WALDEN UNIVERSITY
A higher degree. A higher purpose.

Walden University
ScholarWorks

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies

Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection

2022

Understanding the Lived Experiences of Bystanders and Upstanders During a Bullying Episode

Dr James Torino
Walden University

Follow this and additional works at: https://scholarworks.waldenu.edu/dissertations

Part of the Social Psychology Commons

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies Collection at ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Walden Dissertations and Doctoral Studies by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact ScholarWorks@waldenu.edu.

Walden University

College of Psychology and Community Services

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

James Torino

has been found to be complete and satisfactory in all respects,
and that any and all revisions required by
the review committee have been made.

Review Committee
Dr. Medha Talpade, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Jay Greiner, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Kimberly McCann, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer and Provost
Sue Subocz, Ph.D.

Walden University
2022

Abstract

Understanding the Lived Experiences of Bystanders and Upstanders

During a Bullying Episode

by

James Torino

MBA, Keller Graduate School of Management 2015

MISM, Keller Graduate School of Management 2014

BS, St John’s University 1987

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2022

Abstract

School-age bullying is a social problem negatively affecting more than 11% of the student body in the United States alone. The purpose of this study was to develop a better understanding of the lived experiences of bystanders, who witness a bullying event but do not intervene, and upstanders, who witness the event and intervene on behalf of the victim. To answer to the research question addressing the purpose of this qualitative study, 10 individuals between the ages of 18–20 years old who self-identified as both a bystander and an upstander during a bullying episode were interviewed using the lens of Darley and Latane's model of bystander intervention. Interviews were transcribed and loaded into MAXQDA for axial coding. Findings of this study lend an enhanced understanding of the complex combinations of personal traits and emotions felt by bystanders during a bullying episode that facilitate helping behavior, offering additional insights into the model of bystander intervention. As bystanders, participants experienced sympathy for the victim but also felt fear for their own safety that prevented them from intervening. When describing the moments when they intervened on behalf of the victim, they described feelings of empathy, moving past sympathy, and an intense anger toward the bully and/or the event itself, facilitating intervention. Armed with the additional information from the findings of this study, psychologists and practitioners may have a better chance to create impactful intervention strategies meant to decrease and diminish bullying, thus initiating positive social change for the victims of bullying, a vulnerable population.

Understanding the Lived Experiences of Bystanders and Upstanders During a Bullying Episode

by

James Torino

MBA, Keller Graduate School of Management 2015

MISM, Keller Graduate School of Management 2014

BS, St John’s University 1987

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2022

Dedication

This paper is dedicated to all those who have intervened on behalf of a victim of bullying but most specifically to my children, who because of their kind nature and efforts to help others, found themselves at times bullied as a result.

Acknowledgments

I like to acknowledge all those who supported me through this effort, including my wife, Bethany, and our family who continually sacrificed their time allowing me to focus on this endeavor; my fellow students who continued to inspire me over the last 4 years; and last, but certainly not least, the faculty at Walden, especially my chairperson, Dr. Talpade, whose continued encouragement and guidance motivated me to completion.

Table of Contents

List of Tables v

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study 1

Background 2

Problem Statement 3

Purpose of the Study 3

Research Question 3

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework 4

Nature of the Study 4

Definitions 6

Assumptions 6

Scope and Delimitations 7

Limitations 7

Significance 8

Summary 9

Chapter 2: Literature Review 10

Literature Search Strategy 11

Theoretical Foundation 11

Prosocial Behavior Manifestation 12

Models of Aggression 14

Conceptual Framework 16

Literature Review 17

Factors Associated With Bullying Behavior 17
Bullying and the Bystander 21
Summary and Conclusions 28
Chapter 3: Research Method 30
Research Design and Rationale 30
Role of the Researcher 32
Methodology 33
Participant Selection Logic 33
Instrumentation 34
Researcher-Developed Instrument 34
Procedures for Pilot 35
Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection 35
Data Analysis Plan 36
Issues of Trustworthiness 37
Ethical Procedures 38
Summary 39
Chapter 4: Results 41
Pilot Study 41
Setting 42
Demographics 43
Data Collection 45
Data Analysis 45

Evidence of Tstworthiness 47
Results 48
RQ: What are the Lived Experiences of a Bystander or Upstander During a Bullying Episode? 48
Textural Themes 49
Theme 1: Bullying is Perceived as Fundamentally Wrong 49
Theme 2: Victims are Perceived to be Introverted to the Extent That are Deemed Different and Weak 50
Theme 3: Victims Feel Powerless to Stand Up for Themselves 50
Theme 4: Even Though a Bystander may be Sympathetic or Empathetic, They Feel Powerless to Intervene 50
Theme 5: Even Though a Bystander may Want to Help, They Simply do not Out of Fear for Their Own Safety 51
Theme 6: Upstanders Have a Sense of Responsibility to Help Others and the Courageous Fortitude to Invoke Intervention 52
Theme 7: Upstanders Have Significant Empathy for the Victim and Anger Toward the Bully During an Event 52
Theme 8: Empathy and Anger When Combined With Moral Clarity and Courage Facilitates Intervention 52
Summary 55
Chapter 5: Discussions, Conclusions, and Recommendations 56
Interpretation of the Findings 57

Limitations of the Study 58

Recommendations 60

Implications 61

Conclusion 62

References 63

Appendix: Question Set 74

List of Tables

Table 1. Participant Characteristics: Age, Gender, Current Education, Identifies as Bystander/Upstander 44

Table 2. Codes, Categories, and Themes 54

Chapter 1: Introduction to the Study

Social psychologists have long known that bullying is a global issue, with. the impacts of bullying for school-age children being felt around the world in every country and every culture (Pozzoli & Gini, 2013). According to the National Center for Education Statistics and Bureau of Justice Statistics (2020), bullying affects over 7 million children or 13% of students across 42,000 schools in the United States each year. Twenty-four percent of all students across the United States reported being bullied at least once a month, while others reported being bullied on occasion. For those in middle school, the incidence of bullying was greatest, accounting for more than 27% of all weekly bullying. In a student body of more than 56 million students, nearly 1 out of every 7 school-age children in the United States will suffer the short- and long-term ill effects of aggression from their peers (Institute of Education Sciences, n.d.).

The Center for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC; 2018) has suggested that bullying can be delivered in many ways and in many different modalities, including direct, child-to-child physical abuse; digital or cyberbullying through text messages, social media, and other forms; social bullying in which children are exiled from group activities with peers; and socioeconomic bullying where children simply cannot participate because of their socioeconomic status.

While many may see the short-term effects of bullying, such as anxiety, social stress, self-harm (cutting), and death (suicide), the CDC (2018) has long recognized the longer-term effects of this aggression in which adults who were victimized of bullying may trust less, negatively affecting their adult relationships with significant others,

coworkers, and others. Easing the suffering of those who are bullied, the impacts of which can last from childhood into adulthood, ushers in a positive social change creating a happier, more prosocial society.

Background

Historically, programs that address bullying are only somewhat effective, preventing approximately 20% of bullying from happening (Gaffney et al., 2019). Most bullying prevention programs are focused on changing the behavior of the bully (Pozzoli & Gini, 2013). The Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus & Solberg, 2003), for example, is used in many different countries around the world to measure attitudes about bullying and its effects in a school environment (Lee & Cornell, 2010). The question set is designed to ask about bullying but leaves the upstander's attitude and role somewhat aside, so the questionnaire does not uncover the lived experience of the upstander or bystander. Considering the four potential actors in a bullying episode (i.e., the victim, the bully, a bystander or witness to the event, and a bystander that intervenes [an upstander]; Pozzoli & Gini, 2013), the philosophy to address bullying while focusing on stopping the bullying behavior falls short of addressing the behavior of those that can help.

Given the low efficacy of antibullying programs since 2001, it is not surprising that interventions by bystanders have only shown a slight improvement. In 2001, Hawkins et al. (2001) found that only 20% of bystanders intervened on behalf of a bullying victim while 17 years later, Song and Oh (2018) found that during a cyberbullying episode, bystanders intervened only 30% of the time. The continued low

rate of intervention by bystanders on behalf of a bullying victim when the bystander was present to witness the episode has prompted the current study.

While many researchers (e.g., Polanin et al., 2012; Pozzoli & Gini, 2013; Shriberg et al., 2015) have investigated prosocial helping behavior, illuminating the characteristics that initiate helping behavior in general, research specifically related to bullying among school-age children has failed to help identify the characteristics of the helping behaviors of bystanders who help (i.e., upstanders) versus those who do not during a bullying episode.

Problem Statement

The situation or issue that prompted me to conduct this study was the low rate of intervention by bystanders on behalf of a bullying victim when the bystander was present to witness the episode. Social psychologists have long known that bullying is a global issue, but the research surrounding the lived experiences of upstanders and bystanders is minimal. The effects of bullying can be short term and felt long after the bullying stops, including social stress, anxiety, self-harm, and even death (CDC, 2018).

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the lived experiences of bystanders who intervene (i.e., upstanders) on behalf of a bullying victim and those of bystanders who do not intervene.

Research Question

What are the lived experiences of a bystander or upstander during a bullying episode?

Theoretical/Conceptual Framework

The concepts that grounded this study emerged from Darley and Latane's (1968) exploration of bystander behavior that ultimately resulted in their model of bystander intervention (Latané & Darley, 1970) in which they helped to explain why some bystanders intervene on behalf of others while others do not. Along with citing the need to overcome the diffusion of responsibility, Darley and Latane (1968) found that an individual must take several steps before helping behavior is enacted. Their work built upon several well-known prosocial helping theories, including the cost-reward theory (Batson et al., 2003; Piliavin et al., 1981) and empath-altruism theory (Batson et al., 1991; Shillington et al., 2021) but falls short of explaining the factors necessary for children to actively intervene on behalf of a victim of bullying.

