for boys and girls: where they are more likely to view bullying as a normative behavior in boys than in girls. Taken together, these findings indicate that teachers and school counselors have a wide range of responses and attitudes regarding bullying. Thus, their handling of bullying of bullying situations may vary, resulting in differences in the effectiveness of their interventions.

Existing literature indicates that students who differ from the norm have been vulnerable to victimization. Such students include those who differ in abilities, physical size, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and religion (Holt & Keyes, 2004). For example, in the 2009 National School Climate Survey (Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, & Bartkiewicz, 2010), 84.6% of lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender and questioning (LGBTQ) students reported being verbally harassed, 40.1% reported being physically harassed, and 18.8% reported that they were physically assaulted at school in the past year because of their sexual orientation

(Leiberman & Cowan, 2011). These findings indicate that bullying incidents often involve many cultural issues among students, and that educators have to address them as a part of bullying intervention. Then, building social climates where individual differences are respected and people are open to diversity among students becomes an important part of bullying prevention initiatives. Doing so has been associated with school climates that discourage bullying behaviors (Hanish, Kochenderfer-Ladd, Fabes, Martin & Denning, 2004).

There is evidence that educators vary in their beliefs about diversity and in their sensitivity towards diverse populations (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001). These differences may affect school personnel's willingness to adopt policies that discourage the victimization of those who differ from the norm. For example, O'Higgins-Norman (2008) investigated teachers' willingness to address homophobic bullying concerns though a nationwide curriculum in a sample of Irish schools. According to his results, 41% of teachers reported difficulty addressing homophobic bullying when compared to other types of bullying. Among their concerns was a fear of others questioning their sexuality and/or being perceived as condoning homosexuality. According to these findings, some school personnel may harbor beliefs about victims that affect their willingness to intervene in bullying situations.

Studies on helping behavior suggest that observers' attitudes towards bullying victims may vary based on their attributions of responsibility to the victim. Weiner's (1986, 1996) theory of social conduct indicates that judgments of responsibility determine reactions of anger and sympathy, which influence the likelihood of help-giving or aggression (Rudolph, Roesch, Greitemeyer & Weiner, 2004). For example, when an individual's predicament is judged as controllable, resulting from his or her own actions, less sympathy and more anger is elicited from the observer. In their meta-analytic review of 64 investigations, Rudolph et al. (2004) provided empirical support to Weiner's (1986, 1996) theory of social conduct. In bullying literature, there is evidence that perpetrators and observers place blame on victims' attributes in order to justify

bullying behavior (Hara, 2002). Where school administrators are concerned, their judgments of responsibility may elicit emotions that influence their responses to bullying situations. Where the victim's plight is seen as uncontrollable (e.g., the victim is not responsible), sympathy occurs, thereby eliciting a helping response. Conversely, if the victim is deemed responsible for their predicament, anger is elicited, which may contribute to punishment of the victim rather than prevention of the victimization.

School administrators, like teachers, may vary in their beliefs about the causes of victimization. As in Troop and Ladd's (2002) findings, school administrators may hold assertive, normative or avoidant causal beliefs. In turn, existing literature suggests that these beliefs are likely to influence their management strategies in bullying situations. Punishment, advocating assertion, advocating independence, involving parents, separating students and advocating avoidance have been defined as potential strategies used by teachers to manage bullying situations (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008; Troop & Ladd, 2002). As with teachers, school administrators may differ in their perceived seriousness based on the type of bullying situation that occurs. As with teacher findings, understanding whether school administrators perceive some bullying situations as less serious than others may prompt a need for further professional development on the consequences of all bullying behaviors.

Purpose of the Study

Prior studies have explored several predictors of staff responses in bullying situations. Yet, few have investigated these predictors among school administrators. The current study investigated school administrators' responses to bullying situations and explored variables that predict their responses. Based on existing literature on school personnel's responses to bullying situations, the following variables were examined: Empathy towards victims, perceived seriousness, beliefs about the causes of victimization, openness to diversity, having a school-wide bullying prevention policy and previous anti-bullying training.

School administrators, like other school personnel, may vary in their attitudes toward bullying victims. Consistent with teacher findings, school administrators may also differ in their beliefs about how individuals become victims and in their empathy towards them. Others may vary in their openness to differences among students. Some may also perceive some bullying situations as more serious than others. These attitudes can be clustered into the following categories: empathy towards victims, beliefs about the causes of victimization, perceived seriousness and openness to diversity. According to existing findings, greater empathy has been associated with greater levels of involvement in bullying situations. Similarly, avoidant rather than normative or assertive beliefs were expected to be associated with active involvement in bullying situations (e.g. separating students, involving parents). Verbal and physical bullying situations have been perceived as more serious than those involving social exclusion. It was expected that school administrators who perceive bullying situations as more serious would be more likely to get involved in bullying situations. It was also expected that school administrators' open to diversity would predict greater levels of involvement in bullying situations.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question 1. What are school administrators' beliefs about the causes of victimization?

Hypothesis 1.1: School administrators will more likely endorse avoidant or assertive beliefs than normative beliefs.

Hypothesis 1.2: School administrators will more likely view bullying as a normative behavior for boys than for girls.

Hypothesis 1.3: School administrators will more likely endorse assertive beliefs for boys then for girls.

Research Question 2. Does a school administrator's empathy, perceived seriousness, likelihood of intervention and type of response differ by the type of bullying situation?

Hypothesis 2.1: School administrators will report more empathy, seriousness and more likely intervene in verbal and physical bullying situations than with social exclusion situations

Hypothesis 2.2: School administrators will more likely discipline the perpetrator in verbal and physical bullying situations than in social exclusion situations.

Research Question 3. What predicts school administrators' likelihood of intervention and type of responses in bullying situations?

Hypothesis 3.1. School administrators with higher assertive or avoidant beliefs, less normative beliefs, higher perceived seriousness, and greater empathy will predict greater likelihood of intervention.

Hypothesis 3.2: School administrators with higher assertive or avoidant beliefs, less normative beliefs, higher perceived seriousness, and greater empathy will provide responses that involve expressing disapproval, disciplining the perpetrator or involving parents.

Hypothesis 3.3: School administrators with lower assertive or avoidant beliefs, more normative beliefs, lower perceived seriousness and less empathy will provide no response to bullying situations.

Hypothesis 3.4: School administrators reporting more openness to diversity will report a higher likelihood of intervention in bullying vignettes.

Research Question 4. Does a school administrator's likelihood of intervention and type of response in bullying situations differ by having previous bullying prevention training?

Hypothesis 4.1: Having previous anti-bullying training will predict a greater likelihood of intervention.

Hypothesis 4.2: School administrators having previous anti-bullying training will provide responses that involve expressing disapproval, disciplining the perpetrator or involving parents.

CHAPTER 2

Definitions of Bullying

Several definitions of bullying have been used by researchers, school personnel and policymakers. The following are examples of bullying definitions found in literature:

1. A person is being bullied when he or she is exposed, repeatedly over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more students (Olweus, 1993, p.9).
2. It is characterized by repetition- a victim is targeted a number of times- and by an imbalance of power- the victim cannot defend him/herself easily, for one or more reasons (he or she may be outnumbered, be smaller or less physically strong, or be less psychologically resilient, than the person(s), doing the bullying) (Smith & Ananiadou, 2003, p. 189).
3. Bullying is usually defined as repeated acts of aggression, intimidation, or coercion against a victim who is weaker than the perpetrator in terms of physical size, psychological/social power, or other factors that result in a notable power differential (Merrell et al., 2008, p. 26).

Across these definitions, the following conceptual similarities exist: Repeated acts of aggression, a power differential between the perpetrator and the victim and an inability for the victim to defend him or herself based on this power differential. In addition, bullying has been classified as a subset of aggressive behavior (Dodge, 1991; Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Olweus, 1993).

According to literature on aggressive behavior, perpetrators exhibit different types of aggression. Bullying literature draws on these differences to further define bullying behaviors (Espelage & Swearer, 2003). For example, Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz and Kaukianian (1992) discuss differences between *direct* and *indirect* forms of aggression. Similarly, Crick, Casas and Ku (1999) refer to *overt* versus c*overt* forms of aggression. Essentially, direct (overt) acts include

observable forms of verbal (e.g. threats, naming calling) or physical (e.g. hitting, kicking, punching) aggression. Indirect (covert) acts of aggression are often less observable and do not include face-to-face confrontation. Examples include rumor-spreading or social exclusion by a third party (Espelage & Swearer, 2003). The latter type of aggression was eventually termed *relational aggression* by Crick and Grotpeter (1995). For bullying prevention purposes, distinguishing bullying behaviors by type helps professionals understand the extent of bullying that occurs in a school setting. Moreover, it provides a framework for assessment and intervention planning.

Early Bullying Literature

The systematic study of bullying behavior grew out of public interest existing in Sweden during the late 1960's and early 1970's. Dan Olweus of the University of Bergen has been regarded as the first to study bullying as a distinct type of aggressive behavior (Olweus, 1999). In Scandinavian countries, bullying was referred to as *Mobbing* (Norway, Finland) or *Mobbning* (Sweden, Finland), suggesting that bullying was the result of a group of individuals targeting one individual (Olweus, 1993). Olweus later noted that mobbing was also used to describe victimization by a single individual and that a substantial number of cases in his research did not involve groups. Societal interest in the study of bullying behaviors would spread throughout other Scandinavian countries throughout the 1970's and 80's. The bullying literature acknowledges that the study of bullying behavior in the United States is relatively new, with our knowledge of prevalence, etiology and prevention stemming from earlier research conducted in Europe, Australia and Canada (Swearer & Espelage, 2004).

The Social-Ecological Model of bullying

Bronfenbrenner's Ecological System's theory states that all individuals are part of interrelated systems that place them at the center and broaden to various outer systems that shape

each individual (Bronfenbrenner, 1979, 1994). From the center to the periphery are the following systems:

1. The *microsystem* is composed of an individual or group of individuals in an immediate setting such as a home or school. For example, the parent-child interaction occurs within a home setting.
2. The *mesosystem* represents the interaction between two or more microsystems. Within school settings, the teacher-student interaction is said to also influence student-peer interactions (Hong & Espelage, 2012).
3. The *exosystem* consists of aspects of the environment beyond the immediate system containing the individual. According to Brofenbrenner (1979), an individual's development is influenced by factors in settings where the individual is not present. For example, environmental factors such as crime and poverty within a neighborhood may or may not involve the individual. However, they may still be affected in their immediate setting (e.g. home or school).
4. The *macrosystem* has been referred to as the "cultural blueprint" that may determine the social context and events that occur in an immediate system (Bronfenbrenner, 1994; Hong & Espelage, 2012). Cultural norms and religion are examples of macrosytem factors that may influence events that occur in an immediate setting such as a home, school or business.
5. The *chronosystem* system is the broadest level of an ecological system, which includes consistency or change of individuals and their environments over time (Hong & Espelage, 2012). Examples include the change in family structure or youth outcomes over time resulting from a family death or divorce.

Existing literature considers bullying within a social-ecological model (Hong & Espelage, 2012; Orpinas, Horne & Staniszewski, 2003; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Smith &

Ananiadou,2003; Swearer & Espelage, 2004). For example, the individual may be a bully, a victim of bullying, a bully-victim (e.g. a bully who was previously bullied) or a bystander who witnessed a bullying situation (Swearer & Espelage, 2004). Within the school microsystem, several dyads are present including bully-victim, victim-bystander, victim-teacher and teacher-administrator interactions.

Mesosystem factors that influence bullying have been identified in bullying literature. Fekkes, Pijpers and Verloove-Vanhorick (2005) investigated children's perceptions of bullying behavior, and the involvement of teachers, parents and classmates in bullying incidents. Results indicated that out of 2766 children over 16% reported being bullied on a regular basis and 5.5% reported being actively involved in bullying behavior. Nearly half of the children denied telling their teachers about the bullying incidents. Moreover, in cases of active bullying, the majority of teachers and parents did not talk to bullies about their behavior. The study's findings highlighted the need for regular communication between individuals in different microsystems (e.g. victim-teacher, teacher-bully).

When applied to bullying etiology, societal attitudes are examples of macrosystem factors that could influence the prevalence of bullying in school settings (Swearer & Espelage, 2004). For example, the empirical study of bullying behaviors in Sweden was preceded by a public interest in bullying prevention. More recently in the United States, an increase in public awareness of bullying has led to changes in public policy to prevent bullying. As bullying behaviors have been attributed to school violence, suicide and long-term negative consequences, anti-bullying programs have been adopted throughout school settings nationwide.

Chronosystem factors in bullying literature reflect changes with individuals and their environments over time that are associated with being a bully or victim. One such study included 160 clients from a psychiatric outpatient clinic in Norway with victimization histories (Fosse & Holen, 2002). Results indicated that the majority of those victimized as children grew up without

their biological fathers, suggesting lower levels of social support. Their findings suggest that changes in family structure (e.g. less social support available) over time may be a risk factor for victimization. Others note that stressful life events within a family system over time (e.g. a divorce and preceding events) have been associated with higher levels of aggression and oppositional behavior in children (Hetherington & Elmore, 2003). Other chronosystem factors include repeated adverse life events that are risk factors to negative youth outcomes (e.g. repeated abuse and/or neglect).

Bullying Prevalence

Bullying occurs across a vast range of U.S. schools. Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton and Scheidt (2001) have been credited as the first to survey the prevalence of bullying behavior among a large-scale, nationally representative sample of U.S. students. Their study involved 15,686 students in grades 6 through 10 who completed surveys on bullying prevalence. Nearly 30% of students reported some type of involvement in moderate or frequent bullying behavior. Of the 30%, 13% identified themselves as bullies, 10.6% identified themselves as victims and 6.3% identified themselves as both a bully and victim. It was also found that bullying occurred more frequently in middle school than high school settings, and that boys are more likely to be involved as bullies or victims than girls. Interestingly, there were no differences across urban, suburban and rural areas, suggesting that bullying is prevalent across multiple populations of students.

Seals and Young (2003) investigated bullying prevalence in a sample of 1126 7th and 8th grade students from five Mississippi school districts. According to their findings, 24% of students reported being involved either as a bully or victim. These findings suggest that bullying is prevalent among adolescents, particularly those of middle school age. Other findings suggest that bullying behaviors are also prevalent among elementary school children. Orpinas, Horne and Staniszewski (2003) found that 32% children in kindergarten through 1st grade reported engaging

in at least one aggressive behavior associated with bullying. Among 3rd through 5th graders, 80% committed only one similar aggressive act and 28% engaged in 10 or more aggressive acts.

Earlier literature indicates that male bullies outnumber female bullies (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus. 1991; Swearer & Espelage, 2004) and males are more likely to be victims than females (Olweus, 1991, 1993). However, findings have been mixed, with some reporting that gender was not a significant predictor of bullying behavior (e.g. Bosworth et al., 1999; Goldstein, Young & Boyd, 2008). In general, some researchers are skeptical in drawing conclusions about gender differences in bullying behavior and note that gender may not be a reliable predictor of bullying behavior (Espelage, Mebane & Swearer, 2004; Hong & Espelage, 2012).

Bullying behaviors often occur in social situations where multiple peers are present (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Osterman & Kaukiainen, 1996). Thus, bullying literature identifies one or more roles assumed by peers in bullying situations. Traditionally, roles identified from peer nomination data are: The bully, victim, bully-victim and bystander (Oprinas & Horne, 2006; Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). A growing body of literature suggests that these roles are unstable, with children switching roles as different bullying situations occur (Salmivalli et al., 1996). In addition, within the groups of bullies, victims or bystanders, different characteristics exist. As a result, researchers have identified different subtypes of bullies, victims and bystanders.

Characteristics of Bullies

Because bullies engage in different types of bullying behaviors they are often grouped into different subtypes. Orpinas and Horne (2006) grouped bullies into the following subtypes: *aggressive*, *passive,* and *relational*. The aggressive bully is the role most recognized by peers and school personnel (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). More often than not, aggressive bullies use overt forms of bullying (e.g. hitting, kicking or punching). Children using this type of aggression tend

to have negative attributions toward other students (Crick & Dodge, 1994) and feel as if their acts are justified. Where aggressive bullies are those who initiate aggressive acts against their victims, passive bullies are those who support the bully through cheering, laughing or both (Orpinas & Horne 2006; Samivalli, 1999). The third subtype, relational bullies, is defined by their use of covert, indirect acts of bullying. They may isolate victims through rumor spreading, threatening to withdraw friendships, and/or excluding them from peer groups (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). Like aggressive bullies, relational bullies often facilitate their acts and may be assisted by passive bullies.

Literature is conflicting on whether bullies' behaviors are always explained by feelings of low self-esteem and inadequacy. One study by O'Moore and Kirkham (2001) examined the relationship between self-esteem and bullying in a sample of 8249 Irish students aged 8 to 18. While they found lower global self-esteem in "pure bullies" (e.g. those who bullied without any history of victimization) than children with no bully or victim history, "pure bullies" placed the same value on physical attributes and popularity as their non-bullying or victim counterparts. Their findings are consistent with others, suggesting that some aggressive youth are popular among peers due to their social awareness and dominance (Farmer, Estell, Bishop, O'Neal & Cairns, 2003). In contrast, others note that aggressive bullies present with "fake" high self-esteem because their self-concept is maintained solely by their aggressive acts (Staub, 1999) and not from conventional sources such as satisfactory peer relations or academic achievement (Orpinas & Horne, 2001). In addition, earlier literature found an association between children's' aggressive behaviors and lower popularity among their peers (e.g. Lancelotta & Vaughn, 1989). Researchers also speculate that passive bullies are motivated by their own insecurities in social situations and/or hopes of gaining popularity by aligning themselves with aggressive bullies (Olweus, 1991, 1993; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Samivalli, 1996).

Aggression literature identifies several personal characteristics associated with bullies. One study involving middle school students found that bullying behavior was associated with misconduct, anger and beliefs supportive of violence (Bosworth, Espelage & Simon, 1999). Similarly, Orpinas and Horne (2006) note that bullies harbor beliefs supporting violence due in part to a history of real (or perceived) positive outcomes from their aggressive acts. They may also show less confidence in learning or using non-aggressive acts (Bosworth, Espelage & Simon, 1999). In addition, bio-behavioral characteristics such as weak emotion regulation and executive functioning deficits have been found in aggressive children (Dodge & Pettit, 2003), which makes learning and applying non-aggressive strategies more difficult.