Nature of the Study

To address the research question in this qualitative study, I employed a phenomenological design with semistructured interviews conducted because the goal was to understand the participants lived experiences during a bullying episode. This method allowed me to derive common themes, that when incorporated, created the essence of the cohort's shared experiences. I was not an independent observer in a white lab coat conducting an experiment. In qualitative research, self-reflection about an individual's own attitude, position, and role in society or the researcher's positionality is vital (Ravitch et al., 2016).

The research cohort consisted of 10 participants between the ages of 18–20 years old who were either graduating high school or who had recently graduated high school.

The cohort consisted of both male and female participants of which at least 50% were identified as bystanders with the remaining being identified as upstanders. The adolescent brain continues to develop well into the 20s (Johnson et al., 2009). This development includes emotional intelligence, as defined by Mayer et al. (2004), within their model of emotional intelligence. As such, participants in this cohort were able to process their own emotions and those of others as well as translate that into thought and actions more accurately. I used social media to solicit research participants. Great care was taken to assure the participants' anonymity and confidentiality. As such, potential participants were given explicit instructions regarding the method for volunteering (i.e., via direct message to me). The informed consent form included information pertaining to options for outside counseling, if needed. Furthermore, I instructed participants to describe an event in which the bully was apprehended, eliminating the need to disclose potential criminal liability. Upon completion of the study, participants will be offered a de-identified report to review the findings. This approach lends itself to the exploration and description of the phenomenon as it is experienced directly by the participants themselves (Ravitch et al., 2016). This was important because I sought to capture the characteristics of a bystander and an upstander during the phenomenon of bullying. Furthermore, this method provided me with a basis for reflective analysis that best describes the experiences.

Definitions

Bullying: "Repeated acts of aggression, intimidations, or coercion against a victim who is weaker in terms of physical size, psychological or social power, or other factors that result in a notable power differential" (Ross & Horner, 2009, p. 48).

Bystander: Someone who is present to witness the bullying event but does not intervene (Clarkson, 1987) and is neither the victim nor the perpetrator (Staub, 1992).

Upstander: A bystander who witnesses the event and intervenes on behalf of the victim (Pozzoli & Gini, 2013).

Assumptions

The specific research framework used in this study was based on a constructivism perspective and included a phenomenological qualitative design that lent itself to the exploration and description of the phenomenon as it is experienced directly by the participants themselves. As such, one must make ontological assumptions based on the nature of reality in that reality is subjective in nature, preventing a single truth to prevail, and those involved in a bullying episode whether they be the bully, victim, bystander, or upstander will have different perspectives on the event itself (see Creswell, 2013). Therefore, I had to assume, that while some involved in the episode may have different interpretations of the event, that bullying did in fact happen. For example, two bystanders may have different attitudes on bullying where one thinks it is happening based on their definition and may intervene, whereas the other may not perceive it to have happened, resulting in inaction on behalf of the victim. For this reason, I had to assume bullying has happened based on the experience of the victim.

Scope and Delimitations

To further the understanding of the social problem of bullying, I focused on the experiences of bystanders and upstanders during a bullying event where intervention was exercised or disregarded. For example, research conducted on the effectiveness of the KiVi antibullying program that focused on bystander intervention has shown significant reductions in bullying for elementary school children (Nocentini & Menesini, 2016). It stands to reason then that if someone seeks to diminish bullying, they need only to look to increase interventions. As such, this study focused attention on the bystanders and upstanders of a bullying event. The research participant cohort found within the boundaries of this study included those within the age range of 18 to 20 years old who had been a bystander and/or upstander during a recent bullying episode.

While the theoretical framework was based on help behavior, the theories found therein do fall short of identifying the complete and unique list of characteristics common to all upstanders. This study was meant to uncover more as it relates to upstander behavior. I was unsure if the study would uncover upstander characteristics that are transferrable outside the context of bullying. While the goal of qualitative research does not include the production of facts that can be directly applied to other settings (Ravich & Ravich, 2016), I assumed that bystander behavior that turns into upstander behavior would be similar regardless of the perceived emergency.

Limitations

Because I sought to interview those that did and did not intervene on behalf of a bullying victim, the limitations of this study revolved around finding participants that

would self-disclose their participation during a bullying event. This self-disclosure was captured via an intake form using the definitions found earlier this chapter. Because I sought individuals between 18 and 20 years of age, finding research participants proved to be challenging.

Researcher bias did exist because my children were victims of bullying. Interestingly, they were victimized because they were upstanders. Because the goal of qualitative research is to understand the experience of others (i.e., how they feel and how they think; Ravitch & Ravitch, 2016), it was critically important that I limited my bias and withheld judgement and evaluation. This included being cognizant of involuntary, negative facial expressions or body language. If bias was present and felt by the participant being interviewed, it would have shut down what would be otherwise open, honest, and transparent communications. To limit bias, I used the predetermined question set to ensure the focus remained on addressing the research question.

Significance

This study is significant in that I sought to advance the understanding of the lived experiences of upstanders (i.e., those who intervene on behalf of bullying victims) and bystanders (i.e., those who do not intervene) during a bullying episode. Few social psychologists have sought to delve deep into the antecedents of the behavior of bystanders and upstanders who witness bullying. The findings of this study lend a better understanding of the complex combination of relationships, personal characteristics, individual behavior, and other variables that may affect helping behavior. Armed with this additional information, psychologists and practitioners may have a better chance to

create impactful intervention strategies meant to decrease and diminish bullying, thus initiating positive social change for the 11 million school children hurt by bullying each year (see National Center for Education Statistics and Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2020).

Summary

Bullying is a global social issue that includes a complex combination of personal characteristics, relationships, individual attitudes and behavior, along other variables that may affect helping behavior (Pozzoli & Gini, 2013). Many psychologists have admitted that although they felt their research had advanced the identification of bystander versus upstanders characteristics, they concluded that additional research was needed to better understand these complexities.

In this study, I sought to understand the lived experiences of bystanders and upstanders. Through uncovering the characteristics, emotions, and attitudes present within an upstander, perhaps social psychologists can create a program that helps to manifest these characteristics, resulting in more upstanders.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

While psychologists have long known the harmful effects of bullying and the negative impact it makes on vulnerable children and their families (CDC, 2018), efforts to create programs to diminish this social problem fall short, reducing bullying by a margin of only approximately 20% (Gaffney et al., 2019). Most bullying prevention programs focus on changing the bully's behavior (Pozzoli & Gini, 2013). The Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus & Solberg, 2003), for example, is used in many different countries around the world to measure attitudes about bullying and its effects in a school environment (Lee & Cornell, 2010). The question set is designed to ask about bullying but leaves the upstander's attitude and role somewhat aside. Considering the four potential actors in a bullying episode (i.e., the victim, the bully, a bystander or witness to the event, and a bystander that intervenes [an upstander]; Pozzoli & Gini, 2013), the philosophy to address bullying while focusing on stopping the bullying behavior falls short of addressing the behavior of those that can help. The low rate of intervention by bystanders on behalf of a bullying victim when the bystander was present to witness the episode prompted the current study. The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the lived experiences of bystanders who intervene (i.e., upstanders) on behalf of a bullying victim compared to those of bystanders who do not intervene.

In this chapter, I delve into the literature surrounding bullying, bystanders, and the actions of upstanders as well as providing the theoretical foundations of the study, such as the cost-reward theory (Batson et al., 2003; Piliavin et al., 1981) and empath-altruism theory (Batson et al., 1991; Shillington et al., 2021), that aid in describing helping

behavior. This chapter also includes a discussion of the nature of aggression, social learning, personality, and the balance of power as well as how each facilitates the phenomenon of bullying.

Literature Search Strategy

Databases used during literature searches included the APA Psycinfo, Sage Journals, SocINDEX, Taylor and Francis Online, and Academic Search Complete. I also used Google Scholar to find additional literature that would have referenced older material to find the most current literature on the subject. The following keywords and phrases were used in my searches: *bullying, bullying behavior, bullying in schools, bullying prevention, bullying effects, bystander, bystander intervention, helping behavior, bystander behavior, upstander, upstander behavior, from bystander to upstander,* and *why do bystanders help*.

Theoretical Foundation

This study was grounded in Darley and Latane’s (1968) exploration of bystander behavior that ultimately led to their model of bystander intervention (Latané & Darley, 1970), helping to explain why some bystanders intervene on behalf of others while others do not. Along with citing the need to overcome the diffusion of responsibility and acquiring felt responsibility, Darley and Latane (1968) found that an individual must take several steps before helping behavior is enacted. Pozzoli and Gini (2013) studied bystander behavior among Italian students using the model of bystander intervention to help further understand upstander behavior.

Prosocial Behavior Manifestation

Darley and Latané (1968) learned that for prosocial behavior to manifest itself during times in which others need help, certain factors must be presented to the bystander. Following the high-profile New York City murder of Kitty Genovese, Darley and Latané conducted research surrounding the circumstances of the event, which led to the creation of the model of bystander intervention. Just past midnight on March 13th, 1964, Kitty Genovese was viciously attacked near her apartment building. For more than 45 minutes, Ms. Genovese was heard screaming for help as she was repeatedly stabbed. During the subsequent investigation, it was uncovered that many residents in the surrounding area listened to her cries for help but did not intervene on her behalf. This phenomenon is now described as the bystander effect. While further researching bystander inventions, Darley and Latané concluded that people needed to acquire *helper's felt responsibility*. Simply put, people must attain a feeling of responsibility in which they feel personally responsible for helping. This is akin to an adult child's responsibility toward an aging parent (Stein, 2009). It is easy to understand how this responsibility could naturally exist between a parent and child and perhaps between close friends; however, when found in a circumstance in which another needs help, the phenomenon known as the *diffusion of responsibility* must be overcome, especially when an individual finds themselves among other bystanders (Darley & Latané, 1968). Darley and Latane found that when other bystanders were present, there was a natural inclination for the bystander to assume someone else would intervene. They also found the propensity to help was inversely correlated to the number of bystanders present, so the

more bystanders present, the less likely it was for prosocial behavior to manifest per bystander.

In the model of bystander intervention, Darley and Latané (1968) suggested that five criteria must be met before bystanders intervene: The bystander must have an awareness of the event, they must perceive it as an emergency, they must acquire helper's felt responsibility, they must know what action to take, and then implement the intervention itself. In the case of Kitty Genovese, a bystander must have known Ms. Genovese was being assaulted, knew she was in grave danger, feel responsible for helping, knew to call the police, and then do so. However, when confronted with the diffusion of responsibility, bystanders did nothing to intervene even though these five criteria were met.

To complicate bystander intervention even further, Weirner (1980) suggested that in addition to the criteria identified in the model of bystander intervention, people must also quickly determine whether the victim was responsible for creating the event themselves due to their actions. Warner contended that bystanders were less likely to help if they felt the victim was deserving of the situation.

Darley and Latane's (1968) work built upon several well-known prosocial helping theories, including the cost-reward theory (Batson et al., 2003; Piliavin et al., 1981) in which bystanders chose to help or not based on their analysis of the cost versus benefit. In this theory, bystanders are more likely to assist others if the act has a high reinforcement value or an extremely low-cost value. In contrast, if the cost is relatively high or reinforcement low, it is more likely an intervention will not occur. Pronk et al.

(2014) conducted research surveying 489 Dutch students to understand whether pro-victim intervention was related to the cost-reward theory and found that the theory did help to explain how the anticipation of cost or reward affected helping behavior.

Darley and Latane's (1968) model also built upon the empath-altruism theory (Batson et al., 1991; Shillington et al., 2021) in which it was hypothesized that bystanders will help others based on whether they feel empathy for the victim. In contrast to the cost-reward theory, in the empath-altruism theory the bystander will help regardless of a cost or reward. Longobardi et al. (2020) sought to better understand the relationship between empathy and the motivation to defend others during a bullying episode. After surveying 430 Italian students, they found that empathy was a motivating factor for facilitating helping and defending behavior. They concluded that further studies were needed to determine how to raise spontaneous defending attitudes among school children.

In the *social learning theory*, Bandura et al. (1963a) posited that children who witness bullying on television, in the movies, at home, or in other social settings would then mimic this behavior, especially if seen from a role model. While these theories offer insight into prosocial helping behavior, they fall short of explaining the other factors necessary for children to actively intervene on behalf of a victim of bullying.

Models of Aggression

If one wanted to address bullying by focusing on aggression, then different models of aggression should be considered. In the *frustration-aggression model*, Dolard et al. (1939) suggested that aggression typically results from frustration. This can be witnessed in everyday life, especially among motorists, as road rage stems from

frustration and destructive behavior (Peng et al., 2019). As it relates to bullying, the frustration felt by a child may invoke aggression toward other children. The inability of a bullying victim to direct the frustration to the target object that initiated their frustration, in this case, the bully, may influence them to turn their aggression toward another target object such as another child (Marcus-Newhall et al., 2000).

The *general aggression model* indicates that situational (Anderson & Bushman, 2002a) and environmental (Berkowitz, 1990) factors can facilitate aggression leading to violent behavior. Consider the bullying episode in which a bystander is present. When presented with an aggressive environment, the bystander may also become aggressive toward the victim. Salmivalli et al. (1996) found that when other bystanders cheer or laugh during a bullying episode, the bullying can heighten. Considering Maslow's (1954) assertion that humans all seek a sense of belonging, a bystander may be induced to join in and bully out a sense of belonging to the mob.

Assuming that childhood aggression and bullying are connected, it would follow that social psychologists should look to programs that help to change the aggressive posture between one student to another. To do so, programs need to be constructed to effectively address aggression given the multitude of variables that contribute to aggression. However, there may be simply too many permutations of environmental and biological factors that contribute to aggression to allow for an easily scalable and repeatable solution. To address the aggression at the individual level would take considerable time and resources where customization would prevail.

Conceptual Framework

The logical connections between the theoretical framework presented and the nature of the current study included the need to explore the lived experiences that distinguish bystanders who intervene (i.e., upstanders) during a school-age bullying episode from those who do not. Seeking a better understanding of personal experiences during a bullying episode required me to immerse into the environment itself, taking on a constructivist perspective. This was important because it is through this interaction that deeper meaning was discovered as the participants and I cocreated findings through interactive conversation (see Burkholder et al., 2016). When exploring the lived experiences of both the upstander and bystander, the empath-altruism and cost-reward theories (see Hogg & Cooper, 2007) emerged as central themes helping to explain motivation and behavior. As such, this conceptual framework best guided the overall design of the research and research question, the literature review, and the process for gathering data and their analysis.

To understand the true nature of another's perspective on reality, I also adopted an interpretivism approach that suggested the very nature of reality is based upon an individual's participation in a lived experience (see Elster, 2007). This reality brought about by social construction helped to rule out natural science methodology (see Eilaeson, 2002).

Literature Review

Factors Associated With Bullying Behavior

Psychologists have long posited that many different factors contribute to bullying, including aggression, (Broidy et al., 2003), learned behavior (Bandura et al., 1963a), biology (Lorenz, 1967), personality (Book et al., 2012), and the balance of power (Volk et al., 2014).

Childhood Aggression and Bullying

For those who adopt Ross and Horner's (2009) definition of bullying, aggression comes to the forefront of antecedent research as an individual actively seeks to exert power over another. Almost 80% of children between the ages of 1 to 3 display aggressive behavior (Campbell et al., 2006. During social interactions, this manifests itself through stealing items in possession of another, hitting, and even biting. Eisner and Malti's (2015) suggested that for toddlers, aggression is common but does not last long if they learn prosocial norms from parents and through interaction with others. They incorporate these skills quickly, leading to more collaborative social interaction with others. It is worth noting, however, that a portion of (mainly) male children can maintain increased levels of aggression as they enter adolescence and that this subset of children has an increased propensity toward violence during their teenage and young adult years (Jambon et al., 2019).

A longitudinal study conducted by Broidy et al. (2003) validated this. They found that aggression in children declined between the elementary and middle school ages, with a small subset retaining a higher level of aggression. It would seem then that most

children's aggression diminishes as they get older (Jambon et al., 2019). Tremblay (2000) agreed that some children do not lose their aggressive posture but acknowledged that this characteristic does not always lead to bullying. Hawley (2014) also agreed, suggesting that for those children that retain aggression, some can deploy effective coping strategies to help keep their aggression at bay while others may be seen as persistently aggressive. It would seem then that an individual's aggressive characteristics can be carried throughout their lifetime, and some can simply exercise restraint while others cannot.

Researchers have theorized that if families function with the constant exposure to aggression because of family discord or children being bullied by a parent or sibling, this influence can interfere with the child's psychological functioning, inhibiting them from successfully navigating through their frustration (Bronfenbrenner & Morris, 2006). This ultimately leads to their aggressive behavior tendencies later in life (Jambon et al., 2019). Furthermore, Dodge et al. (2006) posited that language deficits, parenting styles, socioeconomic status, and other factors also play their part in molding a child's aggressive posture, while Côté et al. (2006) pointed out biological factors and environmental stressors that add to the same.

Interestingly, researchers such as Hawley (2014) have suggested that children who learn and exhibit higher levels of prosocial behavior will act in a prosocial manner despite their aggressive posture. Thus, having a prosocial outlook offsets their use of aggression to control their peers. Because the family unit is so influential, Jambon et al. (2019) called upon researchers to conduct additional research to better understand the unique conduits of aggressive behavior if preventive measures are to be implemented to

address modifying the behavior of those who continue to exhibit outward aggression toward others.

Bullying as Learned Behavior

Cementing aggressive behavior may come by way of the constant conditioning in that setting as the child is repeatedly exposed to that stimulus (Pavlov, 1927). For example, if a child witnesses the experience of getting one's way through bullying another often, they may follow that same pattern of behavior as bullying is then considered the path to reward. Although Eisner and Malti (2015) have suggested that children grow out of using aggression to get their way, classic conditioning might suggest otherwise given that particular set of circumstances.

The Biology of Bullying

It would be remiss to seek the antecedents of aggression and bullying without researching the influence of biology. For example, Lorenz (1967), known for an ethology viewpoint, suggested aggression started from our earliest ancestors due to the very nature of survival which begins at a biological level. Humans simply must consume food and water to survive, and when confronted with a limited supply, the need to survive facilitates aggressive behavior. Lorenz likened a white blood cell attack against diseased cells to ensure biological survival to that of person-on-person aggression for biological survival.

Lorenz's assertions followed Abraham Maslow's (1954), who suggested humans have to satisfy basic biological needs such as hunger and thirst to survive and will seek out sustenance to achieve it aggressively pursuing it. Lester (2013) went further to

suggest that the need for shelter in addition to food and water may precipitate aggression pointing many examples of aggression between tribes, countries, etc., as they seek to control natural resources.

Role of Personality in Bullying

Using the early understandings of psychoanalytic (Freud, 1913) and neo-analytic (Mowrer, 1956) perspectives, psychologists continued to seek the connections between personality and aggression. From Freud (1924a), who suggests our adult personality is attributed to our childhood experiences, to Adler (1959), who offers that social interests are the primary source of motivation, it has been argued that aggression is simply part of the human psyche; a psyche developed from birth. Conversely, Eysenck (1967) suggests that humans are predisposed to certain personality temperaments based on genetics and not childhood experiences. In other words, a person's personality is based on biology.

Research conducted by Book et al. (2012) measured personality against adolescent bullying while controlling for aggression and found a negative correlation with agreeableness, conscientiousness, and emotionality and a significant correlation between bullying and callous-unemotional personality traits. This would suggest that personality can contribute to bullying. Similarly, Salmivalli et al.'s. (1999) research illustrated how low self-esteem could induce aggression and violence leading to bullying.