Family and environmental characteristics have also been associated with bullying behaviors in children. Some have found that exposure to inter-parental violence at home was associated with later bullying behavior (Baldry, 2003; Hong & Espelage, 2012; Swearer & Esplage, 2004). For example, Baldry (2003) found that Italian boys and girls witnessing inter-parental violence at home were more likely to bully their peers than those not witnessing such violence. Others note that parents encouraging their children to engage in aggressive behaviors may place their children at risk. One study involving Texas middle school students found that parental support for fighting was the strongest predictor for students' aggressive behavior, fighting and weapon carrying (Orpinas & Horne, 2006;Oprinas, Murray & Kelder, 1999). Moreover, some bullies have had struggling relationships with their parents that have involved maltreatment and limited parental support (Holt & Espelage, 2007; Hong & Espelage, 2012; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Swearer & Espelage, 2004).

Characteristics of Victims

As with bullies, victims vary in their personality and behavioral characteristics. According to Olweus (1993), Orpinas and Horne (2006), there are three different subtypes of victims. *Passive victims* are those singled out without provoking others (Olweus, 1993). They are

described has having vulnerabilities such as low-self-esteem, limited friendships and anxiety that prevents them from asserting themselves when confronted by bullies. In contrast, *provocative victims* are those whose maladaptive social behaviors provoke aggression from bullies and other peers. Examples include those who intentionally annoy or tease others and are reinforced by negative attention. Unlike passive victims, they may engage in bullying behaviors themselves prior to being victimized. For this reason, provocative victims have also been referred to as *bully-victims*. Orpinas and Horne (2006) identified *relational victims* as a third subtype based them being victims of relational aggression. Whereas victimization against passive and provocative victims is easily recognized by others, at a glance the relational victims may not appear to be victimized. Examples include children excluded from social groups based on individual differences such as ethnicity, religious affiliation or sexual orientation. Regardless of the subtype, victimization is associated with several adversities over time. For example, Hawker and Boulton's (2000) meta-analysis of victimization studies revealed strong associations with depression, moderate associations with weaker global self-esteem and smaller associations with anxiety. In extreme cases victimization has been related to an increase in suicidal behavior (Carney, 2000).

Research suggests that certain individual characteristics make children more vulnerable to victimization (Egan & Perry, 1998; Espelage & Swearer, 2004; Hong & Espelage, 2012; Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). For example, Egan and Perry (1998) studied the extent to which low self-concept and self-esteem contributed to victimization in a sample of students from grades three through seven. Their findings suggested that children with low self-esteem behaved in ways that made them more vulnerable to victimization. According to Egan and Perry (1998), these children were less likely to defend themselves and more likely to show signs of helplessness (e.g. social withdrawal, crying) that made them "easy targets" for bullies.

Other individual characteristics involve those who differ from the norm in terms of abilities, physical size, sexual orientation, race/ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and religion (Holt & Keyes, 2004). According to a 2009 National School Climate Survey (Kosciw, Greytak, Diaz, & Bartkiewicz, 2010), 84.6% of lesbian, gay, bi-sexual, transgender and questioning (LGBTQ) students reported being verbally harassed, 40.1% reported being physically harassed, and 18.8% reported that they were physically assaulted at school in the past year because of their sexual orientation (Leiberman & Cowan, 2011). Some note that having an observable disability places children at-risk because they may present as too passive or engage in maladaptive responses that elicit bullies (Rose, Monda-Amaya & Espelage, 2011). In addition, intellectually gifted children have also been susceptible to verbal bullying and similar harassment. In a sample of 432 intellectually gifted 8th graders in eleven US middle schools, Peterson and Ray (2006) found that 67% of these youth experienced some form of name-calling based on their appearance and/or intellectual abilities. These findings support the need for educators to incorporate openness to differences as part of bullying prevention initiatives.

Family and peer relationships during childhood have been associated with being a victim of bullying. Shields and Cicchetti (2001) found that boys and girls who were maltreated were at risk for victimization by their peers. According to their findings, maltreated children may suffer from low self-esteem, which contributes to the vulnerable behaviors found in many bullying victims. Moreover, these same behaviors (e.g. those associated with provocative victims) contribute to low levels of peer support and high levels of peer rejection (Pellegrini, 1998). Beran and Violato (2004) found that parents of bullying victims had high levels of control and low levels of warmth towards their children. Implications were that these parents may create a sense of helplessness and inadequacy in their children that places them at-risk for poor adjustment among peers including peer victimization. Others have investigated children's witnessing of inter-parental violence as a risk-factor for victimization. Whereas Baldry (2003)

found a relation between exposure to inter-parental violence and later bullying behavior, Bauer, Herrenkohl, Lozano, Rivara, Hill and Hawkins (2006) found these children were also at-risk for becoming bullying victims at school. Taken together, all findings suggest significant relationship among individual, peer and family characteristics of victims.

Bystanders

Bullying literature suggests that witnesses (bystanders) are present when bullying occurs. Orpinas and Horne (2006) classify bystanders as either being part of the problem or part of the solution. For example, by laughing at the victim or encouraging the bully, some bystanders assuming bullying roles. Others may intervene to help the victim. However, Salmivalli et al. (1996) defined bystanders by their apathy, suggesting that they avoid any involvement. Atlas and Pepler (1998) acknowledged the prevalence and roles of bystanders in bullying situations. From filming students in grades 1 through 6, they found that 85% of peers were either actively (encouraging or stopping the bullying) or passively (no active intervention) involved in a bullying situation. Only 14% of students who knew of the situation intervened to stop the bullying. Others have suggested that some passively involved bystanders choose not to intervene because they are silently entertained and condone the violence (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Slaby, Wilson-Brewer & Dash, 1994). According to these findings, peers are more likely to encourage the bullying or show indifference than to stop it from occurring. When bystanders appear indifferent, some suggest that they either lack the skills to intervene or fear reprisal from the bullies involved (Orpinas & Horne, 2006).

Bystander attitudes toward bullying victims have been studied as predictors of their involvement (Hara, 2002; Rigby, 1997; Seals & Young, 2003). Hara (2002) found that those who encouraged bullies were more likely to justify their behavior by blaming the victim. Others noted gender differences, with girls showing more empathy toward victims than boys (Rigby 1997).

Moreover, Seals and Young (2003) found that older children harbored more negative attitudes towards bullying, suggesting that they would more likely intervene than younger children.

Bullying Prevention Programs

Orpinas et al. (2003) classified bullying prevention programs as either *targeted* or *universal*. Targeted programs were defined as those designed for a subgroup of at-risk individuals, where interventions are geared towards reducing risk factors and increasing protective factors (Orpinas et al., 2003). In contrast, universal prevention programs are oriented towards modifying whole-school environments to address risk and protective factors (Orpinas et al., 2003). Existing literature suggests that universal bullying prevention programs have components that address the school context and participants in bullying situations.

The development of bullying prevention programs was largely influenced by Olweus's work at the University of Bergen. From the development of the first bullying prevention programs to those present there has been an emphasis on changing school environments that are conducive to bullying behaviors. School environments are influenced by the shared beliefs, values and attitudes of those within them. These shared beliefs, values and attitudes, which shape the interaction between students and school personnel are collectively known as the school climate (Mitchell, Bradshaw & Leaf, 2010). Understanding the school climate has several benefits. At the organizational level, assessing the school climate can identify maladaptive organizational characteristics, which make school-wide models for managing student behavior more difficult to implement. When identified, facets of the school climate, such as discipline and student interpersonal relationships, can be targets for school improvement initiatives. For bullying prevention, school climate characteristics that favor bullying can be modified through school-based interventions for staff, students and parents.

There is evidence that schools with lower incidences of anti-social behavior have more positive psychosocial climates (Bryk & Driscoll, 1988; Gottfredson, Gottfredson, Payne &

Gottfredson, 2005). For example, Gottfredson et al. (2005) investigated school organizational characteristics as predictors of school crime and disorder among a nationally representative sample of 254 secondary schools. Their study distinguished between organization characteristics that were uncontrollable (e.g. structural characteristics such as the community where a school was located or the size of the school) and controllable (e.g. perceived fairness and clarity of rules and positive pro-social climate). *School disorder* was defined as acts of crime and/or incivility committed by students and experienced by students or teachers. *School climate* was defined using measures of perceived fairness, clarity of rules and positive psychosocial school climates. According to results, schools where students perceived greater fairness and clarity of schools had less delinquent behavior and less student victimization. Where bullying prevention programs are concerned, these results suggest that student victimization can be reduced when prevention improves certain aspects of a school climate such as perceived fairness and clarity of rules.

The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program

In 1996, the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence (CSPV) at the University of Colorado launched the Blueprints for Violence Prevention Project, which sought to identify evidence-based programs for school violence prevention (Blueprint for Violence Prevention, 2002-2004). Eleven major prevention and intervention programs were identified to have met strict scientific standards and efficacy (Blueprint for Violence Prevention, 2002-2004). Of these, the Olweus Bullying Prevention program (OBPP) was the only program that addressed bullying behaviors in school settings and met all standards.

OBPP is a whole school approach that addresses the individual, classroom and school levels of social ecology (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Hong, 2009; Kallestead & Olweus, 2003). Prevention at the school level involves administration of needs assessment questionnaires to students and staff, school conference days addressing bullying prevention, effective supervision on school grounds, staff discussion groups and formation of a bullying prevention committee.

Classroom prevention emphasizes rules specific to bullying prevention as well as class meetings with students and parents to promote these guidelines. At the individual level, interventions involve reconciliation between bullies and victims, development of behavior intervention plans to address bullying and parental involvement their development and implementation. The goals OBPP are summarized as follows: 1) To reduce, if not eliminate existing bullying behaviors inside and outside of the school setting, 2) to prevent the development of future bullying behaviors, 3) to increase positive peer relations in school setting and 4) to create school environments that promote pro-social behaviors among all students (Olweus, 1993).

The effects of the OBPP were first studied in Bergen, Norway between the years of 1983 and 1985. The project involved 2500 boys and girls in 42 primary and lower secondary/junior high schools. Results were favorable, with a 50% reduction in bullying behavior, as reported by students. Students also reported significant improvements with the quality of discipline, more positive attitudes towards schoolwork and school experiences (Kallestad & Olweus, 2003).

Researchers have assessed the effectiveness of the OBPP in school districts throughout the U.S. The first evaluation of OBPP in the U.S. was conducted in the mid-1990's with six elementary and middle schools in rural South Carolina (Limber, Nation, Tracy, Melton, & Flerx, 2004; Olweus & Limber, 2010). Districts were organized into matched pairs based on their geographic location and demographics of students. Students were predominately African-American and Caucasian and from low SES backgrounds. According to results after one year of implementation, intervention schools received a 27% reduction in bullying behavior. Similarly, Black and Jackson (2007) examined the program's effectiveness in six Philadelphia public elementary and middle schools during four years of implementation. Students were primarily from low SES backgrounds and were predominately African-American and Hispanic. Using an observation instrument to measure Bullying Incident Density (BID), a 45% decrease in incident density was found from years one through four. Bauer and colleagues (2007) also obtained

favorable outcomes from studying OBPP's effectiveness in a sample of 10 middle schools in Washington State.

The CAPSLE Program

In addition to addressing school climate factors that contribute to bullying behaviors, other programs focus on improving the relationships between bullies, victims and bystanders. One such program is the Creating a Peaceful School Learning Environment Program (CAPSLE). (Twenlow, Sacco, & Williams, 2001). CAPSLE is a school-wide intervention program that promotes awareness of power dynamics and perspective-taking to all students with the hope of increasing empathy and reducing pre-aggressive attitudes (Twenlow, Sacco, & Williams, 2001; Biggs, Twemlow, Vernberg, Fonagy & Dill, 2008). CAPSLE has four components: Classroom Management, Positive Climate Campaign, Gentle Warrior Program and Mentoring Programs. CAPSLE differs from Olweus in many respects. Its first two components promote a pro-social school climate through increasing awareness of power struggles, reflection and modulation of feelings (Biggs et al., 2008). However, it does not set explicit rules against bullying or not target bullies and victims for interventions. In addition, the Gentle Warrior Program is a distinct feature of CAPSLE that involves a structured set of physical activities (e.g. stretching, relaxation, self-defense) in conjunction with psychoeducation that promotes ethical conduct including self-respect, respect for others and generosity (Biggs et al., 2008). Finally, mentorship programs involve the use of peer mentors to support younger students through modeling of appropriate social behaviors and conflict resolution.

Fonagy et al. (2009) investigated that CAPSLE's efficacy in a randomized control trial consisting of 1345third through fifth graders at 9 U.S. High Schools. This study compared the effects of School Psychiatric Consultation (SPC) (e.g. children with severe behavioral concerns are targeted and referred for counseling), treatment as usual (TAU) in addressing aggressive behavior in elementary schools and CAPSLE. Outcome measures included peer and self-reports

of bullying, bystanding, and classroom behavioral observations of disruptive and off-task behavior. According to results, children in CAPSLE schools exhibited more positive bystanding behaviors, showed greater empathy and had less favorable attitudes towards bullying than in TAU and SPC schools.

The Effectiveness of Bullying Intervention Programs

With an increase in public awareness on the prevalence of bullying in school settings, many schools have adopted bullying intervention programs. With these developments came an interest in studying their effectiveness. Existing literature has examined the effects of whole-school and targeted approaches. As with other school-based prevention approaches, the quality of their implementation is influenced by a several school-level characteristics.

There is evidence that most school-based prevention programs vary in how they are implemented and in their overall quality (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 2002). Gottfredson and Gottfredson (2002) discussed four potential characteristics of schools and programs that are related to successful implementation of school-based prevention initiatives:

1. *Organizational capacity* is the amount of resources (e.g. staff, monetary funds) available for a program's implementation. Limited organizational capacity has been associated with failure when implementing school-based initiatives and lower morale among personnel (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 2002).
2. O*rganizational support* consists of the amount of training and/or administrative support available to employees to implement a program. For example, successful implementation of a bullying prevention program involves professional development for all staff on the program's methodology.
3. *Program features-manuals, implementation standards and quality-control methods* ensure that an initiative is implemented and monitored over time for its effectiveness.

4. *Integration into normal school operations, local initiation and local planning* are factors that are expected to increase widespread adoption and enthusiasm for an initiative in a school setting. When considering bullying prevention programs, Olweus (1993) suggests that they must be integrated into a school's philosophy to ensure a positive school climate. Moreover, staff must be able to implement the program in addition to maintaining academic achievement among students.

Gottfredson and Gottfredson's (2002) literature provides insight into how bullying prevention programs can vary in their implementation quality and effectiveness. For example, there is evidence that successful implementation of OBPP requires adequate organizational capacity and support. Implementation of OBPP involves forming a Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee consisting of a school administrator, a teacher from each grade level, a school-based mental health professional (e.g. school counselor, social worker or psychologist), a representative of non-teaching staff (e.g. bus driver), a community representative and a parent representative (Olweus & Limber, 2010). The committee's primary responsibility is to ensure that all components of OBPP are implemented at a school. Moreover, Both CAPSLE and OBPP require some level of initial training and prolonged supervision in order to be implemented successfully. Thus, schools with staffing limitations and limited professional development opportunities may be at a disadvantage for successful implementation of whole-school bullying prevention initiatives.

Findings from effectiveness studies suggest that most bullying prevention programs produce modest positive outcomes on changing attitudes but have little effect on reducing bullying behaviors (Merrell et al., 2008; Smith, Schneider, Smith & Ananiadou,2004). Smith et al. (2004) synthesized the findings from 14 whole-school bullying approaches to determine their overall effectiveness. According to their findings, the majority of these programs produced non-significant outcomes on self-report measures of bullying and victimization. Similarly, Merrell et

al. (2008) conducted a meta-analytic study of bullying intervention program research from 1980 to 2004. It included 16 effectiveness studies with 15386 K through 12 participants from European nations and the U.S. As with Smith et al.'s (2004) findings, the majority of outcomes indicated no significant change in bullying behaviors. However, positive outcomes included fewer pro-bullying attitudes and greater likelihood of responding in bullying situations.

Perceived Seriousness of Bullying Situations

While bullying is viewed as a serious social problem affecting school settings, literature suggests that some bullying situations are perceived as less serious than others. Moreover, differences in perceived seriousness have been found to influence educators' interventions and responses when bullying occurs (Craig et al, 2000; Dedousis-Wallace & Shute, 2009, Yoon & Kerber 2003, Yoon, 2004). Much of this literature has assessed teacher attitudes about different types of bullying behaviors and predicted their responses in hypothetical bullying situations. For example, Craig et al. (2000) studied the effects of individual and contextual factors on attitudes toward bullying in a sample of prospective teachers. As part of their study, they designed *The Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire* to assess individuals' definitions of bullying, perceived seriousness of bullying and likelihood of intervention using 18 hypothetical vignettes of bullying situations. The authors found that physical types of aggression were more often labeled as bullying, perceived more seriously than verbal aggression and were more likely to prompt intervention. In addition, social exclusion was perceived as being less serious than physical or verbal aggression. Their attitudes contrasted with findings that long-term consequences from social exclusion have been more severe for some victims than physical or verbal aggression (Olweus, 1993; Orpinas & Horne, 2006).

Using the Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire, Yoon and Kerber (2003) investigated teachers' attitudes toward three types of bullying behaviors (verbal, physical and social exclusion) and their disciplinary strategies used in each situation. As with previous findings,

teachers perceived social exclusion as less serious than verbal or physical bullying, were less likely to get involved and suggested more lenient intervention strategies than for verbal and physical bullying situations.

Yoon (2004) explored teacher's perceived seriousness, empathy towards victims and efficacy in behavior management as predictors of teacher responses in bullying situations. According to her findings, teachers with higher ratings on the perceived seriousness of the situation indicated that they would more likely intervene in the bullying situations. In addition, multiple regression analysis revealed that perceived seriousness of the bullying situation was the most important predictor of teacher involvement.

There is evidence that teachers' perceived seriousness of bullying situations can increase through professional development participation. In a study examining characteristics that predict teacher intervention in indirect bullying situations, Dedousis-Wallace and Shute (2009) measured teachers' perceived seriousness of bullying situations before and after their participation in a presentation on the mental health impact of bullying. When compared to a treated control group, the presentation increased teachers' perceived seriousness immediately following the presentation and seven weeks later.

Empathy Towards Victims

Empathy by an observer is an individual characteristic that has been found to influence helping behavior (Batson, 1991; Rudolph et al., 2004; Weiner, 1986, 1996). According to the empathy-altruism model of bystander intervention, empathic emotion from an observer motivates him/her to engage in helping behavior (Batson, 1991). For example, witnessing another person in need elicits empathic concern and ultimately helping behavior in order to reduce their distress (Batson & Oleson, 1991). Others relate observers' emotional responses to judgments of responsibility. Wiener's (1986, 1996) theory of social conduct indicates that when a victim's plight is seen as uncontrollable, feelings of sympathy are elicited, thereby increasing

the likelihood of helping behavior. Conversely, anger and aggression are elicited when the victim's predicament is seen as their own doing. Despite their differences, social conduct and empathy-altruism theories emphasize the role of empathic emotion and its influence on observer behavior. Thus, empathy has been studied as a predictor of staff responses in bullying situations.