The Balance of Power

Considering all factors that allow bullying to manifest, the balance of power or, more precisely, the imbalance of power in favor of the bully is a crucial ingredient (Volk et al., 2014). When one feels power and dominance over another and seeks to fulfill the

need for control, bullying can occur (Olweus, 1995; Olweus, 2002). Power and dominance exist beyond the physical realm, however. The National Center for Education Statistics (NCES) and Bureau of Justice Statistics (2020) reported that only 5% of students in the United States reported bullying in the form of physical violence, and only 4% reported being physically threatened. An imbalance of power may also exist socially where one child is more popular than another. This imbalance of social status allows the bully to recruit others to their cause. The National Center for Education Statistics also found that more than 15% of victims reported being bullied online or via text messages. Cyberbullying is more a result of social status than physical dominance (Wegge et al., 2016). Further, Varela et al. (2020) found a relationship between bullying and socioeconomic status among 2,000 Chilian school children where the poor suffered at the hands of the financially fortunate.

Bullying and the Bystander

Until recently, much research has been conducted on bullying focusing on the bully. However, psychologists have recognized there are up to four main actors in a bullying episode. These include the bully or bullies, the victim, a bystander or group of bystanders who witness the event, and a bystander of a group of bystanders who witness the event and intervene on behalf of the victim (Pozzoli & Gini, 2013). I will call those that intervene, upstanders.

What makes the social problem of bullying so challenging to address, especially in middle school, is that these actors can take on multiple roles on any given day, starting as the bully, then becoming the victim, and then a bystander (Paull et al., 2012). This

change in roles is challenging to psychologists as they try to pinpoint patterns of behavior. During research completed by Hawkins et al. (2001), the group found that bystanders were present more than 88% of the time during a bullying episode. However, less than 20% of the time did a bystander intervene. But, when they did, the intervention was aggressive and stopped the bullying more than 50% of the time.

The research has identified the many different factors that precipitate helping behavior by a bystander during a bullying episode. While each research team has identified various aspects related to this behavior, they all acknowledged that the root of the helping behavior was difficult to pinpoint as it seems the presence of multiple factors such as empathy (Cappadocia et al., 2012), character traits (Garcia-Vazquez et al., 2020), personal feelings and a sense of responsibility (Forsberg et al., 2018), the feeling of empowerment to intervene (Johnston et al., 2018), social norms (Pozzoli & Gini, 2013) and others may be necessary for helping behavior to be present among all students. That is to say, not one factor was responsible for facilitating a shared sense of prosocial behavior but many different attributes.

Focusing on the effects of empathy during bullying, Cappadocia et al. (2012) studied bystander experiences during episodes of bullying that occurred at a summer camp in Ontario, Canada. The cohort was represented by 44 girls and 64 boys with a mean age of 12. They deployed the use of the Promoting Relationships and Eliminating Violence Network survey focusing on the sections that discuss bystander intervention. They also used the Empathetic Responsiveness Questionnaire used to measure empathy. When asked whether the child intervened during the last bullying episode they witnessed,

80% said they did in a self-report connecting a higher degree of empathy with a higher degree of intervention. This is similar to what Schlieper (2012) suspected as he researched older collegiate students. Schlieper conducted a study at the University of New Hampshire measuring the prevalence of bullying within a cohort of more than 300 male and female students and found that women were more than twice as likely to be bullied than men but were more likely to intervene on behalf of the victim. It suspected but not confirmed that women may have greater empathy for their female counterparts than males did for theirs, accounting for the higher incidence of helping behavior.

Empathy and other character traits found in upstanders during a bullying episode also piqued the interest of Garcia-Vazquez et al. (2020), who focused on understanding whether character strengths, including happiness, gratitude, and forgiveness, had a relationship with prosocial behavior specifically as it relates to bystanders intervening on behalf of a bullying victim. The research team surveyed 500 early adolescents and 500 middle adolescents across 28 public schools in Senora, Mexico. The team used well-known scales to measure happiness, gratitude, forgiveness, and prosocial behavior and found that happiness, gratitude, and forgiveness did have a positive and direct relationship with prosocial behavior positively affecting intervention. And interestingly, that prosocial behavior had a reciprocal relationship and positive effect on a student's happiness. While also focusing on prosocial behavior, Iotti et al. (2020) surveyed 508 Swiss students inclusive of Grades 5 through 8 to determine whether and to what extent the relationship between teacher and student promoted prosocial behavior by a bystander during a bullying episode. The research team deployed the Koomena and Jellesma (2015)

self-reporting scale used to measure the student's perception of their relationship with their teacher. They also deployed the use of the Motivation to Defend Scale (Jungert et al., 2016) used to assess the motivation by the student to defend another, dividing the assessed values into four separate and distinct subcategories including intrinsic, extrinsic, identified, and introjected motivation. The research team concluded that the greater the closeness between the student and teacher, the greater the likelihood that defending behavior would be present during a bullying episode. They noted that the more willing the student was to establish a close relationship with the teacher, the more likely they were to develop a close relationship with others allowing for a greater degree of prosocial behavior.

Seeking to understand how a sense of responsibility contributed to helping behavior and ultimately bullying intervention, Forsberg et al. (2018) focused on how students articulated the factors that were present when considering whether to help a victim during a bullying episode. Their research uncovered five broad factors: informed awareness, situational seriousness, personal feelings, bystander expectations, and a sense of responsibility. This work confirmed the research done by Darley and Latane (1968), who sought a better understanding of bystander intervention or lack thereof during a time when help was clearly needed. In their classic experiment, Darley and Latane used college students at New York University and put them in a circumstance where an emergency involving another student was apparent. Their findings led to the creation of their model of bystander intervention, which included acknowledging a sense of responsibility before help was given. This led other researchers such as Trach and Hymel

(2020) to research the possible connection between a student's affect toward bullying and its prediction with helping behavior. They queried 2,513 Canadian students from Grades 4 through 7, asking them to recall a bullying incident they witnessed. Students were asked about their relationship with both the victim and the bully, how they felt as they witnessed the event, and whether they responded, and in what manner. Researchers found that the more the bystander liked the victim, the more likely it was for them to intervene.

Further, the intervention itself was more aggressive if they did not like the bully. Bystander anger was a predictor of helping behavior where students were 5 times more likely to intervene if they felt anger during the incident. Their findings led to the acknowledgment that antibullying programs should account for how friendship leads to the natural propensity of intervention.

Pozzoli and Gini (2013) also employed Darley and Latane's (1968) model of bystander intervention to help explain helping behavior in children during a bullying episode. They sought further understanding regarding the active and passive nature of this behavior using three stages of the model of bystander intervention, including attitudes, personal responsibility, and specific coping tactics in addition to the roles of parents and peers. Their research concluded that parents and peers had a profound impact on the nature of helping behavior and its positive effect. However, Pozzoli and Gini found significant variation when testing for active (intervention) verse passive bystander behavior, concluding the coping strategies, attitudes toward bullying, and personal responsibility needed to facilitate helping behavior can be negatively affected by other variables including but not limited to social norms, and parental and peer pressure.

Although they felt their research had advanced the identification of bystander verse upstanders characteristics, they concluded that additional research is needed to understand better the complex combination of relationships, personal characteristics, individual behavior, and other variables that may affect helping behavior.

Understanding the effects of the balance of power during bullying seems to be another common theme among many researchers. Polanin et al. (2012) conducted a meta-analysis of several bullying prevention programs that appeared to be effective in increasing bystander intervention. Evidence from over 12 school programs covering over 12,000 students was reviewed. They found that when bullying occurs, a peer is there to witness the event more than 80 % of the time. However, when peers are present, only 20% of bystanders become upstanders. They did, however, note the research conducted by Hawkins et al. (2001), who conducted research on students in elementary school using naturalistic observations on school playgrounds. They witnessed both bullying and peer intervention and found that when intervention was directed toward the bully, it was more aggressive than when directed toward the victim, altering the balance of power in favor of the victim. Additionally, they found that when interventions occurred, the bullying stopped nearly 60% of the time. Similarly, the research conducted by Nelson et al. (2018) on the perceptions of bullying by preadolescent children identified several factors that led to an imbalance of power such as social exclusion or helped prevent it, such as friendship and support from peers and adults. Finding a similar theme, Gimenez-Gualdo et al.'s (2018) research on student and teacher perception on cyberbullying concluded that the imbalance of power was mostly to blame and noted that the enjoyment of the aggressor

was also a factor. They found that when both peer and teacher intervention was present, especially simultaneously, bullying diminished.

And what of existing antibullying programs and those still being created? During the meta-analysis research conducted by Polanin et al. (2012), the team found that only 25% of existing programs effectively helped reduce bullying incidences. That statistic motivated researchers such a Midgett et al. (2015), who crafted the stealing the show, turning it over, accompanying others, and coaching compassion model (STAC) bystander intervention program used in schools today, and Shriberg et al. (2015), who deployed the use of the Participatory Action Research methodology to include different stakeholders comprised of students, staff, and administration. Shriberg et al.'s multiyear study was designed to actively include research participants in an attempt to help craft an antibullying program. They found that the top-down approach did not help to stem bullying from occurring, while the bottom-up approach helped uncover certain factors necessary for creating a successful antibullying program. Contradicting this, however, was research conducted by Johnston et al. (2018) studied an older high school student body population to evaluate the effectiveness of a STAC bystander intervention program (Midgett et al., 2015) that was used during the student's middle school years. The STAC program was developed by psychologists and not by the school facility and the student body. Johnston et al. found that bullying prevention awareness increased 54% to 63% for those who participated in the STAC education. Interestingly, they found an increased awareness and empowerment to intervene, but also an increased awareness of the fear connected with peer intervention.

In summary, those who have researched the actions of bystanders have identified many different factors that are present illuminating why some bystanders intervene during a bullying episode. While each research offers insights into the other variables, all fall short of giving a comprehensive rationale that encompasses all factors necessary to manifest prosocial behavior related to the proactive intervention during a bullying episode. This alone provides validity to the need for additional research.

Summary and Conclusions

Most researchers have a clear understanding of why bullying occurs. An imbalance of power (Volk et al., 2014) combined with the aggressive nature of the bully (Ross & Horner, 2009) are common themes. One theme, however, has emerged from the literature standing out among the rest. Psychologists simply do not know precisely why some bystanders intervene on behalf of a bullying victim while others do not. Many researchers (Gimenex-Gualdo et al., 2018; Pozzoli & Gini, 2013; Shriberg et al., 2015) have admitted that although they felt their research had advanced the identification of bystander versus upstanders characteristics, they concluded that additional research is needed to understand better the complex combination of relationships, personal characteristics, individual behavior, and other variables that may affect helping behavior.

The present study delved deeper into the bystander's thoughts, feelings, and lived experiences through conversation, leading to a more profound meaning through shared understanding (Burkholder et al., 2016).

In Chapter 3, I will discuss the reasons behind the use of a phenomenological qualitative method that includes a semi-structured interview, the role of the researcher,

the research methodology including participant selection, i.e., procedures for recruitment and identification, and the instrument used to collect the data. Additionally, data analysis with be reviewed, including a synopsis on data credibility, validity, dependability, confirmability, and transferability. Finally, ethical considerations will be fully presented.

Chapter 3: Research Method

School-age bullying continues to be a prevalent social problem. In 2019, approximately 13% of all school children in the United States were victimized by a peer, which accounts for 1 in every 7 students within the U.S. school system in rural and urban settings (National Center for Education Statistics and Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2020). This form of aggression can have both short-term and lasting effects on the victims, where students may immediately experience social stress, anxiety, and self-harm, with some resorting to suicide. Some will also suffer from trust issues into adulthood, affecting their adult relationships (CDC, 2018). The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the lived experiences of bystanders who intervene (i.e., upstanders) on behalf of a bullying victim and those of bystanders who do not intervene.

In this chapter, I describe the research design, explain the rationale behind it, discuss the role of the researcher and the methodology, and identify the overall cohort and the criteria for participant selection. The chapter also includes a description of the instrument and method for data collection and how data were analyzed. Finally, the methods used to establish data trustworthiness are provided to ensure that readers can have confidence in the findings (see Ravich & Carl, 2016).

Research Design and Rationale

I designed this study to answer the following research question: What are the lived experiences of a bystander or upstander during a bullying episode? I employed a phenomenological qualitative design and conducted semistructured interviews to understand the participants' lived experiences during a bullying episode. This method

allowed me to derive common themes that, when incorporated, created the essence of the cohort's shared experiences. I was not an independent observer in a white lab coat conducting an experiment because in qualitative research, self-reflection about one's attitude and position, and role in society or the researcher's positionality is vital (see Ravitch et al., 2016).

Bystander intervention was first researched by Darley and Latané (1968) following a famous event in which bystanders failed to help a woman in grave danger. Their subsequent research gave rise to the model of bystander intervention in which five attributes necessary to facilitate bystander intervention on behalf of a victim were identified. While many researchers (e.g., Polanin et al., 2012; Pozzoli & Gini, 2013; Shriberg et al., 2015) have studied prosocial helping behavior to better understand which characteristics are present in facilitating helping behavior, research thus far specific to bullying among school-age children has failed to help identify all the factors and characteristics necessary to understand what prompts the helping behaviors of bystanders who help (i.e., upstanders) versus those who do not during a bullying episode.

When seeking to understand the experiences of others, social psychologists have relied on the qualitative method to extract information from research participants (Burkholder et al., 2016). Seeking a better understanding of the ecosystem of a school environment, I immersed into the environment of a bullying episode, taking on a constructivism perspective. This was important because it is through this interaction that deeper meaning was discovered as the and participants and I cocreated findings through interactive conversation (see Burkholder et al., 2016). When exploring the lived

experiences of both the upstander and bystander, the empath-altruism and cost-reward theories (Hogg & Cooper, 2007) emerged as central themes helping to explain motivation and behavior.

Role of the Researcher

Ravitch and Carl (2016) contended that in a qualitative study, because the researcher is the primary instrument, a great degree of consideration for the researcher's role must be inherent to the overall research design. Furthermore, they suggested that because social identity, positionality, beliefs, assumptions, ideologies, and bias are vital components to a researcher's identity, the role of the researcher must be well thought out during each stage of the study. Because I was a central aspect of this study, an assessment or reflexivity of my identity, subjectiveness, positionality, and bias was necessary for ongoing and active awareness of how I might influence the research, especially in the construction and interpretation of the process (see Anderson, 2008).Just as the naturalistic researcher uses ordinary conversation when conducting in-depth interviews, for this research I was also a participant observer because this is a natural extension of the naturalistic approach. This allowed me to record what was both heard and seen and use this data in the analysis process to identify patterns of behavior (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012). More specifically, the role of the researcher was that of a student seeking more information on what it is like to be an upstander during a bullying episode. This approach worked well, especially because the participants were also students, and it put me and the participants on an equal footing (see Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Furthermore, this type of relationship enhanced trust between me and the participants, allowing for responsive

interviewing. In this way, I worked together with the participants to delve deeper into the research question during transparent conversation. I did not have any professional or personal relationships with the participants to eliminate any potential power differentials.

Methodology

Participant Selection Logic

The research cohort consisted of 10 participants aged 18 to 20 years old who had recently graduated high school. The cohort consisted of both male and female participants, of which all self-identified as bystanders and upstanders (using the definitions found in Chapter 1), as captured in an intake form. I selected this sampling frame was selected because it has been long understood that the adolescent brain continues to develop well into the 20s (see Johnson et al., 2009). This development includes emotional intelligence, as defined by Mayer et al. (2004), within their model of emotional intelligence. I, therefore, assumed that participants in this cohort would be able to process their own emotions and those of others and translate that into thought and actions more accurately.

While there is no set rule for determining sample size in qualitative research (Ravitch & Carl, 2016) and because the goal of qualitative research and sampling is not to generalize but rather to achieve an understanding of multiple individual perspectives, (i.e., lived experiences), I sought to interview five to six bystanders and five to six upstanders, for a total of 10 to 12 participants to achieve the intended result. Although it was difficult to say whether saturation would have been achieved given the sample size simply because the nature of individual perception during a bullying episode can differ

greatly among students given the multitude of attitudes related to bullying (see Frisén et al., 2007), I felt that after 10 interviews saturation was attained.

Instrumentation

In this study, I conducted a semistructured interview with each participant and asked them seven to 15 open-ended questions meant to facilitate a responsive interview taking on a conversational approach. I developed this set of questions based on existing research meant to establish the attitudes and emotions of others during this phenomenon. The audio portion of the interview was recorded with the participants' permission and transcribed using transcription software. I reviewed each transcription to ensure the participant's responses were transcribed accurately.

Researcher-Developed Instrument

Taking an interpretive constructionism approach is vital to gathering an understanding of how people perceive and interpret the world around them (Rubin & Rubin, 2012). Because individuals look at the world through their lens, it is essential to construct the question set in a way that solicits responses in a conversational form, allowing for the free flow of ideas. Furthermore, asking questions that enable the participant to discuss their experiences cognitively and emotionally will allow for a more in-depth conversation (Saldaña, 2016).

To ensure validity or trustworthiness within the content of the question set, it must address the experiences of the participant when witnessing a bullying event so that the research question aligns with the interview questions (see Ravich & Carl, 2016). I asked the participants to describe the events and the circumstances surrounding the bullying

even as well as asked them to explain how they knew someone was being bullied and what they felt at the time (i.e., anger, sadness, sympathy, etc.). In the end, the interview questions helped the participant recreate the events in their minds and articulate it to me.

Procedures for Pilot

This research included a pilot study including two participants between the ages of 18 and 20 years old. I solicited my friends to find willing participants for the pilot that may have been known or unknown to me. In this case, both participants were known to me. I interviewed the pilot participants using the question set in Appendix A, allowing me to address the efficacy of the interview questions and change, add, or edit as appropriate.

Procedures for Recruitment, Participation, and Data Collection

I used social media to solicit research participants (see Appendix C). Specifically, I posted on different Facebook group pages, such as antibullying organizations seeking those who self-report as a bystander and/or an upstander. In addition to asking for volunteers who have witnessed bullying both as a bystander and an upstander, I suggested those victimized by bullying ask those that intervened on their behalf to volunteer as a participant. Thus, snowball sampling was used to recruit more participants. While an equal number of upstanders and bystanders would have been ideal, it was not required because this study did not compare upstanders to bystanders but simply recorded the lived experiences of each.

I asked potential participants to contact me via Researchandme.com or my direct email address. Upon connecting with each interested potential participant, I described the

study, the method for collecting data, and the process for a participant to exit the study. If the individual wished to participate, they scheduled their interview to be held either on a secure virtual meeting via Zoom or a phone call. During this meeting, after obtaining consent in either writing or via an audio or video recording, I interviewed the participant for up to 1 hour and recorded the audio portion of the session. These recordings reside solely on the hard drive of my computer. The questions were also recorded for coding within a spreadsheet, again that is stored only on my hard drive. I offered each participant the opportunity to obtain a summary of the results at the same social media site where the recruitment took place after the study was completed. Otherwise, the initial interview was the only time I engaged with the participants. If at any time a participant wished to exit the study, I would have inquired about and recorded the reason, removed the participant's answers from the coding process, and deleted the participant's recorded interview. However, each participant completed the entire interview session.

Data Analysis Plan

Upon the completion of each interview, I created a transcript of the conversation using Adobe Premier transcription software. Affective coding was then used to look for patterns and themes in the participant's interview responses (see Saldaña, 2016), helping to translate the data (Vogt et al., 2014). This method helped to identify a participant's values, emotions, possible conflicts, etc. that created a more subject human experience. Certain words and themes that were more salient than others had a more significant impact on the interpretation. I looked for similarities, differences, sequencing, frequency, correspondence, and causation in each interview.

Using the MAXQDA coding software, published by Verbi, Inc, I extended the analytic work from the initial coding by using the axial coding method. Axial coding is used to identify how categories and subcategories relate to one another by describing both the category's property and its dimensions (Saldaña, 2016). In this way, I was able to connect the interactions, conditions, contexts, and consequences surrounding a process, in this case, a bullying episode.