Studies investigating perceived seriousness as a predictor of staff responses in bullying situations have also emphasized the role of empathy towards victims. Craig et al. (2000) found that teachers with greater global empathy were more likely to identify bullying, perceive it as serious and report that they would intervene. Yoon (2004) found that empathy towards specific victims in three types of bullying situations was significant in predicting teachers' likelihood of intervention in response to bullying behaviors. Results of Yoon and Kerber's (2003) study indicated that teachers showed less empathy for victims of social exclusion than for those of verbal and physical bullying. Jacobsen and Bauman (2007) studied school counselors' attitudes and responses to three types of hypothetical bullying situations (verbal, physical and social exclusion). According to their results, school counselors showed more empathy for victims than in similar studies with teachers. However, consistent with teacher findings, school counselors showed less empathy for social exclusion victims than for those of physical or verbal bullying.

Beliefs about the Causes of Bullying

Where Craig et al. (2000) investigate teacher beliefs about what constitutes bullying, others have studied their beliefs about the causes of victimization. Kochenderfer-Ladd and Pelletier (2008) studied the relationship between teacher beliefs about the causes of victimization, classroom management strategies and children's coping with peer victimization. Using a paradigm from Troop and Ladd (2002), teacher views about victimization were divided into *assertive, avoidant* or *normative beliefs*. Assertive beliefs are those suggesting that children would not be bullied if they stood up for themselves. Avoidant beliefs are those suggesting that children would not be bullied if they avoided their perpetrators. Normative beliefs are those

where bullying is perceived as a normative behavior that helps teach social norms. Also consistent with Troop and Ladd's (2002) paradigm were six types of management strategies that teachers may use based on their beliefs. These were punishment, advocating assertion, advocating independence, involving parents, advocating avoidance and separating students. Children's coping strategies were also divided into six types: problem-solving, revenge seeking, adult support, passive coping, cognitive distancing, and peer victimization. According to their results, teachers were less likely to intervene when they saw bullying as a normative behavior but more likely to intervene if they had assertive or avoidant beliefs. In addition, avoidant beliefs were predictive of separating students, which was then associated with lower levels of peer victimization. However, there were no associations between how teachers handle bullying and how their students do. Consistent with previous findings, teachers' beliefs about bullying may influence how they manage bullying situations.

There is also evidence that teachers' attitudes and beliefs may influence their participation in school-wide bullying prevention programs (Kallestad & Olweus, 2003; Biggs et al., 2008). For example, Kallestad and Olweus (2003) investigated factors that predict schools' and teachers' implementation of OBPP in a sample of 37 teachers and 89 schools. Among teacher level predictors, those who perceived more bully/victim problems in their classroom (perceived level of bullying) or perceived their role in bullying prevention as more important (perceived staff importance) scored significant higher on classroom intervention measures. According to these findings, teachers with these perceptions are more likely to adhere to bullying prevention programs. In a similar study, Biggs et al. (2008) studied teacher adherence and its relation to teacher attitudes and student outcomes during the implementation of CAPSLE in sample of elementary schools. Among their findings, teacher's adherence was related to their perceptions of CAPSLE's utility and the degree to which CAPSLE's principles were consistent with their own beliefs about classroom management.

Attitudes toward Diversity

Diversity has referred to the variations of gender, race, social class, sexual orientation, disabilities, age, and peoples' values and beliefs (Haidt, Rosenberg & Hom, 2003) that shape our society. The diversity within a school mirrors the diversity with a broader society (Gao & Mager, 2011). For example, according to the Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics (FIFCFS, 2005), children of color will account for nearly half of the U.S.'s school-aged population by 2020. From 1994 to 2004, 19% of U.S. children spoke a language other than English at home and 5% of school children had difficulty speaking English (FIFCFS, 2005). In addition, more than 3 million children with special education needs spend 80% or more of their school day in a general education classroom, while only 25% found themselves in a general education setting in 1985 (U.S. Department of Education, 2005). These findings suggest that openness to diversity should be an integral part of school climates.

There is evidence that some school climates are hostile towards individuals who differ from the norm. Much of this literature pertains to negative perceptions of LGBT students and school personnel. Stader and Graca (2007) studied the prevalence of negative perceptions of sexual minority teachers in a sample of 117 school teachers who were seeking principal certifications. Teachers were from 20 school districts representing the Dallas-Fort Worth metropolitan area. According to their results, 60% reported overhearing homophobic comments about sexual minority personnel of which 21% reported hearing these comments on a weekly basis. In addition, 21% witnessed what they described as sexually harassing behavior.

Literature suggests that some school climates where bullying is prevalent do not have policies that support openness to diversity. O'Higgins-Norman (2008) investigated teachers' willingness to address homophobic bullying concerns through a nationwide curriculum in a sample of Irish schools. The Social, Personal and Health Education (SPHE) curriculum was designed to promote a number of life skills including social-emotional and physical health, self-

esteem, positive decision-making and other skills necessary for functioning in communities after secondary schooling (O'Higgins-Norman, 2008). Within this curriculum is the Relationship and Sexuality Education (RSE) component, which was hypothesized to be lacking on LGBT issues and related homophobic bullying. The study involved 365 SPHE coordinators who responded to an anonymous survey. Items addressed the extent to which LGBT issues and homophobia are included in the SPHE curriculum. According to their findings, only 36% of teachers reported having a policy addressing equal opportunities. This finding occurred despite a recent legislation in Ireland obliging schools to develop such a policy. Moreover, 79% were aware of instances where verbal bullying using homophobic terms occurred and 30% of them encountered these incidents on more than 10 occasions within the last term of the school year.

Openness to diversity has been assessed as school climate construct. In their study of teachers' attitudes toward bullying, Holt and Keyes (2004) surveyed 797 teachers and paraprofessionals from 18 Wisconsin schools on their perceptions of school climate quality. In addition to openness to diversity, their survey consisted of items measuring degrees of equity, hostile climate and willingness to intervene. On average, participants believed their schools were respectful towards diversity. However, the authors note variations in item responses across schools, suggesting that participants may vary in their attitudes toward diversity.

School Personnel Responses to Bullying Situations

Recent findings suggest that personnel use a variety of strategies when responding to bullying situations. Dake, Price, Telljohann and Funk (2003) investigated teacher responses in a sample of 359 fourth-year teachers. According to their findings, the majority of teachers (86%) engaged in serious talks with the bully and the victim. They also listed contacting parents of the bullies, meeting with bullies, victims and parents to generate possible solutions as effective strategies. Harris and Willoughby (2003) surveyed 68 teachers who were in an administrative certification program. While 57% endorsed immediate punishment for bullies, many believed

that opportunities for counseling and reconciliation with victims should be attempted before punishment. Sending bullies to the office, talking with the student about bullying or referring bullies to the counselor were strategies were less common strategies endorsed. Contacting parents was strongly endorsed.

Others have investigated handling of bullying situations by staff other than teachers. Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa (2008) studied strategies for handling bullying incidents in a sample of 735 teachers and school counselors. Participants were asked how likely they would use various strategies to respond to hypothetical bullying situations. Their analysis examined the use of five strategies uncovered from previous literature: Ignoring the incident, working with the bully, enlisting other adults, and disciplining the bully. Results indicated that most participants were willing to take some action when presented with the bullying situation. Counselors had higher endorsement of "Working with victim" items than did teachers. As with previous findings, all respondents strongly endorsed the "Disciplining the bully" items. Participants from schools with school-wide bullying policies endorsed of "Ignoring the incident" items less than those with no policies. However, there was no consensus on which actions to take in the bullying situation.

Kochenderfer-Ladd and Pelletier (2008) investigated the following management strategies that teachers may use based on their beliefs about the causes of victimization: punishment, advocating assertion, advocating independence, involving parents, advocating avoidance and separating students. Similar to those choosing not to ignore bullying incidents, teachers were less likely to tell children to handle bullying situations on their own (advocate independence) than most other strategies. They were also more likely to report using punishment than most other strategies. Taken together with earlier findings, most personnel's responses involve disciplining the bully. However, other responses such as involving parents, working with

the bully and enlisting adults are strategies endorsed by OBPP (Olweus, 1993) that are used less often.

Principals and Bullying Prevention

There have been relatively few studies investigating principal attitudes and perceptions of bullying in school settings. Literature is also scarce on principals' beliefs about their role in bullying prevention programs. However, principal leadership literature suggests that principals should play an active leadership role in bullying prevention initiatives. Much of this literature highlights the relationship between the principal's leadership behaviors and multiple school level indicators such as perceptions of school safety (Sprague, Smith & Stieber, 2002), school climate quality and the academic achievement of students (Griffith, 1999).

The idea of principals assuming leadership roles in bullying prevention programs stems from evidence of their leadership roles in other types of school initiatives. Kose (2009) describes five comprehensive and interrelated principal roles with regard to professional development. The *Visionary* role describes the responsibility of principals to develop a consensus for a school's mission that includes tangible goals for student achievement. The *Learning Leader* role describes the principal's role in influencing the type of professional development that occurs in a school setting. Moreover, this role is also concerned with promoting an organizational system that aligns professional development with school improvement and student learning goals. The *Structural Leader* role is concerned with the management of resources (e.g. finances, staff development time, curriculum materials) needed for professional development initiatives. The *Cultural Leader* role describes the principal's responsibility of establishing a professional learning community (PLC) or culture within a school that promotes the application of skills learned through professional development. Finally, the *Political Leader* role is concerned with communicating the link between student achievement and professional development to educational policy-makers and stakeholders.

The need for principal involvement in bullying prevention initiatives can be viewed in the context of their role in professional development. For example, principal must establish a school vision to create a bully-free school setting. They must also facilitate professional development to school staff on implementing bullying interventions. Furthermore, principals must create a culture among school staff that promotes the use of bullying prevention strategies. Finally, a principal must provide data to policy-makers that supports a need to continue professional development on bullying prevention initiatives.

Principal leadership literature suggests that effective principal leadership is associated with safer school environments. Astor, Benbeneshty and Estrada (2009) studied organizational characteristics and school violence in a sample of Isreali schools. Their study focused on a subset of *Theoretically Atypical Schools*, which were defined as schools with victimization rates that were in the opposite direction as one would predict based on the community crime and poverty rates (Astor et al., 2009). Schools with low victimization rates in the context of high community crime and poverty were defined as *Atypically Low* schools. Conversely, those high victimization rates in the context low community crime and poverty were defined as *Atypically High* schools. According to their findings, atypically low schools were associated with more effective leadership behaviors among principals. Principals in atypically low violence schools engaged in more positive interactions with students and staff. Moreover, when compared to those in atypically high schools, principals in atypically low schools had detailed policies against school violence and facilitated more supervision on school grounds. These findings suggest that schools with lower levels of violence are associated with principals who are activity involved in violence prevention. Where bullying prevention is concerned, these findings highlight the need for similar leadership behaviors among principals.

Although there is a need for principal involvement in bullying prevention, there is evidence that principals are less aware of the extent of bullying in their schools. From a survey of

59 Texas Middle School Principals, Harris and Hathorn (2006) found that principals were less aware of the locations where bullying occurred, indicated adequate levels of support and perceived their schools as safe. Previous studies (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Nansel et al., 2001) have found that students report more awareness of bullying and are unsure that administrators are willing to respond when bullying occurs (Harris, 2004).

While bullying prevention literature emphasizes a proactive approach to reducing bullying behaviors, findings suggest that principals perceive barriers to such initiatives and are less likely to implement them (Dake et al., 2004). Dake et al. (2004) investigated perceptions and practices of bullying prevention activities in a national random sample of 378 principals. Their survey consisted of 3 closed-format stages of change items related to school-wide activities recommended by OBPP. The first related to whether their schools administered a survey to students assessing the of bullying in their schools; the second related to whether their schools had a school-wide bullying prevention committee and the third related to their schools having a conference day for staff, students and parents to raise awareness about bullying prevention efforts. Principals were able to select from descriptions that best represented their school and from a list of potential barriers for each of the three items. Additionally, principals were asked about the extent of bullying in U.S. schools, extent of bullying in their school, the level of violence in their surrounding communities and the number of school-related bullying problems reported to them in the last two years. Dake and his colleagues found that few principals reported using whole-school approaches similar to OBPP, and that principals perceived post-bullying activities as more effective than proactive approaches and cited lack of priority relative to other problems, limited resources and limited training as barriers. Moreover, most principals perceived bullying behaviors as more prevalent in other U.S. schools than their own.

As with other school personnel, there is evidence that principals vary in their understanding of bullying prevention initiatives and knowledge of the extent of bullying

behaviors in their schools. Yet because of the limited findings on principal perceptions of bullying behaviors, further study is needed to understand why some principals endorse evidenced based bullying prevention programs and others do not. Perhaps principals, like other school personnel, vary in their attitudes towards bullies, victims, and beliefs about the causes of victimization. In turn, these perceptions may influence how they respond in bullying situations and ultimately how the perceive bullying prevention initiatives. Answering these questions may enhance professional development of administrators by reducing attitudes and practices that impede bullying prevention initiatives.

CHAPTER 3

METHOD

The current study examines principal responses to hypothetical bullying situations and the factors that predict their responses. This chapter describes the methods that were used to collect and analyze the data for the research questions proposed for this study. Based on previous studies addressing attitudes about bullying situations, a non-experimental, cross-sectional, correlational design was used to examine factors related to principals' responses to bullying situations. This design was chosen since there was no intervention or manipulation of variables.

Participants

Participants in this study were recruited using two methods. The Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principal's Association (MEMSPA) is a professional organization that reports a membership of over 1,300 elementary and middle school principals organized into 14 divisions throughout the state of Michigan.

MEMSPA's (2012) bylaws provide the following definition of active membership:

> Active membership shall be open to any person who is professionally employed by an educational institution or agency serving as a principal or assistant principal in an elementary or middle school; a director or supervisor with K-8 or K-12 responsibilities; an assistant to the principal in an administrative capacity, with the majority of students in Kindergarten through 8th grade or middle school; a person engaged in the professional education of elementary and middle school principals or teachers (p. 4).

School administrators recruited through MEMSPA were either active members or had previously held an active membership. In addition, principals and assistant principals taking a graduate level course were recruited from the College's Administrative and Organizational Studies program at Wayne State University. According to the instructor, the class consisted of

current principals, assistant principals and teachers in training for administrative roles. Only those who were principals and assistant principals were asked to take part in the study.

Cohen's (1988) power analysis for multiple regression was used to provide an a-priori sample size. Using an alpha level of .05, a medium effect size of .15, six predictors and a power level of .90, a minimum sample size was estimated at 123 participants.

There were 126 school administrators who took part in the study. The majority of participants (96%) were school administrators with previous training in bullying prevention who presided over schools with a school-wide bullying prevention policy. Descriptive statistics for participants are presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Frequency Distribution of Demographic Information (N = 126)

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Gender		
Male	54	43.2
Female	65	52.2
Missing	6	
Level of Education		
Master's	81	64.3
Ed. Specialist	28	22.2
Ph.D or Ed.D	11	8.7
Missing	6	
Ethnicity		
African-American	5	4.0
Caucasian	112	89.6
Hispanic/Latino	2	1.6
Missing	6	
Role		
Principal	107	84.9
Assistant Principal	5	4.0

Demographic Characteristics	Frequency	Percent
Superintendent	5	4.0
Other (e.g., Dean of students, other admin etc.)	3	2.4
Missing	6	
Type of School		
Public	118	93.7
Private	2	1.6
Missing	6	
Level of School		
Elementary	61	48.4
Middle	17	13.5
High School	32	25.4
Other	10	7.9
Missing	6	
Anti-bullying Policy		
Yes	120	100.0
No	0	0
Missing	6	
Attended Bullying Prevention Training		
Yes	86	68.8
No	33	26.4
Missing	6	

Of the 126 participants, 117 provided their age and years of experience as a school administrator. The mean age and experience of participants was 46 (*SD* = 7.74) years and 9 (*SD* = 6.39) years, respectively. There was a significant variation in the years of experience among participants (e.g., years of experience ranged from 1 to 33). All of the participants reported presiding over schools with school-wide bullying prevention policies. These descriptive statistics are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics (N=126)

	Mean	*SD*	Minimum	Maximum
Age	46.82	7.74	30	66
Years as Principal	8.99	6.39	1	33

Measures

The following instruments were used to collect data and distributed via surveymonkey.com: The Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire, Student Social Behavior Questionnaire, Personal Beliefs about Diversity Survey, demographic questionnaire and prize registration (See Appendices A through E).

Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire: The Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire was developed by Craig et al. (2000) to measure teacher attitudes toward different types of bullying behaviors. It originally consisted of 18 vignettes depicting examples of verbal bullying, physical bullying, social exclusion and sexual harassment. The original vignettes were grouped into those witnessed or not witnessed by the teacher. Each vignette of Craig et al.'s (2000) Bullying Attitude Questionnaire follows the three characteristics of bullying defined by Olweus (1993): a negative act from a perpetrator, a power imbalance between the victim and the perpetrator and repeated, aggressive acts over time. Following each vignette, the respondent is asked to answer four questions. The first three questions rate their likelihood of intervention (*1= not likely to 5= very likely*), perceived seriousness of the situation (*1= not serious to 5= very serious*) and level of empathy toward victims (*1= not at all empathic to 5= very empathic*). The fourth question is an open-ended question that asks, "How would you respond to this situation?" Principal responses will be coded based on the following nominal classification of strategies: (a) no response, dismiss incident, (b) peer resolution (involve peers to facilitate solution) (c) express

disapproval, (d) discipline perpetrator (punish with suspension, detention, other disciplinary action), (e) involve parents, (f) involve other adults as collaborators (faculty, student services, outside agencies), (g) provide class-wide response (e.g., address incident with class) and (h) provide a school-wide response (e.g., establish victim support group, empathy training for bullies and/or bullying prevention committee). For each respondent, the number of times a response fell in each category was tallied across the vignettes. A total score for each category (a-h) was generated. This system was chosen based on the pilot study conducted by Bauman and Yoon (Personal communication, 9/24/2012).