Issues of Trustworthiness

For a study to be considered valid or trustworthy, it must be credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable (Guba, 1981). To address credibility, I ensured that the meaningful inferences gathered from the question set were measuring what they were designed to measure (see Ravitch & Carl, 2016). To that end, the overall research and question set was designed to extrapolate the lived experiences of a participant during a bullying episode. Furthermore, it was necessary to continue to be reflective throughout the process.

The method of uncovering the lived experience of another lends to the study's transferability (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). A qualitative study is not meant to produce findings that can be transferred to other settings; instead, the method of arriving at the data can help other researchers replicate the design based upon the descriptive statements uncovered in relation to the context of bullying (see Guba, 1981). To this end, I kept detailed records of the context to allow future researchers to replicate the process.

Ensuring the research design and data collection methods are consistent throughout the research process will lend to the dependability or stability of the data

(Guba, 1981). In a sense, dependability and credibility have similar requirements in that each seeks to validate that the data being captured are answering the research questions (Ravich & Carl, 2016). For example, if I sought the lived experience of the participant, having the bystander participant offering their perception of how the victim felt would not be consistent with dependable data. As such, the question set was precisely targeted to the lived experience of the participant.

Finally, to achieve confirmability, researchers must consider their own biases, especially as they begin to interpret the data (Ravich & Carl, 2016). Because qualitative research is subjective, confirmable data must be relatively neutral and free from acknowledged researcher bias (Guba, 1981). Accordingly, I remained cognizant of my own bias due to my personal experience as a parent of a bullied child. To remain neutral, I asked probing question such as, "Describe the circumstances when you intervened" and "How did you feel when you intervened?" and did not ask the participant to confirm a feeling I may had had in that moment.

Ethical Procedures

I used social media to recruit participants and asked them to contact me directly via my Walden University email or through Researchandme.com. Each participant was provided with a written informed consent document that included the Institutional Review Board number 01-28-22-0854676 and were allowed to ask questions before the interview began.

Because some participants may have been traumatized by the event, I offered several avenues for professional consultation by providing the phone numbers of national

hotlines and directing participants to community health centers in their area. All data collected will remain anonymous and will only be stored on my hard drive. This hard drive is password protected and only accessible to me. Furthermore, all data will be erased and/or destroyed upon the conclusion of the study.

I did not have a professional or personal relationship with any participant, eliminating any potential power differential. However, because I was older than the participants and a Ph.D. candidate, it was essential to approach the participant as a fellow student to avoid a power differential.

Summary

Describing and exploring the lived experience of another requires a qualitative study to allowing the researcher to draw out the experience of the participant through conversation. Furthermore, the use of the phenomenological approach allows the researcher to uncover common themes while cocreating findings with the participant (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). Because trust is an important element to establish transparency, I took on the role of a student-researcher gathering data during 1-hour, semistructured interviews with participants recruited through social media. I recorded and transcribed the sessions and analyzed the resulted data using affective coding. This research design helped to ensure the study was credible, transferable, dependable, and confirmable (see Guba, 1981). Finally, I took all necessary precautions to ensure the confidentiality of the participant and their mental well-being.

In Chapter 4, I will discuss the pilot study, the research setting, participant's demographics, the data collection and data analysis processes, the evidence of trustworthiness, and the study's results.

Chapter 4: Results

School-age bullying continues to be a significant social problem in the United States. In 2019, it was reported that 1 in every 7 students in the United States was bullied throughout the school year (National Center for Education Statistics and Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2020). This has lasting effects on the victim in both the short and long term and may include social stress, anxiety, and self-harm, with some resorting to suicide (CDC, 2018). The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the lived experiences of bystanders who intervene (i.e., upstanders) on behalf of a bullying victim and those of bystanders who do not intervene.

In this chapter, I describe the pilot study, the official research setting and how personal conditions may have influenced results interpretation (if any), the demographics of the research cohort, the data collection and data analysis processes, the evidence of trustworthiness, and the results including textural-structural descriptions for each theme giving the reader greater insight into the lived experiences of the participants as they recalled salient events associated with bullying.

Pilot Study

Prior to conducting actual research, researchers use piloting to help identify areas of possible refinement that could include the design of the study itself and/or instruments used to collect and analyze data (Ravitch & Carl, 2016). For qualitative studies, a pilot is critically important to ensure the interview questions and the flow and approach of the interview align with gathering the information pertinent to the research question

(Sampson, 2004). This small-scale version of the research gives researchers vital information needed to increase the efficacy of the larger effort (Polit et al., 2001).

For this study, I approached the pilot interviews in the same manner as would be expected during the actual research. Two pilot participants were interviewed separately, each known to me but not known to the other. Both were 19-year-old male college students. Each conversation was hosted on Zoom, lasted approximately 40 minutes, and was audio recorded . After the interviews were completed, the participants and I discussed the flow of the conversation and whether the questions captured the essence of the research question. Each participant felt the question set was appropriate and the flow of the conversation was easy and natural. As such, no changes were made to the question set or flow of the interview.

I used Adobe Premiere to convert the audio-recorded speech to text and then listened to the audio recording while reading the created text. There were a few inconsistencies in the translation from speech to text, so I made edits to the text ensuring the written text accurately reflected the participants' spoken words. This process was carried forward to into the official research design. I imported the text into MAXQDA for coding. The MAXDQA program operated as designed, indicating there was no need to change the coding tool or data analysis strategy.

Setting

The participants of the study were unknown to me at the time of their volunteering to participate in the study and did not work for the same company or attend the same school as me. Additionally, during the interviews each participant was in a

private, physical space allowing for confidentiality during the session. As such, there were no organizational conditions that would have influenced the participants or the results of the interviews. Any personal conditions that may have influenced the participants were not evident or disclosed to me. However, I did convey to the participant that they could stop at any time if the conversation became too uncomfortable. Each participant completed the interview in its entirety.

Demographics

The participant cohort consisted of 10 individuals aged 18 to 20 years old, including six males and four females. No participants identified as anything other than male or female. The ages, gender, current education enrollment status, and the bystander/upstander self-identification of the participants are listed in Table 1.

Table 1

Participant Characteristics: Age, Gender, Current Education, Identifies as Bystander/Upstander

Participant	Age	Gender	Current Education	Identified as Bystander/Upstander
#1	20	Male	College	Both
#2	19	Male	College	Both
#3	18	Male	College	Both
#4	20	Male	College	Both
#5	19	Male	College	Both
#6	19	Female	College	Both
#7	20	Male	College	Both
#8	19	Female	College	Both
#9	18	Female	College	Both
#10	20	Female	College	Both

All participants indicated they were high school graduates, and each was currently enrolled in a higher education institution. Participants were located across the United States on both the east and west coast and in the central states. I did not use geographic location as a criterion for participation. While I did not ask for race identification, 2 of the 10 participants self-reported as Black. Additionally, each participant identified as both a bystander and an upstander (i.e., one who intervenes on behalf of a victim) during a bullying event.

Data Collection

I interviewed 10 participants in total, with eight of the 10 interviews taking place on a Zoom video call and the remaining two via phone. Of those interviewed via Zoom, five were on camera and three were off camera. I audio recorded the interviews, including those that were on camera using the built-in recording software on my laptop. The Zoom recording function was not used. The interviews lasted between 20 and 45 minutes in length.

Once an interview was completed, I loaded the audio file into Adobe Premier and transcribed the speech into text. Once this process was complete, the data were exported to Microsoft Excel, and I listened to the audio recording while reading along with the text. I did at times have to edit the text to ensure the transcription was an exact representation of the audio file. After transcription was completed, all 10 Excel files were uploaded into MAXQDA software for coding. The data collection methodology aligned with the plan presented in Chapter 3. Additionally, there we no unusual circumstances encountered in data collection.

Data Analysis

Data analysis began when I reviewed the audio recordings of the interviews while reading the transcribed text to ensure accuracy in transcription. During this process, as I relived the interview and focused on the content, certain words and phrases began to stand out and repeat themselves during similar questions asked of all 10 participants. The review of the voice and transcription together created a heightened awareness of the

participants' responses, a welcomed yet unexpected benefit of the exercise. I began to note the coded words and phrases for each participant during this process.

After all transcriptions were checked and edited (as necessary) for accuracy, I assimilated all transcriptions into one spreadsheet and uploaded the file into MAXQDA coding software for further analysis. Using the software, coded words and phrases were organized by categories that were also driven by the question set. These categories and their respective codes formed notable themes.

As codes, such as morally wrong, anger, and empathy, were captured, categories, such as participants attitudes toward bullying and upstander's feelings during a bullying event, gave way to themes. Bullying was perceived as fundamentally wrong. Upstanders had significant empathy for the victim and anger toward the bully during an event. When participants were asked about their attitudes toward bullying; they described the characteristics of victims, bystanders, and upstanders; and their respective feelings. Of all the participants, only Participant #7 recalled events outside of a school setting, including one at a bus stop and one during an afterschool sporting event. All participants, however, recalled events specific to school-age children. The participants were also asked about their own feelings as they acted in the role of a bystander and upstander and were asked to identify those feelings relevant to the motivation behind intervening on behalf of the victim. Here, codes, such as sympathy, empathy, anger, disgust, and responsibility, created the category of motivations to intervene. This, in turn, led to the theme of empathy and anger when combined with moral clarity, responsibility, and courage facilitates action. Because each participant self-identified as being in both roles (i.e., a

bystander who does not intervene during a bullying event and one who did [during separate events]), they were all able to express their feelings during multiple bullying events in which they were either solely a bystander or a bystander who intervened (i.e., an upstander). Overall, the categories could be seen as the personal attitudes, characteristics, and feelings of those in different roles during a bullying event, specifically a victim, bystander, and upstander, and the motivations leading to intervention. Upon the 10th interview, I felt that saturation was achieved because codes, categories, and themes repeated themselves. I did not find any evidence of discrepant cases.