Previous studies (Jacobson & Bauman, 2007; Yoon, 2004; Yoon & Kerber, 2003) used six vignettes, two of each type of vignette, all witnessed by the respondent. Jacobson and Bauman (2007) reported alpha coefficients for the three Likert scale items (perceived seriousness, empathy and likelihood of intervention) for each bullying type. Alpha coefficients were .76 for physical bullying, .73 for social exclusion and .65 for verbal bullying. Alpha coefficients for Seriousness items were calculated at .68, empathy items at .88, and likelihood of intervention items at .67. Yoon (2004) reported an alpha coefficient of .70 for the perceived seriousness scale, .86 for the empathy scale, .77 for the likelihood of intervention scale, and .67 for level of involvement, open-ended items. Yoon and Kerber (2003) reported alpha coefficients for Perceived Seriousness, Empathy, Likelihood of Intervention and Level of Involvement at .65, .78, .62 and .55, respectively.

Yoon (2004) reported the relationship among teacher characteristics and teacher responses to bullying. When considering variables measured by the Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire, higher ratings of likelihood of intervention were related to higher levels of perceived seriousness (r = .73) and greater levels of empathy for bullying victims (r = .55). In addition, greater levels of empathy were related to higher levels of perceived seriousness (r

= .52). Teacher ratings on likelihood of intervention were not significantly related to their level of involvement (r = .10), suggesting that these variables are measuring two different constructs.

Using the Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire, Jacobsen and Bauman (2007) found differences in school counselors' response to bullying situations by type. Repeated measures ANOVA on perceived seriousness and empathy scores were conducted for the three bullying types (verbal bullying, physical bullying, and relational bullying/social exclusion). How counselors would intervene with bullies and victims for each bullying type was also examined using repeated-measured ANOVA. Differences in perceived seriousness and empathy across each type were statistically significant. Recommended actions toward perpetrators and victims were also statistically significant. As a group, participants rated physical and verbal bullying as more serious than social exclusion and were more likely to intervene in physical and verbal situations and in those involving social exclusion. Using independent t-tests, a significant difference in perceived seriousness of social exclusion was found, where school counselors with bullying prevention training, rated social exclusion as more serious than those without training. Where gender was concerned, females in the sample perceived social exclusion to be more serious than did males. Results suggest that the Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire has adequate discriminative validity when used with school staff other than teachers.

Student Social Behavior Questionnaire: Principals' attitudes and beliefs were measured using a modified version of Troop and Ladd's (2002) Student Social Behavior Questionnaire (SSBQ). Principals will be asked to indicate how they agree with each statement using the following 4-point scale: *1 = strongly disagree; 2= disagree somewhat; 3= agree somewhat; and 4= strongly agree*. The measure consists of three scales: Assertive, Normative, and Avoidant. Assertive scale assesses the belief that children who stand up for themselves will not be victimized (2 items for boys, 3 items for girls. Sample items include "Kids will stop bullying a boy/girl who asserts himself/herself). The Normative scale assesses the belief that peer

victimization is normative behavior among children (2 items for boys, two items for girls. Sample items include "For boys, teasing other children is just part of growing up," and "Teasing helps girls learn important social norms"). The Avoidant scale assesses the belief that children who avoid aggressors will not be victimized (2 items for boys, 2 items for girls. Sample items include "Students will stop picking on girls/boys who ignore them"). Separate subscales for boys and girls were computed. Directions were modified for use with principals and to accommodate the survey monkey format. The following change was made: "Please indicate with an "x" how much you agree with each of the following statements about the boys/girls in your class" was changed to "Please indicate how much you agree with each of the following statements about the BOYS/GIRLS in your school."

Troop and Ladd's (2002) original scale consisted of 14 items for boys and 14 identical items for girls. Kochenderfer-Ladd and Pelletier (2008) omitted several original items because they reduced internal consistency or were filler items. Their final modified scale consisted of 13 items (6 for boys, 7 for girls). Alpha coefficients for Assertiveness items were at .83 and .74 for boys and girls, respectively. Normative items had alpha coefficients at .84 and .94 for boys and girls, respectively. Avoidant items had alpha coefficients at .88 and .84 for boys and girls, respectively. Using this instrument Kochenderfer-Ladd and Pelletier (2008) found gender differences for normative views, such that teachers were more likely to view peer victimization as normative behavior among boys than girls. According to these results, their scale provided adequate discriminative validity when used with teachers.

Personal Beliefs About Diversity Scale: The Personal Beliefs About Diversity Scale is a measure designed by Pohan and Aguilar (2001) to assess educators' beliefs about diversity. It includes 15 items related to the following diversity issues: 1) race/ethnicity (e.g., "there is nothing wrong with people from different racial backgrounds having/raising children"), 2) gender (e.g., "many women in our society continue to live in poverty because males still

dominate most of the major social systems in America"), 3) social class (e.g., "the reason people live in poverty is that they lack motivation to get themselves out of poverty") , 4) sexual orientation (e.g., "it is not a good idea for same-sex couples to raise children"), 5) disabilities (e.g., "people with physical limitations are less effective as leaders than people without physical limitations") , 6) language (e.g., "it is more important for immigrants to learn English than to maintain their first language"), and 7) immigration (e.g., "America's immigrant and refugee policy has led to the deterioration of America") (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001). It uses a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). The scale assesses varying levels of acceptance across each issue. Higher scores reflect openness/acceptance to most or all diversity issues while lower scores reflect low levels of acceptances. Midrange scores suggest acceptance to certain issues and/or indifference to towards some topics in the measure (Pohan & Aguilar, 2001). Directions were modified in order to accommodate the survey monkey format. The following change was made: "Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item below by placing an "x" corresponding to your selection. Please answer every item and use the following scale to select your answers: 1= Strongly Disagree, 2= Disagree, 3=Undecided, 4= Agree, 5= Strongly Agree" was changed to "Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item below by indicating your response below."

Psychometric properties of the Personal Beliefs about Diversity scale have been reported based on a pilot study including 1,941 pre-service and in-service teachers. The study included pilot, preliminary and field testing stages. Item clarity, scale reliability and procedural issues were addressed during the pilot test phase, which involved 280 pre-service undergraduate education students enrolled in a multi-cultural education course (Brown, 2010; Pohan & Aguillar, 2001). The Cronbach alpha coefficient for the Personal Beliefs scale was .78 for both pre-test and posttest conditions. Only items with an item-total correlation coefficient of .30 or greater were retained. Preliminary testing included 187 undergraduate students, graduate students

and practicing educators. The field-testing stage included 1,295 pre-service and practicing teachers from four different states. Following revision, the current version of the scale was administered as a pre-test and then as a post-test to 179 additional students enrolled in a multicultural education course. In pilot and field testing, reliability coefficients ranged from .71 to .81.

Pohan and Aguillar (2001) reported tests of construct validity using correlational analyses with variables of age, gender, multicultural coursework and cross-cultural experiences (Brown, 2010). Personal beliefs did not vary as a function of age across subjects, but did vary by gender, with females obtaining significantly higher personal beliefs scores than males. Subjects with more cross-cultural experiences (e.g., foreign travel, studying abroad) had significantly higher personal beliefs scores. Performance on the Personal Beliefs about Diversity Scale was also compared to performance on the Professional Beliefs about Diversity Scale, a similar measure that assessed educators' views on diversity in an educational context. Both measures were strongly and positive correlated to each other at the preliminary (r =.72) and field testing stages of development (r = .77 for pre-service teachers; r = .67 for practicing teachers).

Demographic Questionnaire: A questionnaire requesting demographic information was given to the participants. On the demographic survey participants provided their age, gender, ethnicity, highest level of education, type of school (i.e., public or private), role (i.e., principal, assistant principal or other), level of school. and years of principal experience. Principals were also asked to indicate if their schools had a school-wide bullying prevention policy and if they had previous bullying prevention training.

Procedure

Approval to conduct this study was received from the Wayne State University Human investigation Committee (HIC). A letter describing the research as an exploration of school administrator responses in bullying situations and explaining the purpose of the study was sent to

the executive director of MEMSPA. MEMPSA's "Level I" endorsement was obtained (Appendix F). Level I endorsement from MEMSPA allows the researcher to obtain an endorsement letter and utilize membership rolls (e.g. email distribution list) for survey sampling purposes. The researcher also offered to attend a committee meeting to present information about the study's process and purpose with the opportunity to answer any questions. Each member was sent an email ensuring confidentiality, introducing the study and survey and providing a link to the survey, which was posted on Survey Monkey (www.surveymonkey.com). Included in the introduction was a notification that completion of the survey will be voluntary and anonymous with informed consent implied by the act of completing the survey. Approximately one month after the initial email, a second email reminding members of the study and response deadline was sent. After submission deadline of four months, the survey was closed to new participants. In an effort to encourage participation, participants were given the opportunity to provide their name and contact information in a prize registration survey. In order to keep participant responses anonymous, this survey was kept separate from the initial survey. A web link to a list of evidenced-based bullying prevention programs was available to all participants. In addition, a drawing was completed where 50 participants were chosen to receive a $5 Starbucks Gift Card. Gift cards were sent via mail to their school addresses.

To provide a system for collecting data, an account with Survey Monkey was established. Permission to use, modify, and reformat each survey was obtained via e-mail from each of its developers (Appendix F). The survey consisted of items inputted to Survey Monkey in the following order: The Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire items, Student Social Behavior Questionnaire items, Personal Beliefs about Diversity Survey items, Demographic Questionnaire items and prize registration.

In coding school administrator's written responses to bullying situations, the researcher and another research assistant tested the coding system by first selecting a random sample of 50

participants' responses, and independently coding the responses into one of the nine categories listed above. Inter-rater agreement was measured, with Kappa values ranging from .86 to 1.00 across the nine categories. See Table 3 for these results.

Table 3

Inter-rater Agreement: Participant Responses to Bullying (n=50)

Category	% of Agreement	*K*
No Response	100.00	1.00
Peer Resolution	100.00	1.00
Express Disapproval	90.00	.86
Discipline Perpetrator	94.00	.93
Involve Parents	92.00	.91
Involve Other Adults	96.00	.91
Other Response	100.00	1.00

Data Analysis

For the analysis of data, correlational analyses, multiple regression analyses and analysis of variance were conducted using the SPSS version 22. All decisions on statistical significance of each research question were made using an alpha level of 0.05. The research questions, variables and statistical analysis for each question are outlined in Table 4.

Table 4

Statistical Analyses

Research Questions & Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analyses
Research Question 1. What are school administrators' beliefs about the causes of victimization? Hypothesis 1.1: School administrators will more likely endorse avoidant or	<u>Independent Variable</u> Gender of victims <u>Dependent Variable</u> School administrator beliefs: • Assertive Beliefs • Normative Beliefs • Avoidant Beliefs	t-tests for dependent samples were used to determine if a difference existed between male and female students on the three school administrator beliefs.

Research Questions & Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analyses
assertive beliefs than normative beliefs. Hypothesis 1.2: School administrators will more likely view bullying as a normative behavior for boys than for girls. Hypothesis 1.3: School administrators will more likely endorse assertive beliefs for boys than for girls.		
Research Question 2. Does a school administrator's empathy, perceived seriousness, likelihood of intervention and type of response differ by the type of bullying situation? Hypothesis 2.1: School administrators will report more empathy, seriousness and more likely intervene in verbal and physical bullying situations than with social exclusion situations. Hypothesis 2.2: School administrators will more likely discipline the perpetrator in verbal and physical bullying situations than in social exclusion situations.	<u>Independent Variable</u> Type of bullying situation: • Verbal • Physical • Social Exclusion <u>Dependent Variables</u> Empathy Perceived Seriousness Likelihood of Intervention Type of response • No response, dismiss incident • Express disapproval • Discipline perpetrator • Involve adults as collaborators • Involve victim and bully in response • Provide a school-wide response • Provide a class-wide response • Other Response	Repeated measures of ANOVA was used to determine if perceived seriousness, empathy and likelihood of intervention differ by the type of bullying situation.
Research Question 3. What predicts School administrators' likelihood of intervention and type of response in bullying situations? Hypothesis 3.1. School	<u>Independent Variable</u> School administrator beliefs: • Assertive Beliefs • Normative Beliefs • Avoidant Beliefs Perceived Seriousness Empathy for Victim Openness to Diversity	A multiple regression analysis was performed with each type of belief (assertive, normative and avoidant), perceived seriousness, empathy for victim and openness to diversity as predictor variables.

Research Questions & Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analyses
administrators with higher assertive or avoidant beliefs, less normative beliefs, higher perceived seriousness, and greater empathy will predict greater likelihood of intervention. Hypothesis 3.2: School administrators with higher assertive or avoidant beliefs, less normative beliefs, higher perceived seriousness, and greater empathy will provide responses that involve expressing disapproval, disciplining the perpetrator or involving parents. Hypothesis 3.3: School administrators with lower assertive or avoidant beliefs, more normative beliefs, lower perceived seriousness and less empathy will provide no response to bullying situations. Hypothesis 3.4: School administrators reporting more openness to diversity will report a higher likelihood of intervention in bullying vignettes.	<u>Dependent Variable</u> Likelihood Of Intervention Type of response • No response, dismiss incident • Express disapproval • Discipline perpetrator • Involve adults as collaborators • Involve victim and bully in response • Provide a school-wide response • Provide a class-wide response • Other Response	Likelihood of intervention and each type of response were criterion variables. Pearson product moment correlations were used to determine the strength and direction of the relationship between openness to diversity, likelihood of intervention in bullying vignettes, and disciplining the perpetrator.
Research Question 4: Does a school administrator's likelihood of intervention and type of response in bullying situations differ by having previous bullying prevention training? Hypothesis 4.1: Having previous anti-bullying	<u>Independent Variable:</u> Previous anti-bullying training <u>Dependent Variables:</u> Likelihood of Intervention Type of response • No response, dismiss incident • Express disapproval	ANOVA using previous anti-bully training as the independent variable. Likelihood of intervention and each type of response will be dependent variables.

Research Questions & Hypotheses	Variables	Statistical Analyses
training will predict a greater likelihood of intervention. Hypothesis 4.2: School administrators having previous anti-bullying training will provide responses that involve expressing disapproval or disciplining the perpetrator	• Discipline perpetrator • Involve adults as collaborators • Involve victim and bully in response • Provide a school-wide response • Provide a class-wide response • Other Response	

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to investigate factors that influence school administrators' responses in bullying situations. This chapter presents the results of the data analyses used to address each research question in the study. Each research question was tested using inferential statistical analyses with statistical significance determined using an alpha level of .05.

Preliminary Analyses

The descriptive statistics for beliefs about the causes of victimization are provided in Table 5.

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics for Beliefs about Bullying by Gender (N = 126)

Type of Belief	Mean	*SD*	Min	Max
Overall Assertiveness	12.52	2.74	3.00	19.00
Assertiveness for boys	5.56	1.10	2.00	8.00
Assertiveness for girls	7.04	1.68	3.00	11.00
Overall Normative	5.52	2.03	3.00	12.00
Normative for boys	2.84	1.09	2.00	6.00
Normative for girls	2.71	1.07	2.00	6.00
Overall Avoidant	8.52	2.62	2.00	14.00
Avoidant for boys	4.34	1.25	2.00	7.00
Avoidant for girls	4.32	1.39	2.00	8.00

The bullying attitudes questionnaire measured school administrators' perceived seriousness of a bullying situation, empathy towards victims, likelihood of intervention and type of response to three different types of bullying vignettes (verbal, physical and social). Table 6 presents descriptive statistics of empathy, perceived seriousness and likelihood of intervention by vignette type. Overall scores for these scales were determined by summing those from each type

of vignette. Higher scores indicate higher levels of empathy, seriousness and likelihood of intervention.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Empathy, Seriousness and Intervention by Vignette Type

	n	Mean	*SD*	Minimum	Maximum
Empathy-Overall	118	26.30	2.68	10.00	30.00
Verbal	123	8.68	1.42	2.00	10.00
Physical	125	9.14	1.12	6.00	10.00
Social	122	8.52	1.33	2.00	10.00
Seriousness- Overall	124	26.54	2.68	19.00	30.00
Verbal	125	8.81	1.07	6.00	10.00
Physical	126	9.34	.84	6.00	10.00
Social	125	8.41	1.26	5.00	10.00
Intervention- Overall	117	28.77	1.92	20.00	30.00
Verbal	123	9.56	.73	6.00	10.00
Physical	123	9.82	.44	8.00	10.00
Social	123	9.37	1.10	5.00	10.00

For each type of bullying situation, responses were coded into the following categories: No response, peer resolution, indication of disapproval, discipline perpetrator, involve parents, involve other adults, school-wide response, class-wide response and other type of response. Responses from verbal, physical and social exclusion situations were summed to create overall scores for each category. Means are based on the number of times a response fell in each category. None of the participants in the sample provided school-wide responses. As a result, this variable was excluded from the statistical analyses. Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics for how school administrators responded to bullying situations by vignette type.

Table 7

Descriptive Statistics for Responses to Bullying by Vignette Type (n=126)

	Mean	*SD*	Min	Max
No Response-Overall	.05	.28	.00	2.00
Verbal	.02	.13	.00	1.00
Physical	.00	.00	.00	.00
Social	.03	.22	.00	2.00
Peer Resolution- Overall	.05	.25	.00	2.00
Verbal	.01	.09	.00	2.00
Physical	.00	.00	.00	.00
Social	.04	.20	.00	1.00
Express Disapproval-Overall	4.29	1.88	.00	6.00
Verbal	1.48	.72	.00	2.00
Physical	1.27	.81	.00	2.00
Social	1.54	.72	.00	2.00
Discipline Perpetrator-Overall	3.03	1.89	.00	6.00
Verbal	.94	.85	.00	2.00
Physical	1.44	.75	.00	2.00
Social	.65	.73	.00	2.00
Involve Parents-Overall	2.24	2.02	.00	6.00
Verbal	.59	.71	.00	2.00
Physical	.91	.86	.00	2.00
Social	.61	.75	.00	2.00
Involve Other Adults-Overall	.53	1.03	.00	5.00
Verbal	.14	.41	.00	2.00
Physical	.17	.47	.00	2.00
Social	.21	.48	.00	2.00
Class-wide Response-Overall	.12	.50	.00	4.00
Verbal	.02	.13	.00	1.00
Physical	.02	.13	.00	1.00
Social	.08	.31	.00	2.00

	Mean	*SD*	Min	Max
Other Response-Overall	.24	.98	.00	6.00
Verbal	.08	.35	.00	2.00
Physical	.08	.35	.00	2.00
Social	.08	.37	.00	2.00

Reliability

The internal consistency reliability of each instrument was determined by calculating Cronbach's alpha for each subscale and for overall scores. See Table 8 for these values. Alpha coefficients for perceived seriousness, empathy, likelihood of intervention and diversity subscales ranged from .78 to .88. These values are similar to those from previous uses of the Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire discussed in Chapter 3.