Evidence of Trustworthiness

Guba (1981) stated that credibility, transferability, dependability, and confirmability are necessary components for any study to be deemed valid or trustworthy. To address credibility, I ensured that the inferences collected from the questions were measuring the lived experiences of the participants when present during a bullying episode. This confirmation began as feedback was gathered from pilot participants. Pilot participants felt that the question set was truly measuring their particular lived experiences. As I continued to interview each of the current study participants, it was evident that each question asked helped to bring past events forward into the minds of the participant, allowing them to relive and retell such experiences. This allowed participants to remember significant details and offer insight into what it was like for each to live through a bullying episode

A qualitative study is not meant to generate results that can be transferred to other settings; rather, the process of arriving at the data can help other researchers reproduce the design based upon the descriptive statements uncovered in relation to the context of bullying (Guba, 1981). To ensure transferability, I kept detailed records of the context of the research design and process so that future researchers could replicate the process.

Dependability is obtained when the research design and data collection methods are consistent throughout the research process (Guba, 1981). To ensure dependability, the question set was precisely targeted to the lived experiences of the participants, and I approached each interview in the same manner using the question set to guide the conversation.

Due to the subjective nature of this study, when interpreting the data, I remained neutral and I acknowledged my own bias to achieve confirmability (see Ravich & Carl, 2016). I organized the codes to form categories and eventually themes. As certain words and phrases repeated themselves, these categories and themes came into focus quite organically.

Results

RQ: What are the Lived Experiences of a Bystander or Upstander During a Bullying Episode?

The goal of this study was to answer the research question. To achieve this, I interviewed 10 participants using a specific question set designed to bring these experiences back into the forefront of participants' minds, allowing them to recall and retell the circumstances of each event and their feelings and attitudes at that time. During

follow-up questions, each participant was asked to expound on their feelings to bring additional clarity to their lived experiences. Because of the relatively close proximity of the participant age to the recalled events, participants were able to recall salient points and provide sufficient detail that allowed me to get a firm understanding of their experiences. When I asked each participant if they could recall the specific details around a bullying event, each responded with a "yes." One participant said with "I remember a time at a bus station when…" before describing how they lived through the bullying event. Most of the participants made comments such as "I felt…" when describing the events. Furthermore, each participant identified as both a bystander and upstander, recalling each perspective during separate bullying episodes. After the audio recordings were transcribed using Adobe Premier, analyzed for accuracy, and uploaded to MAXQDA for coding, I identified a total of 54 codes ultimately leading to eight distinct themes.

Textural Themes

Theme 1: Bullying is Perceived as Fundamentally Wrong

Participants felt bullying was fundamentally wrong. For example, Participant #1 suggested bullying was "cruel," that it "lowers self-esteem of the victim," and was "degrading." Participant #10 said bullying was "morally wrong, unethical, and makes me angry," while Participant #6 felt bullying "can lead to depression." All participants indicated they believed that bullying was "emotionally harmful to the victim."

Theme 2: Victims are Perceived to be Introverted to the Extent That are Deemed Different and Weak

When asked about the characteristics or traits of victims, Participant #3 felt victims were “introverted,” while Participants #4, #5, #6, and #10 perceived them to be “insecure.” Participants #4 and #5 used the word “vulnerable,” and Participants #3 and #5 thought victims were “perceived to be weak.” Participant #1 thought victims were “shy,” while Participants #8 and #9 felt victims were also “timid.” Participant #2 thought the victim “has low self-esteem,” and Participant #10 thought victims may be an “outlier from bully/bullying group.” In this regard, participants felt that bullies choose their victims based on a perceived weakness.

Theme 3: Victims Feel Powerless to Stand Up for Themselves

When participants were asked about their perception of how a victim feels about bullying, they felt the victim was unwilling and/or unable to stand up for themselves. Participant #2 thought victims were “fearful” and “traumatized” by the event, and Participant #4 felt the victims was “confused.” Participant #10 felt victims were “sad,” while Participant #2 suggested victims felt they could “not ask for help.”

Theme 4: Even Though a Bystander may be Sympathetic or Empathetic, They Feel Powerless to Intervene

When participants were asked to describe their perception of a bystander’s characteristics or traits, Participant #8 thought victims were a “timid” type. Participants #3, #8, #9, #10, thought bystanders were “sympathetic,” while Participants #1 and #9 felt bystanders could also be “empathetic.” Participant #3 suggested bystanders may even

have a “lack of empathy” for others offing insight into what was lacking for intervention. Participant #7 described a bystander as someone who was “powerless” to help.

Theme 5: Even Though a Bystander may Want to Help, They Simply do not Out of Fear for Their Own Safety

Participants were asked to describe their feelings during a bullying event. There was a myriad of responses during this line of questioning as some felt the bystander may not have the capacity to intervene perhaps lacked the courage to do so. Participants #8, #9, #10 suggested bystanders were feeling “sympathy” for the victim during the event while Participants #1 and #9 suggested they were also feeling “empathy.” Participants #2, #3, #4, #9, and #10 thought bystanders felt “anger” toward the bully while Participant #4 thought bystanders could also be “confused” during the event. Participants #3 and #9 felt that a bystander does “want to help” while Participant #4 suggested they were feeling “frustrated” that no one was helping. Participant #3 thought bystanders felt “helpless” and Participants #1, #8, #9, and #10 thought bystanders were “afraid” feeling fear. Participant #5 noted that bystanders may feel “conflict avoidance” while Participants #1 and #2 said bystanders had “fear of consequences” for intervening. Even when they may have completed the journey through the model of bystander intervention (Latané & Darley, 1970), the overarching reason for inaction was fear for their own safety. For example, when asked what prevented action during a particular time in which a participant was a bystander only, Participant #2 replied, “fear that they would intervene and also be bullied in the process.”

Theme 6: Upstanders Have a Sense of Responsibility to Help Others and the Courageous Fortitude to Invoke Intervention

When asked to describe their perception of an upstander’s characteristics or traits, Participant #9 suggested upstanders “know what's right and wrong” and a Participant #4 offered upstanders have a “sense of justice.” Participant #2 thought upstanders “feel responsible to help others” while Participant #8 thought upstanders exhibited “courageous” traits. Overall, participants felt that upstanders had the character traits necessary to intervene.

Theme 7: Upstanders Have Significant Empathy for the Victim and Anger Toward the Bully During an Event

When asked to describe their feelings during an episode in which they intervened on behalf of a victim, the feelings of empathy and anger were the two emotions deemed most salient by each participant especially in the moments just before intervention. For example, when asked what the most important feelings felt as an upstander was, Participant #3 responded, “sympathy and empathy.” while Participant #6 said, “I felt bad…and to some extent also got angry about the person who was bullying the other one.”

Theme 8: Empathy and Anger When Combined With Moral Clarity and Courage Facilitates Intervention

During each conversation the researcher asked the participant to describe what they were feeling just prior to intervention i.e., in that moment when they went from bystander to upstander. Empathy and anger were the two feelings felt by all that had

intervened on behalf of the victim. When these feelings were present and the participant successfully navigated through the model of bystander intervention (Latané & Darley, 1970), intervention was imminent.

Table 2 illustrates the codes that were captured that led to both categories and themes.

Table 2

Codes, Categories, and Themes

Codes	Categories	Themes
Unethical, morally wrong, cruel, lowers self-esteem of the victim, can lead to depression, degrading, makes me angry	Participants Attitudes toward Bullying	Bullying is perceived as fundamentally wrong
Introverted, insecure, vulnerable, perceived to be weak, shy, timid, has low self-esteem, outlier from bully/bullying group	Victim characteristics/traits	Victims are perceived to be introverted to the extent that are deemed different and weak.
Fearful, confused, traumatized, sad, inaction, does not ask for help	Victim's feeling during a bullying event	Victims feel powerless to stand up for themselves
Sympathetic, empathetic, lack of empathy, powerless, helpless	Bystander characteristics/traits	Even though a bystander may be sympathetic or empathetic, they feel powerless to intervene
Sympathy, empathy, anger, confusion, want to help but not sure what to do, sad, frustrated, helpless, afraid conflict avoidance, fear of consequences for intervening,	Bystander's feeling during a bullying event	Even though a bystander may want to help, they simply do not out of fear for their own safety
Have moral clarity and a sense of justice, feel responsible to help others, courageous	Upstander characteristics/traits	Upstanders have a sense of responsibility to help others and the courageous fortitude to invoke intervention
Sympathy, empathy, anger, disgust, helper's felt responsibility, afraid	Upstander's feelings during a bullying event	Upstanders have significant empathy for the victim and anger toward the bully during an event
Sympathy, empathy, anger, disgust, helper's felt responsibility, afraid, had enough, felt the victim was in danger	Motivations to intervene	Empathy and anger when combined with moral clarity and courage facilitates intervention

Summary

Answering the research question, what are the lived experiences of a bystander or upstander during a bullying episode? was accomplished as I used a question set that helped the participant recall their own experiences during bullying events. Each participant was able to recall specific detail surround each event and share their attitudes and feelings at that time. Codes and categories emerged during data analysis providing the researcher with enough information to form distinct themes and capture the true essence of their respective lived experiences.

In Chapter 5 I will discuss the interpretation of the findings, the limits of the study, recommendations resulting from the study, and implications to social change.

Chapter 5: Discussions, Conclusions, and Recommendations

Each year across the United States, millions of students suffer the aftereffects of bullying. Currently, school-age bullying continues to affect 1 in every 7 students, accounting for approximately 13% of all school-age children in the United States (National Center for Education Statistics and Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2020). The CDC (2018) reported both the short- and long-term effects of bullying on a student include social stress, anxiety, self-harm, and suicide. The purpose of this qualitative study was to explore the lived experiences of bystanders who intervene (i.e., upstanders) on behalf of a bullying victim and those of bystanders who do not intervene during a bullying event as well as the nature of characteristics that may reveal bystander and upstander behavior. Understanding this behavior is vital when developing antibullying programs.