Coefficients for overall avoidant, assertiveness and normative views ranged from .74 to 87. Alpha coefficients for assertive beliefs for boys and girls were .55 and .52 respectively. Normative beliefs for boys and girls had alpha coefficients of .50 and .64, respectively. Subscales for avoidant beliefs for boys and girls had alpha values of .66 and .81. Gender subscales consisted of 2 to 3 items whereas overall belief subscales consisted of 4 to 5 items. Lower internal consistencies for gender subscales were expected due to the reduction in items.

An intercorrelation matrix using Pearson product moment correlations was created to understand the relationships between variables. See Table 9 for these results. The relationship between perceived seriousness and intervention was the highest at r=.57, p < .001. Low to moderate, positive correlations were also noted between the following variables: Seriousness and empathy (r =.37, p <.001), intervention and disciplining the perpetrator (r = .21, p < .05), expressing disapproval and involving parents (r =.22, p < .05), assertive and normative beliefs (r = .41, p < .001), assertive and avoidant beliefs (r = .31, p < .001), empathy and intervention (r = .28, p < .001), intervention and diversity (r = .26, p < .001), diversity and involving parents (r =.35, p < .001). Among negative correlations, the highest occurred between diversity and

normative beliefs (r = -.47, p < .001). Similar negative correlations were found between the following variables: Intervention and no response (r = -.43, p < .001), other response and expressing disapproval (r = -.46, p < .001) and other response and disciplining the perpetrator (r = -.35, p < .001).

Table 8

Cronbach's Alpha Coefficients-Scaled Variables

Scales	Number of Items	α Coefficient
Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire		
Seriousness	6	.78
Empathy	6	.88
Intervention	6	.80
Student Social Behavior Questionnaire		
Overall Assertiveness	5	.74
Assertiveness for boys	2	.52
Assertiveness for girls	3	.55
Overall Normative	4	.80
Normative for boys	2	.50
Normative for girls	2	.64
Overall Avoidant	4	.87
Avoidant for boys	2	.66
Avoidant for girls	2	.81
Personal Beliefs about Diversity Scale	15	.78

Table 9

Intercorrelation Matrix – Scaled Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
1. Seriousness	1.00														
2. Empathy	.37**	1.00													
3. Diversity	.13	.04	1.00												
4. Assertive	.06	.00	-.19*	1.00											
5. Avoidant	-.18*	.05	-.24**	.31**	1.00										
6. Normative	-.11	-.02	-.47**	.41**	.18*	1.00									
7. Intervention	.57**	.28**	.26**	-.02	-.23*	-.21*	1.00								
8. No Response	-.27**	-.13	-.13	.01	.17	.14	-.43**	1.00							
9. Peer Resolution	.02	-.10	.12	.05	-.04	-.04	-.07	-.03	1.00						
10. Express Disapproval	.00	-.11	.13	.10	.01	.06	-.03	-.04	.04	1.00					
11. Involve Parents	.02	-.05	.35**	-.04	-.14	-.21*	.08	-.08	.06	.22*	1.00				
12. Involve Other Adults	.00	-.05	.02	.05	.07	-.13	.07	-.07	.18	-.01	.10	1.00			
13. Discipline Perpetrator	.09	.11	.05	.04	-.13	-.09	.21*	-.26**	-.07	.09	.15	.06	1.00		
14. Class-wide Response	-.19	-.11	.13	.02	-.10	.02	-.19	-.04	.02	.01	.06	.07	.05	1.00	
15. Other Response	.07	.08	-.10	-.13	-.10	.00	.04	-.04	-.05	-.46**	-.25**	-.09	-.35**	-.06	1.00

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$

Research Questions

Four research questions were addressed in this study. Inferential statistics were used to answer each questions. A criterion alpha level of .05 was used to determine the statistical significance of the findings.

Research Question 1. What are school administrators' beliefs about the causes of victimization?

Hypothesis 1.1: School administrators will more likely endorse avoidant or assertive beliefs than normative beliefs.

Paired samples t-tests were used to compare means for overall assertive, avoidant and normative beliefs. Table 10 presents results of this analysis.

Table 10

Paired t-Tests – Beliefs about Causes of Bullying

Types of Beliefs	N	Mean	SD	DF	t-Value
Assertive	121	12.52	2.74	120	13.96**
Avoidant	121	8.51	2.62		
Assertive	121	12.52	2.74	120	28.70**
Normative	121	5.54	2.04		
Normative	122	5.52	2.04	121	-11.01**
Avoidant	122	8.52	2.62		

*$p < .05$; **$p < .01$

The comparison between overall assertive beliefs (M = 12.52, SD = 2.74) and overall avoidant beliefs (M = 8.51, SD = 2.62) was statistically significant, t (120) = 13.96, $p < .01$. When overall assertive (M = 12.52, SD = 2.74) was compared to overall normative beliefs (M = 5.54, SD = 2.04), the results were statistically significant, t (120) = 28.70, $p < .01$. The results of the comparison between normative beliefs (M = 5.52, SD = 2.04) and avoidant beliefs (M = 8.52, SD = 2.62) was statistically significant, t (121) = -11.01, $p < .001$. In examining the mean scores, normative beliefs had the lowest scores, with assertive beliefs having the highest scores.

Hypothesis 1.2: School administrators will more likely view bullying as a normative behavior for boys than for girls.

Hypothesis 1.3: School administrators will more likely endorse assertive beliefs for boys than for girls.

The scores for the beliefs about causes of bullying were compared using paired t-tests. The results of this analysis are presented in Table 11.

Table 11

Paired t-Tests – Beliefs about Causes of Bullying By Gender

Types of Beliefs	*N*	Mean	*SD*	*DF*	*t*-Value
Assertive - Boy	121	5.57	1.11	120	-14.38**
Assertive - Girl	121	7.08	1.65		
Avoidant - Boy	118	4.33	1.26	117	-.22
Avoidant - Girl	118	4.35	1.38		
Normative - Boy	119	2.83	1.09	118	-1.88**
Normative - Girl	119	2.71	1.07		

**$p < .01$

The comparison of assertive beliefs between boys ($M = 5.57$, $SD = 1.11$) and girls ($M = 7.08$, $SD = 1.65$) was statistically significant, t (120) = -14.38, $p < .01$. The results of the comparison on school administrators perceptions of avoidant beliefs between boys ($M = 4.33$, $SD = 1.26$) and girls ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 1.38$) was not statistically significant, t (117) = -.22, $p < .01$. When school administrators' scores for normative beliefs of boys ($M = 2.83$, $SD = 1.09$) and girls ($M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.07$) were compared, the results were statistically significant, t (118) = -1.88, $p < .01$.

Research Question 2. Does a school administrator's empathy, perceived seriousness, likelihood of intervention and type of response differ by the type of bullying situation?

> Hypothesis 2.1: School administrators will report more empathy, seriousness and more likely intervene in verbal and physical bullying situations than with social exclusion situations.
> Hypothesis 2.2: School administrators will more likely discipline the perpetrator in verbal and physical bullying situations than in social exclusion situations.

A repeated measures ANOVA was used to examine hypotheses 2.1 and 2.2 to determine if empathy, perceived seriousness and likelihood of intervention differed for the three types of situations (physical, verbal, and social). Table 12 presents results of this analysis.

Table 12

One Way Repeated Measures ANOVA for Empathy, Perceived Seriousness, Likelihood of Intervention

	N	*M*	*SD*	*DF*	*F*	η^2
Empathy				2, 116	22.06**	.28
Verbal	118	8.65	1.43			
Physical	118	9.12	1.13			
Social	118	8.53	1.32			
Seriousness				2, 122	38.20**	.39
Verbal	124	8.81	1.08			
Physical	124	9.33	.84			
Social	124	8.40	1.25			
Intervention				2, 115	15.83	.22
Verbal	117	9.58	.66			
Physical	117	9.82	.45			
Social	117	9.37	1.08			

Note: *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

A statistically significant difference was found for the comparison of empathy across the three situations, F (2, 116) = 22.06, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .28$. When the mean scores were compared across the three situations, empathy was highest for physical (M = 9.12, SD = 1.13) and lowest for social (M = 8.53, SD = 1.32). Verbal (M = 8.65, SD = 1.43) was higher than social, but lower than physical. The results of the comparison of the three types of situations for seriousness were statistically significant, F (2, 122) = 38.20, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .39$. The comparison of the three situations for seriousness indicated that physical (M = 9.33, SD = .84) had the highest scores, with social (M = 8.40, SD = 1.25) having the lowest scores. Verbal (M = 8.81, SD = 1.08) was higher than social, but lower than physical. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA for intervention across the three types of situations was statistically significant, F (2, 115) = 15.83, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .22$. A comparison of the mean scores for the three types of situations for intervention

indicated that physical (M = 9.82, SD = .45) was the highest, followed by verbal (M = 9.58, SD = .66, with social having the lowest scores (M = 9.37, SD = 1.08).

In examining the frequency distributions regarding the types of responses, it appears that three types, expressing disapproval, involving parents, and disciplining the perpetrator ad sufficient variability to be used in a repeated measures ANOVA. The repeated measures ANOVA was used to determine if the types of responses differed across the three types of situations. Table 13 presents results of this analysis.

Table 13

One Way Repeated Measures ANOVA for Types of Responses

	N	*M*	*SD*	*DF*	*F*	η^2
Expressing Disapproval				2, 118	8.06**	.12
Verbal	120	1.56	.66			
Physical	120	1.33	.78			
Social	120	1.62	.65			
Involving Parents				2, 118	9.20**	.14
Verbal	120	.70	.75			
Physical	120	.96	.86			
Social	120	.70	.78			
Disciplining Perpetrator				2, 118	1.24	.02
Verbal	120	.15	.42			
Physical	120	.18	.48			
Social	120	.23	.49			

Note: *p < .05, **p < .01

The comparison of disapproval among the three types of situations, the results were statistically significant, F (2, 118) = 8.06, p < .01, η^2 = .12. The mean score was highest for social (M = 1.62, SD = .65) and lowest for physical (M = 1.33, SD = .78). The mean score for

verbal (M = 1.56, SD = .66) was higher than physical, but lower than social. The results of the repeated measures ANOVA used to compare involving parents by the three types of situations was statistically significant, F (2, 118) = 9.20, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .14$. The comparison of the mean scores found that physical (M = .96, SD = .86) was the highest scores, with the verbal (M = .70, SD = .75) and social (M = .70, SD = .78) having similar scores. When disciplining the perpetrator was compared across the three types of situations, the results were statistically significant, F (2, 118) = 1.24, $p < .01$, $\eta^2 = .02$. The mean scores were highest for social (M = .23, SD = .49) and lowest for verbal (M = .15, SD = .42). The mean score for physical (M = .18, SD = .48) was higher than verbal and lower than social.

Research Question 3. What predicts School administrators' likelihood of intervention and type of response in bullying situations?

> Hypothesis 3.1. School administrators with higher assertive or avoidant beliefs, less normative beliefs, higher perceived seriousness, and greater empathy will predict greater likelihood of intervention.

A multiple regression analysis was completed with perceived seriousness diversity, empathy, and each type of belief (assertive, avoidant, normative) used as predictor variables. The likelihood of intervention was used as the criterion variable. The predictor variables accounted for 39% of the variance of intervention (R^2 = .39, F (6, 95) = 10.16, p <.001). Perceived seriousness significantly contributed to the model (β = .45, p <.001) but empathy (β = .14, ns), assertiveness (β = .11, ns), avoidant beliefs (β = -.12, ns), normative beliefs (β = -.13, ns) and diversity (β = .12, ns) did not. Table 14 presents results of this analysis.

Table 14

Regression Analysis Summary for Predictor Variables and Likelihood of Intervention

	$R^2 = .39$, F (6, 95) = 10.16, $p < .001$		
Predictor Variables	β	*SE*	*t*
Seriousness	.45	.07	4.85**
Empathy	.14	.06	1.54
Diversity	.12	.03	1.30
Assertive	.11	.07	1.12
Avoidant	-.12	.07	-1.35
Normative	-.13	.10	-1.30

Note: **p<.01

Hypothesis 3.2: School administrators with higher assertive or avoidant beliefs, less normative beliefs, higher perceived seriousness, and greater empathy will provide responses that involve expressing disapproval, involving parents or disciplining the perpetrator.

A multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine if seriousness, empathy, diversity, assertive, avoidant, and normative beliefs about the causes of bullying could be used to predict expressing disapproval response category to bullying situations. The six predictor variables accounted for 6% of the variance in the expressing disapproval category for the bullying vignettes. The results were not statistically significant, $R^2 = .06$, F (6, 95) = 1.07, ns. These results are presented in Table 15.

A multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine if seriousness, empathy, diversity, assertive, avoidant, and normative beliefs about the causes of bullying could be used to predict the disciplining the perpetrator response category to bullying situations. The six predictor variables accounted for 5% of the variance in the disciplining the perpetrator category for the bullying vignettes. The results were not statistically significant, $R^2 = .05$, F (6, 95) = .90, ns. These results are presented in Table 16.

Table 15

Regression Analysis Summary for Predictor Variables and Expressing Disapproval

	$R^2 = .06, F (6, 95) = 1.07, ns$		
Predictor Variables	*β*	*SE*	*t*
Seriousness	.03	.07	.48
Empathy	-.06	.06	-.95
Diversity	.06	.03	2.05
Assertive	.02	.07	.28
Avoidant	.02	.07	.25
Normative	.15	.10	1.51

Table 16

Regression Analysis Summary for Predictor Variables and Disciplining the Perpetrator

	$R^2 = .05, F (6, 95) = .90,$ ns		
Predictor Variables	*β*	*SE*	*t*
Seriousness	.02	.08	.24
Empathy	.03	.06	.48
Diversity	-.02	.03	-.62
Assertive	.07	.08	.96
Avoidant	-.15	.07	-2.06
Normative	-.07	.11	-.65

A multiple linear regression analysis was used to determine if seriousness, empathy, diversity, assertive, avoidant, and normative beliefs about the causes of bullying could be used to predict the involving parents response category to bullying situations. The six predictor variables accounted for 14% of the variance in the involving parents category for the bullying vignettes. The results were statistically significant, (R^2 = .14, F (6, 95) = 2.56, p < .05). Diversity significantly contributed to the model (β = .08, p < .05) but perceived seriousness (β = -.05, ns),

empathy (β = -.02, ns) assertiveness (β = .07, ns), avoidant beliefs (β = -.09, ns) and normative beliefs (β = -.10, ns) did not. These results are presented in Table 17.

Table 17

Regression Analysis Summary for Predictor Variables and Involving Parents

	$R^2 = .14, F(6, 95) = 2.56, p < .05$		
Predictor Variables	*β*	*SE*	*t*
Seriousness	-.05	.08	-.57
Empathy	-.02	.06	-.26
Diversity	.08	.03	2.62*
Assertive	.07	.08	.83
Avoidant	-.09	.07	-1.19
Normative	-.10	.11	-.91

Note: *p<.05

Hypothesis 3.3: School administrators with lower assertive or avoidant beliefs, more normative beliefs, lower perceived seriousness and less empathy will provide no response to bullying situations.

Because the no response category did not have sufficient variability, a multiple regression analysis was not conducted.

Research Question 4: Does a school administrator's likelihood of intervention and type of response in bullying situations differ by having previous bullying prevention training?

Hypothesis 4.1: Previous anti-bullying training will predict a greater likelihood of intervention.
Hypothesis 4.2: School administrators having previous anti-bullying training will provide responses that involve expressing disapproval, disciplining the perpetrator or involving parents.

A one-way ANOVA was completed with previous anti-bullying training as the independent variable and likelihood of intervention, expressing disapproval, disciplining the perpetrator, and involving parents categories as dependent variables. Likelihood of intervention and involving parents differed among school administrators who had attended training for bullying and those who had not attended this type of training. The comparison of intervention between the two groups of school administrators was statistically significant, $F(1, 111) = 4.39$, p

< .05. School administrators who had attended training (M = 28.96, SD = 1.87) were more likely to intervene than school administrators who had not attended training (M = 28.13, SD = 2.03). The comparison of involving parents was statistically significant, F (1, 111) = 4.95, p < .05. School administrators who had attended training (M = .2.13, SD = 1.97) were less likely to involve parents than school administrators who had not attended training (M = 3.06, SD = 2.05). The remaining comparisons were not statistically significant between the two groups of school administrators. See Table 18 for these results.

Table 18

One-Way ANOVA for Previous Bullying Prevention Training on Likelihood of Intervention and Each Type of Response

	Previous Training					
	Yes		No			
Response	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*DF*	*F*
Intervention	28.96	1.87	28.13	2.03	1, 111	4.39*
Expressing Disapproval	4.41	1.67	4.74	1.46	1, 111	0.95
Discipline Perpetrator	3.23	1.80	3.06	1.79	1, 111	0.18
Involve Parents	2.13	1.97	2.04	2.04	1, 111	4.95*

Note: *p<.05

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate school administrators' responses to bullying situations and explore variables that predict their responses. Results of the statistical analyses to test the hypotheses were mixed, with support provided for some of the hypotheses. Results of the research questions and their implications are discussed in this section.

The first research question addressed school administrators' beliefs about the causes of victimization. Three types of beliefs were examined (assertive, avoidant and normative beliefs) and school administrators were asked separate questions pertaining to male and female bullying victims. Means for normative beliefs were significantly lower than those for assertive and avoidant beliefs. These results indicated that school administrators would more likely endorse assertive or avoidant beliefs than normative beliefs. That is, school administrators felt that victimization occurs when victims are unable to avoid their perpetrators and/or lack the assertiveness to defend themselves. Consistent with Kochenderfer-Ladd and Pelletier's (2008) findings among teachers, school administrators were less likely to see bullying as a normative behavior among children. Furthermore, school administrators did not differ in their normative and avoidant beliefs for boys and girls. Inconsistent with the hypothesis, school administrators reported significantly higher assertiveness beliefs for girls than for boys.

The lack of differences between boys and girls on normative beliefs may reflect societal changes in beliefs about bullying. Bullying as a normative behavior for boys stems from the belief that bullying among boys teaches social norms more so than girls. Yet several studies have noted that physical bullying, which is prevalent among boys (Nansel et al., 2001), has been viewed as more serious and prompted higher levels of intervention (Craig et al. 2000; Yoon & Kerber, 2003; Yoon, 2004). Taken together, these results may reflect an increase in awareness of the bullying. Due to the large-scale, systemic study of bullying in U.S. schools and more recent

bullying prevention legislation, normative beliefs about victimization may be less prevalent among school personnel. Comparisons between questions pertaining to males and females indicated no significant differences in normative or avoidant beliefs for boys or girls. Moreover, school administrators reported significantly higher assertiveness beliefs for girls than for boys. These findings did not support the hypotheses that school administrators would more likely endorse normative beliefs for boys than for girls or that assertive beliefs would be significantly higher for boys.

The finding that assertiveness views were higher for girls than for boys may reflect gender differences in the types of assertiveness behaviors perceived by school administrators. The current study did not examine the effects of verbal, physical, and relational bullying on the school administrators' beliefs, but it is possible that the types of bullying specific to boys or girls explain school administrators' attitude toward assertiveness. Assertiveness for boys has been defined by their ability to stand up to their perpetrators (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008). Based on this definition, boys who assert themselves physically against their perpetrator are less likely to remain victims. Unfortunately, physical assertiveness violates most school policies and often results in disciplinary action. Thus, the notion that boys should be more assertive in physical bullying situations may have been discouraged among school administrators in the sample. In contrast, assertiveness in cases of social exclusion, which has been traditionally associated with bullying among girls (Crick, Casas & Nelson, 2002), may not involve assertiveness behaviors that violate school policies. For example, assertiveness in a social exclusion bullying situation may involve attempting to dispel negative rumors or setting boundaries with those engaging in relational aggression.

The second set of hypotheses considered differences in empathy, seriousness, likelihood of intervention and type of response among school administrators across three types of bullying situations. It was hypothesized that school administrators would report more empathy,

seriousness and more likely intervene in verbal and physical situations than in social situations. Results supported this hypothesis in that school administrators perceived physical situations as more serious and were more likely to intervene when compared to verbal and social exclusion situations. These findings are consistent with those from Craig et al. (2000), Yoon and Kerber (2003), and Yoon (2004) with teachers as participants. When considering the leadership role of school administrators, results suggest that a greater emphasis is placed on addressing overt acts of bullying when compared to covert acts.

The salience of physical bullying and physical harm to victims may explain why school administrators perceive these acts with greater seriousness and likelihood of intervention. Consistent with school climate literature, overt acts of violence or threats of violence occurring on a regular basis are characteristics of school disorder (Gottfredson et al., 2005). When acts of physical bullying occur, they may be observable to students, staff or anyone else present in a school building. Witnessing these acts may create an immediate negative perception of the school climate. Thus, when physical bullying occurs there is an immediate need to comfort the victim, restore "order" and maintain a safe and welcoming school climate. In contrast, social exclusion forms of bullying are often difficult to define and subject to different interpretations by observers (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). As a result, they are less observable and may not present as an immediate threat to the school climate in the way that physical forms of bullying present.

As with perceived seriousness, school administrators reported more empathy for victims in physical bullying situations than in verbal or social exclusion situations. Empathy for victims in social exclusion situations was lower than for those in verbal situations. As with higher perceptions of seriousness, school administrators' higher levels of empathy in physical bullying situations may be influenced by them observing the effects of physical harm to the victim. For example, physical bullying vignettes depicted situations where school personnel witnessed violent acts by the perpetrator against the victim on more than one occasion. In addition, the

imagery of bruising or similar signs of physical harm were present and may have contributed to higher levels of empathy for victims. Consistent with the empathy-altruism model of bystander intervention (Bateson, 1991), school administrators' higher levels of empathy may have motivated them to intervene in order to reduce the victim's distress.

When considering Weiner's (1986, 1996) theory of social conduct, school administrators' reporting greater empathy for victims in physical vignettes can be also understood as their tendency to view the victim's plight as uncontrollable. In physical bullying vignettes, victims were attacked physically in a manner that appears abrupt and unprovoked. While social and verbal vignettes were also presented in this way, school administrators may have explored the possibility of other verbal exchanges leading up to events depicted in social and verbal bullying situations. Hence, where an unprovoked physical attack is seen as uncontrollable, social exclusion and verbal threats could be view as controllable and associated with characteristics of the victim. For example, Orpinas and Horne (2006) argue that bully-victims have often present with maladaptive, provocative behaviors that make them more vulnerable to social exclusion. Examples include the reinforcement of negative attention that bully-victims receive from intentionally annoying or teasing others. Thus, there may be a notion among school administrators that physical attacks are less controllable by the victim than verbal threats or social exclusion.

There was only a slight difference between empathy in verbal and social exclusion situations. Findings from teachers in Craig et al. (2000), Yoon (2004), Yoon and Kerber (2003) as well as Jacobsen and Bauman's (2007) work with school counselors all indicated that participants reported less empathy for victims of social exclusion when compared to victims of verbal bullying. Increased awareness of the adverse effects of social exclusion may have contributed to the increased empathy for social exclusion victims. In their meta-analytic review, Hawker and Boulton (2000) discuss findings on the long-term effects of social exclusion, which

have included declines in self-esteem, depression, anxiety and future difficulties developing and maintain peer relationships.

School administrators' responses across verbal, physical and social exclusion situations were mixed. Based on the pilot study conducted by Bauman and Yoon (Personal communication, 9/24/2012), school administrators' responses were initially coded into the following categories: No response, peer resolution, expressing disapproval, disciplining the perpetrator, involving parents, involving other adults, class-wide response, school-wide response and other type of response. However, in examining the frequency distributions regarding the types of responses, only three types, expressing disapproval, involving parents, and disciplining the perpetrator, had sufficient variability to be used in the statistical analyses. Therefore, the subsequent analyses were conducted on these three categories of responses. Contrary to the hypothesis, there were no significant differences in disciplining the perpetrator across verbal, physical and social exclusion situations. However, significant differences in involving parents and expressing disapproval were found across the three types of vignettes. Specifically, school administrators were more likely to involve parents in physical bullying situations than in verbal or social exclusion situations. School administrators were also more likely to express disapproval in verbal or social exclusion situations than in physical situations.

The finding of similar rates of disciplining the perpetrator across each type of bullying situation can be understood by the variation in types of discipline occurring in school settings. Examples of discipline indicated by school administrators included loss of privileges, detention, suspension and expulsion. Thus, while discipline was reported similarly across bullying vignettes the possibility exists that the extent of disciplinary action may have varied across the three types of situations. However, previous studies investigating teacher responses have found that disciplining the perpetrator was more common in physical bullying situations with no indication

of the type discipline reported (Bauman, Rigby & Hoppa, 2008; Harris & Willoughby, 2003; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008).

The finding that involving parents was more common in physical bullying situations is further supported by school administrator's perceptions of seriousness in physical bullying vignettes. As in previous studies (Craig et al. 2000, Yoon, 2004; Yoon & Kerber, 2003), the current study found that perceived seriousness was associated with a higher likelihood of intervention. In light of these findings, school administrators who perceived physical bullying situations as more serious than others may have sought parental involvement as a form of intervention. Involving parents in bullying situations is well supported by Olweus Bullying Prevention Program and similar bullying prevention programs. However, these programs also emphasize parent involvement regardless of the type of bullying situation. The finding that school administrators were less likely to involve parents in verbal and social exclusion situations suggests that further education is needed to address the seriousness of all types of bullying situations.

School administrators expressing more disapproval in verbal and social exclusion situations when compared to physical situations may have reflected a tendency to counsel the victim and perpetrator before responding in other ways. Because victims and perpetrators are often referred to the school administrator after bullying situations occur, school administrators may engage in conflict resolution as a means of preventing further incidents. In their study involving counselors, who often assume this role, Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa (2008) found that counselors were more likely than teachers to involve the bully and victim in their response. Taken together with findings on perceived seriousness, when encountering verbal and social exclusion situations, school administrators may view them with less seriousness but also as an opportunity to facilitate conflict resolution. In contrast, involving parents and disciplining the

perpetrator may be associated with physical bullying situations, which are perceived with greater seriousness.

The third research question examined the factors that predicted a school administrator's likelihood of intervention and type of response in bullying situations. It was hypothesized that school administrators with higher assertive or avoidant beliefs, less normative beliefs, higher perceived seriousness, and greater empathy would more likely intervene in bullying situations than those without these characteristics. School administrators with lower assertive or avoidant beliefs, more normative beliefs, lower perceived seriousness and less empathy were hypothesized to provide no response to bullying situations. School administrators reporting more openness to diversity were hypothesized to report a higher likelihood of intervention in bullying vignettes and provide responses that involved disciplining the perpetrator.

According to multiple regression analysis results, perceived seriousness was a significant predictor of a school administrator's likelihood of intervention in bullying vignettes, but empathy, normative beliefs, assertiveness, avoidant beliefs and openness to diversity were not. The finding that empathy towards victims did not predict school administrator's likelihood of intervention contrasts with findings from Craig et al. (2000), Yoon and Kerber (2003), Yoon (2004) on teachers and Jacobsen and Bauman's (2007) on school counselors. On each scale, most school administrators responded with lower normative beliefs, higher assertive and avoidant beliefs, high openness to diversity, with high levels of empathy towards victims and with high levels of perceived seriousness. In addition, all school administrators in the sample reported having school-wide bullying prevention policies in their buildings. Taken together, these findings suggest that anti-bullying attitudes are not always predictors of intervention in bullying situations. Supporting these findings are results from Merrell et al.'s (2008) meta-analytic study of bullying prevention programs. While program implementation resulted in fewer pro-bullying attitudes, most programs did not reduce the prevalence of bullying behaviors. When

considering the current study's results, school administrators like other school personnel may not intervene in bullying situations despite having a bullying prevention program in their buildings.

Pearson product moment correlations indicated that school administrators more open to diversity were more likely to intervene in bullying situations and more likely to discipline the perpetrator when intervening. Openness to diversity was also a predictor of involving parents in bullying situations. Few studies have investigated openness to diversity as a predictor of intervention or responses in bullying situations. Those that have viewed openness to diversity as a predictor of school climate quality (See Holt & Keyes, 2004). Others have found both a high prevalence of bullying among Lesbian, Gay, Bi-sexual, Transgendered (LGBT) populations and an unwillingness among educators to endorse curriculums that support LGBT youth (O'Higgins-Norman, 2008). In addition to items addressing acceptance towards LGBT populations, the diversity scale used in the current study consisted of items related to race/ethnicity, gender, social class, disability status, language and immigration. Because the scale covers a broad range of diversity issues, it is likely school administrators scoring high on this scale are open to diversity in a variety of areas including acceptance of students who differ from the norm.

Intercorrelation results indicate modest to moderate correlations between openness to diversity and other significant variables studied in bullying literature. For example, openness to diversity was negatively correlated with providing no response in bullying situations, negatively correlated with having normative beliefs about the causes of bullying and positively correlated with involving parents in bullying situations. According to these findings, school administrators with greater openness to diversity were less likely to ignore bullying situations, less likely to see bullying as a normative behavior and more likely to involve parents when bullying occurs. Thus, these findings support a need to further study the relationship between openness to diversity and school administrator responses in bullying situations.

The fourth research question addressed whether a school administrator's likelihood of intervention and type of response in bullying situations differed by having previous bullying prevention training. School administrators with previous bullying prevention training reported a higher likelihood of intervention than those without previous training. Literature suggests that training can influence attitudes. For example, Dedousis-Wallace and Shute (2009) found that teachers' perceived seriousness of bullying situations increased immediately following a bullying prevention presentation and seven weeks later.

Despite having an effect on a school administrators' likelihood of intervention, there were less favorable findings on whether school administrators' responses to bullying situations differed with previous training. School administrators with previous training were less likely to involve parents than school administrators with no previous training. In addition, training did not have an effect on expressing disapproval or disciplining the perpetrator. These results contrast with goals of bullying prevention in that training should encourage parental involvement, anti-bullying attitudes and disciplining those who engaging in bullying behavior. Further emphasizing these types of responses in bullying prevention training may provide school administrators with more strategies when encountering bullying situations.

The current study found that while the majority of participants had previous bullying prevention training, none provided school-wide responses and few provided class-wide responses to bullying situations. In addition to addressing the situations at the individual level, school-wide and class-wide responses are embedded in evidence-based bullying prevention programs because they address bullying at multiple levels of a school's social ecology. In doing so, significant reductions in bullying behaviors have been found (Kallestad & Olweus, 2003). Thus, the study's results suggest that bullying prevention training for school administrators should include methods of addressing bullying situations at the classroom and school levels.

Results indicating that school administrators with previous training were less likely to involve parents than those with no previous training may reflect the need to emphasize the importance of parental involvement in bullying prevention training. Similar to the findings that school administrators were less likely to involve parents in verbal and social exclusion situations, school administrators, even with previous training, may not see the importance in involving parents in certain bullying situations. When considering the school administrator's role in facilitating communication between school personnel and parents, there is a need for school administrators to utilize a process that involves parents in efforts to prevent bullying as well as in cases where bullying has occurred.

Implications for School administrators and Bullying Prevention Programs

Understanding school administrator attitudes and responses in bullying situations is the first step toward effective bullying prevention trainings for school administrators. The findings of the current study provide a number of implications for school administrators and their role in bullying prevention. First, the findings support a need for school administrators to address bullying situations of all types with similar levels of intervention. Regardless of the type of bullying situation, bullying behaviors are harmful to those involved and to the school climate as a whole. Addressing these findings in bullying prevention training programs with school administrators may provide a broader understanding for school administrators when approaching bullying situations.

The results of this study warrant additional training for school administrators on school-wide and class-wide bullying prevention strategies. No school-wide responses and very few class-wide responses were provided by school administrators when addressing bullying situations. Additional training on the effectiveness and use of whole-school bullying interventions may aid school administrators with encouraging anti-bullying attitudes and promoting favorable school climates.

The finding that school administrators with previous training were more likely to intervene may reflect the unique role of school administrators in school settings. There are various roles in professional development initiatives that are assumed by school administrators (Kose, 2009). In addition to responding to bullying situations, school administrators must also develop a consensus for a school's mission to prevent bullying. In this role, a school administrator must design tangible school goals for creating an anti-bullying school climate. For example they present these initiatives to staff, students and the school community. In contrast, other school personnel may only be responsible for the implementation of these initiatives, which provides less of an opportunity to practice the concepts discussed in bullying prevention training. Thus, the role for creating a school's mission for bullying prevention may influence how they internalize bullying prevention training and respond in bullying situations.

Another job characteristic unique to school administrators is their role in establishing professional learning communities and designing professional development opportunities. In terms of bullying prevention, school administrators are often responsible for designing the opportunities to train staff on bullying prevention techniques. Moreover, they are also responsible for managing the resources necessary to implement these initiatives. Bullying prevention for school administrators must incorporate these aspects in addition to the background on bullying behaviors addressed in training programs with other school personnel. In doing so, bullying prevention training for school administrators should have a broad scope that addresses the social-ecological model of bullying, namely the mesosystem factors. These factors include the perceptions of bullying behaviors among students and involvement of teachers, parents and other classmates in bullying incidents. They are the interaction between microsystems that occur in a school setting and are all incorporated with a school climate.

The findings of the present study suggest that school administrators endorse more anti-bullying attitudes than other school personnel in earlier studies. Specifically, few participants

indicated that bullying behaviors were normative behaviors and the vast majority perceived all bullying situations as serious and showed empathy for victims. The majority of participants who provided responses to bullying situations expressed disapproval and advocated for disciplining the perpetrator in bullying vignettes. According to these results, most school administrators acknowledge the need for bullying prevention programs.

Openness to diversity has not been studied extensively as a predictor of school personnel's responses to bullying situations. The finding that school administrators who were more open to diversity were less likely to dismiss bullying situations, less likely to have normative beliefs and showed a higher likelihood of intervention indicates that openness to diversity is relevant to our understanding of school administrator responses to bullying situations. Moreover, this finding suggests that school administrators who accept students who differ from the norm are more likely to intervene if these students are victimized. Thus, bullying prevention training should incorporate openness to diversity through educating school administrators about diverse populations of students and their school experiences, particularly as they relate to bullying.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The sample size was relatively small and participants were recruited from a state-wide association of school administrators and from graduate level courses. School administrators from both sources could represent a biased sample in terms of their knowledge of bullying behaviors and in their access to bullying prevention training. As a state-wide school administrator organization, the Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principal Association (MEMSPA) purports to provide annual training to its members. Similarly, those in graduate level courses may have additional access to knowledge of bullying behaviors and bullying prevention training. In contrast, there are significant numbers of

principals who are not MEMSPA members or current graduate level students who did not take part in this study.

The voluntary nature of this study may also be a limitation. School administrators who opted not to take part in this study may represent a subgroup with differing views on bullying behaviors and differing responses in hypothetical bullying situations. However, several studies with school personnel (Craig et al. 2000; Bauman, Rigby & Hoppa, 2008; Dake et al., 2003; Dake et al.,2004; Jacobsen & Bauman, 2007; Yoon, 2004; Yoon & Kerber, 2003) have obtained participants voluntarily and uncovered consistent findings on how school personnel respond in hypothetical bullying situations.

Of the school administrators who took part in the study, 112 (88.9%) reported that they were current principals or assistant principals. Others reported previous principal experience, but were in different administrative roles such as superintendent or dean of students. Although they are not current principals or assistant principals, they play important roles in addressing school bullying. However, these participants may have had differing views on bullying behaviors from current principals or assistant principals. Future studies could explore potential differences.

Another limitation to the study involves the measures on attitudes about the causes of bullying. Avoidant, assertive and avoidant beliefs were positively correlated with each other, suggesting less adequate discriminative validity with the study's participants. In addition, internal consistency values were lower for items when they were separated by gender. Both internal consistency and discriminative validity were adequate when used in earlier studies.

Future Directions for School Administrators and Bullying Prevention

The results of this study provide useful information on how school administrators understand bullying behaviors and how they respond to bullying situations. Additional study is needed on the differences in bullying prevention training received by school administrators and how these differences influence their understanding and responses in bullying situations.

Understanding differences in training may help understand why school administrators' responses were clustered into a small number of categories. Moreover, understanding training differences may explain why few school administrators provided class-wide responses and no school administrators provided school-wide responses.

Additional study is needed to fully understand the relationship between a principal's openness to diversity and intervention in bullying situations. Since openness to diversity is a broad characteristic, further study could investigate which characteristics of diversity (e.g., openness towards specific groups that have high rates of victimization) predict responses in bullying situations. In addition, how openness to diversity relates to other predictors of responses in bullying situations warrants further study.

Finally, further research could address why school administrators endorsed higher assertive beliefs for girls than for boys when considering beliefs about the causes of bullying. This finding was in contrast to previous findings with teachers, where assertive beliefs were higher for boys than girls. Understanding gender differences in attitudes about the causes of bullying may help identify training initiatives to prevent gender biases from affecting how school administrators respond in bullying situations.

APPENDIX A- BULLYING ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please read the following situations and answer the questions that follow as if you are the teacher witnessing the bullying event. There are no right or wrong answers.

Your class is getting ready to go to lunch and the students are standing at the door. You hear a student say to another student, "Hey, give me your lunch money or I'll find you after school and you'll be sorry." The student complies at once. This is not the first time this has happened.

1 – In your opinion, how serious is this situation?
- 1=Not at all serious
- 2=Not very serious
- 3=Moderately serious
- 4=Serious
- 5=Very serious

2 – I would be upset by the student's behavior and feel sympathetic to the other student
- 1=Strongly disagree
- 2=Disagree
- 3=Neither disagree or agree
- 4=Agree
- 5=Strongly agree

3 – How likely are you to intervene in this situation?
- 1=Not at all likely
- 2=Not very likely
- 3=Somewhat likely
- 4=Likely
- 5=Very likely

4 – How would you respond to this situation?

As your students enter your classroom you see a student kick another student without provocation. Bruising is evident. This student has been known to engage in this type of behavior before.

1 – In your opinion, how serious is this situation?
- 1=Not at all serious
- 2=Not very serious
- 3=Moderately serious
- 4=Serious
- 5=Very serious

2 – I would be upset by the student's behavior and feel sympathetic to the other student
- 1=Strongly disagree
- 2=Disagree
- 3=Neither disagree or agree
- 4=Agree
- 5=Strongly agree

3 – How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

1=Not at all likely
2=Not very likely
3=Somewhat likely
4=Likely
5=Very likely

4 – How would you respond to this situation?

During a project time you overhear a student say to another student, "If you don't let me copy your idea for this project, I'll make sure no one wants to hang out with you." This is not the first time you have heard this student say this type of thing.

1 – In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

1=Not at all serious
2=Not very serious
3=Moderately serious
4=Serious
5=Very serious

2 – I would be upset by the student's behavior and feel sympathetic to the other student

1=Strongly disagree
2=Disagree
3=Neither disagree or agree
4=Agree
5=Strongly agree

3 – How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

1=Not at all likely
2=Not very likely
3=Somewhat likely
4=Likely
5=Very likely

4 – How would you respond to this situation?

You have allowed the students in your class to have a little free time because they have worked so hard today. You witness a student say to another student, "No, absolutely not. I already told you that you can't sit with us or be a part of our group." The student sits alone for the remaining time with tears in her eyes. This is not the first time this student has excluded other students from her group of friends.

1 – In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

1=Not at all serious
2=Not very serious
3=Moderately serious
4=Serious
5=Very serious

2 – I would be upset by the student's behavior and feel sympathetic to the other student
1=Strongly disagree
2=Disagree
3=Neither disagree or agree
4=Agree
5=Strongly agree

3 – How likely are you to intervene in this situation?
1=Not at all likely
2=Not very likely
3=Somewhat likely
4=Likely
5=Very likely

4 – How would you respond to this situation?

While students are writing, you hear a student say to another student "Teachers pet, brown-noser, suck-up, kiss-ass." The student tries to ignore the remarks but sulks at his desk. You saw the same thing happen the other day.

1 – In your opinion, how serious is this situation?
1=Not at all serious
2=Not very serious
3=Moderately serious
4=Serious
5=Very serious

2 – I would be upset by the student's behavior and feel sympathetic to the other student
1=Strongly disagree
2=Disagree
3=Neither disagree or agree
4=Agree
5=Strongly agree

3 – How likely are you to intervene in this situation?
1=Not at all likely
2=Not very likely
3=Somewhat likely
4=Likely
5=Very likely

4 – How would you respond to this situation?

A student brought a $10 gift card to school. He boasts that he won it in a contest. Another student goes over and smacks his head, demanding the gift card. The student refuses at first, but eventually gives in.

1 – In your opinion, how serious is this situation?
1=Not at all serious
2=Not very serious
3=Moderately serious
4=Serious
5=Very serious

2 – I would be upset by the student's behavior and feel sympathetic to the other student
1=Strongly disagree
2=Disagree
3=Neither disagree or agree
4=Agree
5=Strongly agree

3 – How likely are you to intervene in this situation?
1=Not at all likely
2=Not very likely
3=Somewhat likely
4=Likely
5=Very likely

4 – How would you respond to this situation?

APPENDIX B- STUDENT SOCIAL BEHAVIOR QUESTIONNAIRE

Please indicate with an "x" how much you agree with each of the following statements about the boys in your school.	Strongly agree	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Strongly disagree
1. Kids will stop bullying a boy who asserts himself.				
2. Boys who get picked on need to learn to stand up for themselves.				
3. Teasing helps boys learn important social norms.				
4. The best thing for boys to do when others pick on them is to stay away from those students in the future.				
5. Boys who are picked on by their classmates should just avoid their attackers.				
6. Fights between boys teach them to stand up for themselves.				

Please indicate with an "x" how much you agree with each of the following statements about the girls in your school.	Strongly agree	Agree somewhat	Disagree somewhat	Strongly disagree
1. Kids will stop bullying a girl who asserts herself.				
2. Girls who get picked on need to learn to stand up for themselves.				
3. Girls get picked on because they let others push them around.				
4. Teasing helps girls learn important social norms.				
5. The best thing for girls to do when others pick on them is to stay away from those students in the future.				
6. Girls who are picked on by their classmates should just avoid their attackers.				
7. Fights between girls teach them to stand up for themselves.				

APPENDIX C- PERSONAL BELIEFS ABOUT DIVERSITY

This scale measures your beliefs about diversity. Indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each item below by placing an "x" corresponding to your selection. Please answer every item and use the following scale to select your answers:

1= Strongly Disagree 2= Disagree 3=Undecided 4= Agree 5= Strongly Agree

	1=SD	2=D	3=U	4=A	5=SA
1. There is nothing wrong with people from different racial back-grounds having/raising children.					
2. America's immigrant and refugee policy has led to the deterioration of America.					
3. Making all public facilities accessible to the disabled is simply too costly.					
4. Accepting many different ways of life in America will strengthen us as a nation.					
5. It is not a good idea for same-sex couples to raise children.					
6. The reason people live in poverty is that they lack motivation to get themselves out of poverty.					
7. People should develop meaningful friendships with others from different racial/ethnic groups.					
8. People with physical limitations are less effective as leaders than people without physical limitations.					
9. In general, White people place a higher value on education than do people of color.					
10. Many women in our society continue to live in poverty because males still dominate most of the major social systems in America.					
11. Since men are frequently the heads of households, they deserve higher wages than females.					
12. It is a good idea for people to develop meaningful friendships with others having a different sexual orientation. 13. Society should not become more accepting of gay/lesbian life-styles.					
14. It is more important for immigrants to learn English than to maintain their first language.					
15. In general, men make better leaders than women.					

APPENDIX D- DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Please indicate your response to each of the following.

1. Have you attended training on preventing, identifying, responding to, or reporting incidents of bullying during the current or past school year?
___Yes
___ No

2. Does your school district have an anti- bullying policy?
_____ Yes
_____ No

3. In your opinion, how prevalent is bullying at your school?
_____ 1= Extremely Rare
_____ 2=Occasional
_____ 3=Prevalent
_____ 4=Extremely Prevalent

4. Please indicate if you reside over a public or private school:
_____ Public
_____ Private

5. Please indicate the type of school you reside over:
_____ Elementary School
_____ Middle School
_____ Other

6. Please indicate which locality best describes your school:
_____ Urban
_____ Suburban
_____ Rural

7. Approximately how many students are enrolled at your school?
_____

8. What is your average class size?
_____

9. Approximately what percentage of your students are eligible for free or reduced lunches?
_____

10. Approximately how many office disciplinary referrals do you receive per day (i.e. how many students per day are sent to your office because of a disciplinary issue)?
_____

10. Are you:
_____ Male
_____ Female

11. Please indicate your current age:
_____

12. Please indicate your racial background:
_____ American Indian or Alaska Native
_____ Asian
_____ Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
_____ Hispanic/Latino
_____ African American or Black
_____ White
_____ Some other race

13. Please indicate your highest level of education:
_____ Bachelor's degree
_____ Master's degree
_____ Educational Specialist degree
_____ Ph.D or Ed.D.
_____ Other

14. Please indicate how many years of principal experience you have:
_____

15. Please indicate how many years you taught before becoming an administrator:

APPENDIX E- PRIZE REGISTRATION

As a reward for your participation you may take advantage of the following:

- A web link to a list of evidenced-based bullying prevention programs is available to all participants.
- A drawing will be completed where 50 participants will be chosen to receive a $5 Starbucks Gift Card.

If you provide your contact information it will not be connected to the responses in your survey. Your contact information will not be included in the analysis of the data. Please provide your name and email address below if you would like to take advantage of these incentives:

APPENDIX F- PERMISSION TO USE SCALES

RE: Online Campus Directory: Request to use Questionnaire

From: **Aguilar, Teresita E** (teaguilar@lake.ollusa.edu)
Sent: Thu 9/20/12 10:34 AM
To: aguibdiop@wayne.edu (aguibdiop@wayne.edu)
4 attachments
Beliefs Guide.pdf (2.9 MB) , K M Brown_Review of Existing Measures.pdf (103.3 KB) , Causey et al_Cultural Diversity_Teacher Ed.pdf (104.3 KB) , P Taylor_Teacher Ed and MCE.pdf (336.7 KB)

Aguib:

By this email, I am granting you permission to use the Beliefs scale. I have attached the information and wish you the best in your very important research. Please keep me posted on your progress.

I've also attached a couple of other articles that might be of interest to you.

Teresita

Teresita E. Aguilar, Ph.D.

Director, Center for Mexican American Studies and Research

Our Lady of the Lake University

Moye 110

411 SW 24th St.

San Antonio, TX. 78207

(210)-431-4148

Re: Request to use Questionnaire

From: **Becky Ladd** (Becky.Ladd@asu.edu)
Sent: Tue 9/25/12 11:47 AM
To: Aguib Seydou Diop (aguibdiop@wayne.edu)

2 attachments

T4 teacher classroom Scales.doc (42.0 KB) , Teacher beliefs about bullying wave 4.docx (32.8 KB)

Thank you for your interest in these scales. One attachment is the measurement; the other is the items that correspond to scales and reliability estimates of internal consistency.
I wish you well in this very important line of research!
Best wishes,
Dr. Ladd

Becky Kochenderfer Ladd, Ph.D.
Associate Professor
School of Social and Family Dynamics
PO Box 873701
Arizona State University
Tempe, AZ 85287-3701
Fax: (480) 965-6779

APPENDIX G- MEMPSA LETTER OF SUPPORT

MEMSPA
The Principal is the Key
Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principals Association

March 25, 2013

To Whom It May Concern,

I am writing to offer my support for Aguib Diop in his effort to complete his dissertation study "Principal Responses in Bullying Situations". MEMSPA will offer the necessary supports for data collection and look forward to the resulting completed project findings.

We support bullying prevention efforts throughout the school community and hope to offer more effective approaches to this challenge for our practicing principals.

Best Regards,

Paul Liabenow

Paul Liabenow
Executive Director

1980 N. College Road, Mason, MI 48854
517.694.8955 ** Fax 517.694.8945 ** www.memspa.org

APPENDIX H- HUMAN INVESTIGATION COMMITTEE APPROVAL

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

IRB Administration Office
87 East Canfield, Second Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Phone: (313) 577-1628
FAX: (313) 993-7122
http://irb.wayne.edu

NOTICE OF EXPEDITED APPROVAL

To: Aguib Diop
College of Education

From: Dr. Scott Millis _____
Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)

Date: May 24, 2013

RE: IRB #: 047513B3E

Protocol Title: Predictors of Principal Responses in Bullying Situations: Implications for Bullying Prevention Programs

Funding Source:

Protocol #: 1304011971

Expiration Date: May 23, 2014

Risk Level / Category: Research not involving greater than minimal risk

---

The above-referenced protocol and items listed below (if applicable) were **APPROVED** following *Expedited Review* Category (#7)* by the Chairperson/designee *for* the Wayne State University Institutional Review Board (B3) for the period of 05/24/2013 through 05/23/2014. This approval does not replace any departmental or other approvals that may be required.

- Revised Protocol Summary Form (received in the IRB Office 5/22/2013)
- Protocol (received in the IRB Office 4/29/2013)
- The request for a waiver of the requirement for written documentation of informed consent has been granted according to 45 CFR 46.117(1)(2). Justification for this request has been provided by the PI in the Protocol Summary Form. The waiver satisfies the following criteria: (i) The only record linking the participant and the research would be the consent document, (ii) the principal risk would be potential harm resulting from a breach of confidentiality, (iii) each participant will be asked whether he or she wants documentation linking the participant with the research, and the participant's wishes will govern, (iv) the consent process is appropriate, (v) when used requested by the participants consent documentation will be appropriate, (vi) the research is not subject to FDA regulations, and (vii) an information sheet disclosing the required and appropriate additional elements of consent disclosure will be provided to participants not requesting documentation of consent.
- Research Information Sheet (dated 4/25/2013)
- Data Collection Tools: Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire, Student Social Behavior Questionnaire, Personal Beliefs about Diversity Scale, and Demographic Questionnaire

---

- Federal regulations require that all research be reviewed at least annually. You *may* receive a *"Continuation Renewal Reminder"* approximately two months prior to the expiration date; however, it is the Principal Investigator's responsibility to obtain review and continued approval ***before*** the expiration date. Data collected during a period of lapsed approval is unapproved research and can never be reported or published as research data.
- All changes or amendments to the above-referenced protocol require review and approval by the IRB **BEFORE** implementation.
- Adverse Reactions/Unexpected Events (AR/UE) must be submitted on the appropriate form within the timeframe specified in the IRB Administration Office Policy (http://www.irb.wayne.edu//policies-human-research.php).

NOTE:

1. Upon notification of an impending regulatory site visit, hold notification, and/or external audit the IRB Administration Office must be contacted immediately.
2. Forms should be downloaded from the IRB website at **each** use.

WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY

IRB Administration Office
87 East Canfield, Second Floor
Detroit, Michigan 48201
Phone: (313) 577-1628
FAX: (313) 993-7122
http://irb.wayne.edu

NOTICE OF EXPEDITED AMENDMENT APPROVAL

To: Aguib Diop
College of Education

From: Dr. Scott Millis S. Millis, PhD
Chairperson, Behavioral Institutional Review Board (B3)

Date: August 02, 2013

RE: IRB #: 047513B3E

Protocol Title: Predictors of Principal Responses in Bullying Situations: Implications for Bullying Prevention Programs

Funding Source:

Protocol #: 1304011971

Expiration Date: May 23, 2014

Risk Level / Category: Research not involving greater than minimal risk

The above-referenced protocol amendment, as itemized below, was reviewed by the Chairperson/designee of the Wayne State University Institutional Review Board (B3) and is APPROVED effective immediately.

- Research Information Sheet, revision dated 07-16-13, reflecting a change in compensation.

APPENDIX I- RESEARCH INFORMATION SHEET

Title of Study: Predictors of School Administrator Responses in Bullying Situations: Implications for
Bullying Prevention Programs

Principal Investigator (PI): Aguib Diop, College of Education, Theoretical and Behavioral Foundations, 313-598-3591

Purpose:
You are being asked to be in a research study of factors that influence principal responses in bullying situations because you are an elementary, middle school or high school principal. This study is being conducted at Wayne State University.

Study Procedures:
If you take part in the study, you will be asked to complete a survey and demographic questionnaire. You will be asked about your beliefs about the causes of bullying, attitudes toward diversity, attitudes and responses to hypothetical bullying situations and general demographics. The survey and demographic questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to complete.

Benefits:
As a participant in this research study, there will be no direct benefit for you; however, information from this study may benefit other people now or in the future.

Risks:
There are no known risks at this time to participation in this study.

Costs:
There will be no costs to you for participation in this research study.

Compensation:
You will not be paid for taking part in this study. However, a web link to a list of evidenced-based bullying prevention programs will be available to all participants. In addition, a drawing will be completed where 50 participants will be chosen to receive a $5 Starbucks Gift Card.

Confidentiality:
All information collected about you during the course of this study will be kept without any identifiers.

Voluntary Participation /Withdrawal:
Taking part in this study is voluntary. You are free to not answer any questions or withdraw at any time. Your decision will not change any present or future relationships with Wayne State University or its affiliates.

Questions:
If you have any questions about this study now or in the future, you may contact Aguib Diop at the following phone number: 313-598-3591. If you have questions or concerns

about your rights as a research participant, the Chair of the Human Investigation Committee can be contacted at (313) 577-1628. If you are unable to contact the research staff, or if you want to talk to someone other than the research staff, you may also call (313) 577-1628 to ask questions or voice concerns or complaints.

Participation:
By completing the survey and demographic questionnaire you are agreeing to participate in this study.

REFERENCES

Astor, R.A., Benbenishty, R., & Estrada, J.N. (2009). School violence and theoretically atypical schools: The principal's centrality in orchestrating safe schools. *American Educational Research Journal, 46 (2)*, 423-461. doi: 10.3102/0002831208329598

Atlas, R. S., & Pepler, B. J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. *The Journal of Educational Research, 92, 86-99*.

Baldry, A. C. (2003). Bullying in schools and exposure to domestic violence. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 27,* 713-732. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(03)00114-5.

Bauer, N. S., Herrenkohl, T. I., Lozano, P., Rivara, F. P., Hill, K. G., & Hawkins, J. D. (2006). Childhood bullying involvement and exposure to intimate partner violence. *Pediatrics*, *118*, e235–e242. doi: 10.1542/peds.2005-2509

Bauer, N., Lozano, P., & Rivara, F. P. (2007). The effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention program in public middle schools: A controlled trial. *Journal of Adolescent Health,40*, 266-274.

Bauman, S., Rigby, K., & Hoppa. K. (2008). U.S. teachers' and school counsellors' strategies for handling school bullying incidents. *Educational Psychology*, 28, 837-856. doi: 10.1080/01443410802379085

Beran, T., & Violato, C. (2004). A model of childhood perceived peer harassment: Analyses of the Canadian national longitudinal survey of children and youth data. *The Journal of Psychology, 138*, 129–147.

Biggs, B., Nelson, T., Twemlow, S. W., Vernberg, E., Fonagy, P., & Dill, E. (2008). Teacher adherence and its relation to teacher attitudes and student outcomes in an elementary school-based violence prevention program. *School Psychology Review, 37(4)*, 533-549.

Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 18, 117-127. doi: 10.1002/1098-2337

Black, S. A., & Jackson, E. (2007). Using bullying incident density to evaluate the Olweus bullying prevention programme. *School Psychology International, 28*, 623-638.

Blueprint for Violence Prevention (2002–2004). *Blueprints model programs: Olweus bullying prevention program (OBPP)*. Retrieved from http://www.colorado.edu/cspv/blueprints/model/programs/BPP.html

Bosworth, K., Espelage, D. L., & Simon, T. R. (1999). Factors associated with bullying behavior in middle school students. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 19,* 341-362.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development: Experiments by nature and human design.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1994). Ecological models of human development. In T. Husen & T. N. Postlethwaite (Eds.), *International Encyclopedia of Education* (2nd Ed., Vol. 3, pp. 1643-1647). Oxford, England: Pergamon Press.

Bryk, A.S. & Driscoll, M.E. (1988). *The school as community: Theoretical foundations, contextual influences, and consequences for students and teachers*. Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin, National Center on Effective Secondary Schools.

Carney, J.V. (2000). Bullied to death: Perceptions of peer abuse and suicidal behavior during adolescence. *School Psychology International, 21,* 44-54.

Carney, A. G., & Merrell, K. W. (2001). Bullying in schools: Perspectives on understanding and preventing an international problem. *School Psychology International, 22,* 364–382. doi:10.1177/0143034301223011

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences, 2nd Edition*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.

Craig, W.M., Henderson, K. & Murphy, J.G. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International Special Issue: Bullies and Victims, 21(1),* 5-21.

Crick, N. R., Casas, J. E., & Ku, H. (1999). Relational and physical forms of peer victimization in preschool. *Developmental Psychology, 35,* 376-385. doi:0012-1649/99.

Crick, N.R., Casas, J.F. & Nelson, D.A. (2002). Toward a more comprehensive understanding of peer maltreatment: Studies of relational victimization. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 11(3),* 98-101.

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. *Psychological Bulletin, 115,* 74–101.

Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social- psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, *66*, 710-722.

Cunningham, P. B., & Henggeler, S. W. (2001). Implementation of an empirically based drug and violence prevention and intervention program in public school settings. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, *30*(1), 221–232.

Cunningham, C.E., Vaillancourt, T., Rimas, H., Deal, K., Cunningham, L., Short, K. & Chen, Y. (2009). Modeling the bullying prevention program preferences of educators: A discrete conjoint experiment. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 37,* 929-943.

Dake, J.A., Price, J.H., Telljohann, S.K. & Funk, J.B. (2003). Teacher perceptions and practices regarding school bullying prevention. *Journal of School Health, 73*(9), 347-355. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2003.tb04191.x

Dake, J.A., Price, J.H., Telljohann, S.K. & Funk, J.B. (2004). Principals' perceptions and practices of school bullying prevention activities. *Health Education & Behavior, 31*, 372-387. doi:10.1177/1090198104263359

Dodge, K. A. (1991). The structure and function of reactive and proactive aggression. In D.Pepler & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp.201– 218). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Dodge, K. A., & Pettit, G. S. (2003). A biopsychosocial model of the development of chronic conduct problems in adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 39,* 349–371.

Dupper, D.R & Meyer-Adams, N. (2002). Low-level violence: A neglected aspect of school culture. *Urban Education, 37(3)*, 350-364. doi: 10.1177/00485902037003003.

Egan, S. K., & Perry, D. G. (1998). Does low self-regard invite victimization? *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 299–309.

Espelage D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review*, *32*(3), 365–383.

Evers, K.E., Prochaska, J.O., Van Marter, D.F., Johnson, J.L., & Prochaska, J.M. (2007). Transtheoretical-based bullying prevention effectiveness trials in middle and high schools. *Educational Research, 49 (4),* 397-414. doi:10.1080/00131880701717271

Farmer, T. W., Estell, D. , Bishop, J., O'Neal, K., & Cairns, B. (2003). Rejected bullies or popular leaders? The social relations of aggressive subtypes of rural African-American early adolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 39*, 992-1004. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2007.06.008

Federal Interagency Forum on Child and Family Statistics. (2005). *America's children: Key national indicators of well-Being.* Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.

Fekkes, M., Pijpers, F. I. M., & Verloove-Vanhorick, S. P. (2005). Bullying: Who does what, when and where? Involvement of children, teachers and parents in bullying behavior. *Health Education Research, 20*, 81–91. doi:10.1093/her/cyg100

Fonagy, P., Twemlow, S.W., Vernberg, E.M., Nelson, J.M., Dill, E.J., Little, T.D. & Sargent, J.A. (2009) A cluster randomized controlled trial of child-focused psychiatric consultation and a school systems-focused intervention to reduce aggression. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 50(5)*, 607–616. doi:10.1111/j.1469-7610.2008.02025.x

Fosse, G.K., & Holen, A. (2002). Childhood environment of adult psychiatric outpatients in Norway having been bullied in school. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 26*(2), 129-137. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(01)00312-X

Gao, W. & Mager, G. (2011). Enhancing pre-service teachers' sense of efficacy and attitudes toward school diversity through preparation: A case of one U.S. inclusive teacher education program. *International Journal of Special Education, 26 (2)*, 92-107.

Glickman, C. (2002). *Leadership for learning: How to help teachers succeed*. Arlington, Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Goldstein, S. E., Young, A., & Boyd, C. (2008). Relational aggression at school: Associations with school safety and social climate. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 37*, 641–654.

Gottfredson, D.C. & Gottfredson, G.D. (2002). Quality of school-based prevention programs: Results from a national survey. *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency, 39(1),* 3-35.

Gottfredson, G.D., Gottfredson, D.C., Payne, A.A., & Gottfredson, N.C., (2005).School climate predictors of school disorders: Results from a national study of delinquency prevention in schools. *Journal of Research on Crime and Delinquency, 42 (4),* 412-444.

Griffith, J. (1999). The school leadership/school climate relation: Identification of school configurations associated with change in principals. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 35(2),* 267-291. doi: 10.1177/00131619921968545

Haidt, J., Rosenberg, E., & Hom, H. (2003). Differentiating diversities: Moral diversity is not like other kinds. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *33*(1), 1-36.

Hallinger, P. & Heck, R.H. (2010). Collaborative leadership and school improvement: understanding the impact on school capacity and student learning. *School Leadership and Management, 30 (2),* 95-110.doi:10.1080/13632431003663214

Hanish, L. D., Kochenderfer-Ladd, B., Fabes, R.A., Martin, C. L., & Denning, D. (2004). Bullying among young children: The influence of peers and teachers. In D. L. Espelage, & S.M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention.* (pp. 141-159). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Hara, H. (2002) Justifications for bullying among Japanese schoolchildren. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 5,*197–204.

Harris, S., (2004). Bullying at school among older adolescents. *Prevention Researcher, 11(3)*, 12-14.

Harris, S. & Hathorn, C. (2006). Texas middle school principals' perceptions of bullying on campus. *NASSP Bulletin, 90 (1)*, 49-69. doi:10.1177/0192636505284527

Harris, S. Willoughby, W. (2003).Teacher perceptions of student bullying behaviors. *ERS Spectrum, 21(3)*, 11-18.

Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M.J. (2000). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines, 41*, 441–455. doi: 10.1111/1469-7610.00629

Heck, R., Larson, T. J., & Marcoulides, G. A. (1990). Instructional leadership and school achievement: Validation of a causal model. *Educational Administration Quarterly, 26*(2), 94-125.

Hetherington, E. M., & Elmore, A. M. (2003). Risk and resilience in children coping with their parents' divorce and remarriage. In S. S. Luthar (Ed.), *Resilience and vulnerability: Adaptation in the context of childhood adversities* (pp. 182-212). New York: Cambridge.

Holt, M.K., & Espelage, D.L. (2007). Perceived social support among bullies, victims, and bully-victims. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 36,* 984–994.doi:10.1007/s10964-006-9153-3

Holt, M.K. & Keyes, M.A. (2004). Teachers' attitudes toward bullying. In D.L. Espelage & S.M. Swearer (Eds), *Bullying in American schools* (pp 121-139). Mahwah, NJ.: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hong, J.S. (2009). Feasibility of the Olweus bullying prevention program in low-income schools. *Journal of School Violence, 8(1),* 8 97. doi:10.1080/15388220802067953

Hong, J.S. & Espelage, D.L. (2012). A review of research on bullying and peer victimization in school : An ecological systems analysis. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17,* 311-322. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.03.003

Jacobsen, K.E., & Bauman, S. (2007), Bullying in Schools: School counselors responses to three types of bullying situations. *Professional School Counseling, 11(1)*, 1-9.

Kallestad, J. H., & Olweus, D. (2003). Predicting teachers' and schools' implementation of the Olweus bullying prevention program: A multilevel study. *Prevention &Treatment*, *6,* 3-21. doi:10.1037/1522-3736.6.1.621a

Kochenderfer-Ladd, B., & Pelletier, M. E. (2008). Teacher's views and beliefs about bullying: Influences on classroom management strategies and students' coping with peer victimization. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 431-453. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2007.07.005

Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. J., & Skinner, K. (2002). Children's coping strategies: Moderators of the effects of peer victimization. *Developmental Psychology, 38(2),* 267−278. doi: 10.1037//0012-1649.38.2.267

Kosciw, J. G., Greytak, E. A., Diaz, E. M., & Bartkiewicz, M. J. (2010). *The 2009 national school climate survey: The experiences of lesbian, gay, bisexual and transgender youth in our nation's schools*. New York, NY: GLSEN.

Kose, B.W. (2009). The principal's role in professional development for social justice: An empirically based framework. *Urban Education, 44 (6),* 628-663.

Lagerspitz, K.M., Bjorkqvist, K. & Peltonen, T. (1988).'Is indirect aggression typical of females? Gender differences in aggressiveness in eleven-to twelve-year old children.' *Aggressive Behavior,14*, 403-414.

Lancelotta, G. X., & Vaughn, S. (1989). Relation between types of aggression and sociometric status: Peer and teacher perceptions. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, *81*, 86–90. doi: 10.1037//0022-0663.81.1.86. ISSN: 0022-0663.

Lieberman, R. & Cowan, K. (2011). Bullying and youth suicide: Breaking the connection. National Association of Secondary School Principals: *Principal Leadership* 12 (2), 12-17.

Limber, S. P., Nation, M., Tracy, A. J., Melton, G. B., & Flerx, V. (2004). Implementation of the Oweus Bullying Prevention Program in the Southeastern United States. In P. K. Smith, D. Pepler & K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 55-79). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Merrell, K.W., Gueldner, B.A., Ross, S.W. & Isava, D.M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23 (1),* 26-42. doi: 10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.26

Michigan Elementary and Middle School Principal Association. (2012, December). *Bylaws.* Retrieved from http://www.memspa.org/bylaws

Mitchell, M.M., Bradshaw, C.P. & Leaf, P.J. (2010). Student and teacher perceptions of school climate: A multilevel exploration of patterns of discrepancy. *Journal of School Health, 80(6)*, 271-279.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M. D., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviours among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 16,*2094–2100.

O'Higgins-Norman, J. (2008). Equality in the provision of social, personal and health education in the republic of Ireland: The case of homophobic bullying? *Pastoral Care in Education, 26(2),* 69-81. doi: 10.1080/02643940802062568

Olweus D (1991): Bully-victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In K. Rubin & D. Pepler (Eds.), *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression.* Hillsdale, N.J.: Erlbaum, pp 411-448.

Olweus D. (1993) *Bullying at School: What We Know and What We Can Do*. Oxford, United Kingdom: Blackwell Publishers.

Olweus, D. (1999). Sweden. *The nature of school bullying.* New York: Routledge.

Olweus, D. & Limber, S. (2010). The Olweus bullying prevention program: Implementation and evaluation over two decades. In S. R. Jimerson, S.M. Swearer & D.L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 377-402). New York, N.Y:Routledge.

O'Moore, M., & Kirkham, C. (2001). Self-esteem and its relationship to bullying behaviour. *Aggressive Behavior, 27*, 269–283. doi: 10.1002/ab.1010

Orpinas, P & Horne, A.M. (2006). *Bullying Prevention: Creating a Positive School Climate and Developing Social Competence.* Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Orpinas, P., Horne, A. M., & Staniszewski, D. (2003). School bullying: Changing the problem by changing the school. *School Psychology Review*, *32*(3), 431–444.

Orpinas, P., Murray, N., Kelder, S. (1999). Parental influences on students' aggressive behaviors and weapon carrying. *Health Education & Behavior*, 26 (6), 774-787.

Pellegrini, A. D. (1998). Bullies and victims in school: A review and call for papers. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 19, 165-176.

Peterson, J. S., & Ray, K. E. (2006). Bullying among the gifted: The subjective experience. *Gifted Child Quarterly, 50*, 252-269. doi:10.1177/001698620605000305

Rigby, K (1997), *Bullying in Schools and What to Do about It*, London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Rose, C. A., Monda-Amaya, L. E., & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Bullying perpetration and victimization in special education: A review of the literature. *Remedial and Special Education, 32*, 114–130. doi:10.1177 /0741932510361247

Rudolph, U., Roesch, S.C., Greitemeyer, T. and Weiner, B. (2004). A meta-analytic review of help giving and aggression from an attributional perspective. *Cognition and Emotion, 18,* 815–848.

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior, 22,* 1–15.

Seals, D, & Young, J. (2003). Bullying and victimization prevalence and relationship to gender, grade level, ethnicity, self-esteem, and depression. *Adolescence, 38,*735-747.

Shields, A., & Cicchetti, D. (2001). Parental maltreatment and emotion dysregulation as risk factors for bullying and victimization in middle childhood. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 30,* 349-363. doi:10.1207/S15374424JCCP3003_7

Slaby, R.G., Wilson-Brewer, R., & Dash, K. (1994). *Aggressors, Victims, and Bystanders: Thinking and Acting to Prevent Violence.* Newton, MA: Education Development Center, Inc.

Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review, 33,*547–560.

Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2003). The nature of school bullying and the effectiveness of school based interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies, 5,* 189–209.

Stader, D.L. & Graca, T.J. (2007). School culture and sexual minority teachers in the United States. *Journal of Education and Human Development*, *1* (2), 1-10.

Staub, E. (1999). The roots of evil: Social conditions, culture, personality and basic human needs. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 3*, 179-192.

Sprague, J. R., Smith, S. & Stieber, S. (2002). Principal perceptions of school safety. *Journal of School Violence, 1*(4), 51-64.

Swearer, S.M.& Espelage, D.L (2004). Introduction: A Social-ecological framework of bullying among youth. In D.L. Espelage & S.M. Swearer (Eds), *Bullying in American schools* (pp 1-12). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Troop, W. P., & Ladd, G.W. (2002). Teachers' beliefs regarding peer victimization and their intervention practices. *Poster presented at the Conference on Human Development, Charlotte, NC*.

Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., Sacco, F. C., Gies, M. L., Evans, R., & Ewbank, R. (2001). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: a controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence. *American Journal of Psychiatry, 158(5)*, 808-810.

Walker, J., & Slear, S. (2011). The impact of principal leadership behaviors on the efficacy of new and experienced middle school teachers. *NASSP Bulletin, 95(1)*, 46-64. doi: 10.1177/0192636511406530.

Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of achievement and emotion.* New York: Springer-Verlag.

Weiner, B. (1996). Searching for order in social motivation. *Psychological Inquiry,* 7, 199-216.

Yoon, J.S., & Kerber, K. (2003). Bullying: Elementary teachers' attitudes and intervention strategies. *Research in Education, 69*, 27-34.

Yoon, J.S. (2004). Predicting teacher interventions in bullying situations. *Education and Treatment of Children, 27(1),* 37-45.

ABSTRACT

SCHOOL ADMINISTRATOR RESPONSES IN BULLYING SITUATIONS: IMPLICATIONS FOR BULLYING PREVENTION PROGRAMS

by

AGUIB DIOP

May 2015

Advisor: Dr. Jina Yoon

Major: Educational Psychology

Degree: Doctor of Philosophy

The purpose of this study was to investigate school administrators' responses to bullying situations and explore variables that predict their responses. Elementary, middle and high school administrators (n = 126) from school districts throughout Michigan participated in the study. Data were collected during the 2013-2014 school year.

Differences between beliefs about the causes of victimization were found in that school administrators were less likely to endorse normative beliefs about the causes of victimization than assertive or avoidant beliefs. School administrators were more likely to endorse assertive beliefs for girls than for boys. Empathy towards victims, perceived seriousness of the bullying situation, likelihood of intervention and type of response across three types of hypothetical bullying situations were measured. School administrators perceived physical bullying situations as more serious, reported more empathy for victims and were more likely to intervene and involve parents when compared to verbal or social exclusion situations. They were more likely to provide responses that involved expressing disapproval in verbal or social exclusion bullying situations than in physical bullying situations.

Factors that predicted a school administrator's likelihood of intervention and type of response in bullying situations were examined. Perceived seriousness was a significant predictor of a school administrator's likelihood of intervention in bullying vignettes. School administrators

more open to diversity were more likely to intervene in bullying situations, more likely to discipline the perpetrator and involve parents when intervening. School administrators with previous bullying prevention training reported a higher likelihood of intervention in bullying situations but were less likely to involve parents. Previous training did not have an effect on expressing disapproval or disciplining the perpetrator in bullying situations. The study provides support for further research on school administrators and their role in bullying prevention initiatives.

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

AGUIB S. DIOP

EDUCATION

December, 2014	Doctor of Philosophy, Wayne State University Major: Educational Psychology Advisor: Dr. Jina Yoon
August, 2007	Master of Arts, Wayne State University Major: School & Community Psychology
December, 2001	Bachelor of Science, University of Pittsburgh Major: Interdisciplinary Studies, Concentrations in Biology and Psychology

CURRENT LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATION

Michigan School Psychologist Certificate
Nationally Certified School Psychologist (NCSP) Certificate

RESEARCH INTERESTS

- Individual and Contextual Factors Affecting Bullying Behavior
- School-Based Bullying Prevention Programming
- Peer Relationships in School-aged Children

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2014- Present	School Psychologist, Troy Schools, Troy, MI
2013- 2014	School Psychologist, Warren Consolidated Schools, Warren, MI
2011-2013	Pre-Doctoral Intern, Hegira Children's Outpatient Services, Westland, MI
2009-2013	School Psychologist, Southgate Community Schools, Southgate, MI
2008-2009	School Psychologist, Van Buren Public Schools, Belleville, MI
2007-2008	School Psychologist, Leona Group, LLC, Lansing, MI
2007	Clinical Intern, Vista Maria, Dearborn Heights, MI
2007	School Psychology Intern, Grosse Pointe Public School District, Grosse Pointe, MI

PROFESSIONAL AFFILIATIONS

Michigan Association of School Psychologists
Macomb-St. Clair Psychological Association