In this study, participants discussed their experiences as both a bystander and upstander during bullying episodes, leading to the emergence of distinct themes as each recounted their experiences and their respective feelings during and after the events. Participants' attitudes toward bullying were consistent in that they felt bullying was morally wrong and harmful to the victim. As bystanders, participants experienced a sense of sadness and sympathy for the victim but also felt fear for their own safety preventing them from intervening. When describing the moments when they intervened on behalf of the victim, they described feelings of empathy, moving past sympathy, and an intense anger toward the bully and/or the event itself. Furthermore, during the episode in which the participant was an upstander, each described the circumstances that would indicate

they had completed the journey through the five criteria of the model of bystander intervention as created by Latané and Darley (1970), further validating the model. In this model, Latané and Darley contended that for a bystander to intervene, they must be aware of the event, must recognize it as an emergency, must acquire helper's felt responsibility, must know what to do, and then act. The findings may help social psychologists gain further understanding of the transition from bystander to upstander, aiding in the construction of programs designed to improve intervention strategies.

Interpretation of the Findings

As mentioned, the experiences of the participants, specifically during intervention, validated the model of bystander intervention (see Latané & Darley, 1970), which was used as the theoretical framework of this study. Upstanders were aware the event was bullying, knew the moment constituted an emergency, felt responsible to help, knew what to do, and acted. This does not come as a surprise because Latané and Darley's model has been validated through past research when identifying factors necessary for people to intervene on behalf of someone in need of help (Pozzoli & Gini, 2013). It would, however, endorse the need to craft and deploy a bullying prevention solution that includes the model's basic principles. While these basic principles are necessary, they are only part of the solution.

One of the most interesting findings was that as each participant relived a bullying episode in which they intervened, all cited empathy being present as a bystander, but it was anger, in their opinions, just prior to intervention that specifically motivated them to intervene. There were times when empathy was present, but in the absence of anger,

intervention did not occur. Empathy has been noted in research conducted by Cappadocia et al. (2012), Garcia-Vazquez et al. (2020), and Schlieper (2012) as a feeling held by those that intervened during bullying. Further, Longobardi et al. (2020) found that empathy was actually a motivating factor for facilitating helping and defending behavior. This would also validate Batson et al. (1991) findings regarding the empathy-altruism hypothesis that suggest helping behavior can be driven by feeling empathy for another.

In this study, participants cited anger in the moments just before intervention as a motivating factor facilitating action. It could be considered to be a gating event where a bystander has to be angry enough to intervene. Although Trach and Hymel (2020) suggested a possible connection between anger and intervention, they fell short of explaining it is as a root cause for motivation behind intervention. However, they did note that when anger was present, bystanders were 5 times more likely to intervene. In the current study, I found that it was anger coupled with empathy and the necessary personality traits that moved participants to action even in the face of fear of retribution.

Limitations of the Study

A large limitation of this study was the recruitment of participants due to the narrow nature of the selection criteria of the cohort. Participants were between the ages of 18 and 20 years old who were either a bystander or upstander or both during a bullying event. While finding those that met this criterion seemed difficult, I was able to overcome this challenge using social media and the free service offered by ResearchandMe.com to recruit participants. In this way, I was able to locate willing participants and then use snowballing to find additional participants. Snowball sampling proved to be fruitful.

Another limitation of the study was the interviewing methodology. Although I used a semistructured interview design, the concerns around possible COVID-19 transmission prohibited in-person interviews, so the interviews in this study were conducted using video and voice-only modalities. Only five of the participants took part in a video interview. This limited my ability to connect body language together with voice inflection and diminished the identification of potential clues for the advancement of the conversation. With over 10,000 possible nonverbal clues exchanged during face-to-face conversations (Wood, 2012), it would seem reasonable that clues were missed in audio only and telephone interviews that may have illuminated additional facts.

The question set provided for the study's trustworthiness by accurately addressing the experiences of the participants when witnessing a bullying event. However, while the study uncovered empathy and anger as gating events present during intervention, it did not measure the level of anger or empathy on a scale to determine the levels present when achieving the motivation to intervene. This was a limitation because the results do not provide the insight necessary to address the stimulation of empathy and anger required in an antibullying solution. Studies have not yet shown how much empathy and anger a bystander felt just prior to intervening. Hence, it would be difficult to suggest a solution that would invoke empathy and anger to the extent that they cause the motivation to intervene without knowing to what extent they were necessary.

The theoretical framework for this study was limited insofar as the model of bystander intervention (Latané & Darley, 1970) did not address the feelings of bystanders as part of the motivation to intervene. The empathy-altruism hypothesis (Batson et al.,

1991), which correlates empathy to helping behavior, fell short of offering any insights into the feelings of others outside of empathy as a motivating factor for helping behavior. Neither theory addressed the anger felt by the bystander and neither addressed the personal characteristics existing in those that helped or intervened. In this way, these theories went only part of the way to explaining intervention as it relates to a bullying event.

Recommendations

Social psychologists who have previously researched bullying and bystander intervention, such as Pozzoli & Gini (2013), Shriberg et al. (2015), and Gimenex-Gualdo et al. (2018), concluded that more research was needed to more fully explain the complicated combination of personal characteristics, individual emotions, and other variables present that may affect helping behavior. This study furthered this understanding by uncovering that while empathy was present during intervention, it was that emotion in combination with anger just prior to intervention and courage that led to the intervention itself. Given that empathy and anger were present at the time of intervention in combination with certain personality traits and the successful passage through the five criteria of the model of bystander intervention (see Latané & Darley, 1970), I would recommend that additional research be completed to better understand how (a) the level of empathy and anger present in the upstander during intervention and (b) to what extent the unique combination of empathy, anger, and the necessary character traits, together with the successful completion of the five model of bystander intervention criteria play a role in intervention.

Implications

The positive social change that would be initiated through an effective bullying reduction solution cannot be overstated. With more than 11 million students across the United States negatively impacted by the effects of bullying each year (National Center for Education Statistics and Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2020), reducing bullying even by a small percentage could have a significant positive impact on society because those that suffer from anxiety, physical and emotional pain, self-harm (such as cutting), and death (suicide) would find relief as a result (see CDC, 2018). This relief, however, would also benefit the families of the victims because they too feel the stress and anxiety throughout this experience as they sympathize and empathize for the victim. Even one death saved by a reduction in bullying and the aversion of the potential pain and anguish felt by a parent as a result is worth continuing to research the issue until a valid, effective solution is found and implemented.

Understanding the lived experiences of a bystander as they transition from bystander to upstander during a bullying episode gives social psychologists insights into the emotions, attitudes, characteristics, and motivations present in a bystander during that transition that may be valuable when seeking to craft a solution that diminishes and decreases bullying. These insights may lead to enhancements of existing antibullying programs to increase their efficacy. The insights may also lead to the development of new programs that incorporate these findings in a different way. Understanding the environment that induces intervention may even lead to enhancements in programs that focused on social and emotional learning as they seek to create positive climates in

schools by enhancing the interpersonal skills of students (see Weissberg et al., 2015). All these collective efforts can have a positive impact on this significant social issue.

Conclusion

In this study, I found that there are many variables to consider when attempting to understand the circumstances (i.e., attitudes, emotions, and character traits) present during the act of transitioning from bystander to upstander during a bully episode. Strong emotions of empathy, anger, and courage were felt by participants just prior to intervening. However, intervention did not happen unless it also followed the participant's transition through the five criteria of the model of bystander intervention (see Latané & Darley, 1970).

Simply put, human behavior is not easily predicted given the vast array of circumstances present at any given moment. However, I found several elements present during participants' lived experiences when intervention occurred. Armed with this information, psychologists and practitioners are now closer to being able to formulate impactful solutions that will help more bystanders turn into upstanders and, in turn, bring relief to millions of vulnerable children and their families. These solutions may even save some children from an unnecessary death and prevent their families from experiencing the incredible anguish as a result.

References

Adler, A. (1959). *The practice and theory of individual psychology*. Littlefield Adams.

Anderson, L. (2008). *Reflexivity*. In R. Thorpe & R. Holt (Eds.), *The SAGE dictionary of qualitative management research* (pp. 184–186). Sage.

Anderson, C. A., Bushman, B. J. (2002). Human aggression. *Annual Review of Psychology*, *53*, 27–51.

Bandura, A., Ross, D., Ross, S. A. (1963). Imitation of film-mediated aggressive models. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, *66*, 3–11.

Batson, C. D., Batson, J. G., Slingsby, J. K., Harrell, K. L., Peekna, H. M., & Todd, R. M. (1991). Empathic joy and the empathy-altruism hypothesis. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*(3), 413–426. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.61.3.413

Batson, C. D., van Lange, P., Ahmad, N., & Lishner, A. (2003). *Altruism and helping behavior*. In M. A. Hogg & J. Cooper (Eds.), *Sage handbook of social psychology* (pp. 279-295). Sage.

Berkowitz, L. (1990). On the formation and regulation of anger and aggression. *American Psychologist, 45*, 494–503.

Book, A. S., Volk, A. A., & Hosker, A. (2012). Adolescent bullying and personality: An adaptive approach. *Personality and Individual Differences, 52*(2), 218–223. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.10.028

Broidy, L. M., Nagin, D. S., Tremblay, R. E., Bates, J. E., Brame, B., Dodge, K. A., & Vitaro, F. (2003). Developmental trajectories of childhood disruptive behaviors

and adolescent delinquency: A six-site, cross-national study. *Developmental Psychology, 39,* 222–245. https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.2.222

Burkholder, G. J., Cox, K. A., & Crawford, L. M. (2016). *The scholar-practitioner's guide to research design*. Laureate Publishing

Campbell, S. B., Spieker, S., Burchinal, M., Poe, M. D., & NICHD Early Child Care Research Network. (2006). Trajectories of aggression from toddlerhood to age 9 predict academic and social functioning through age 12. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 47*(8), 791-800.

Cappadocia, M. C., Pepler, D., Cummings, J. G., & Craig, W. (2012). Individual Motivations and characteristics associated with bystander intervention during bullying episodes among children and youth. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 27*(3), 201–216.

Center for Disease Control and Prevention. (2018). *Preventing bullying*. https://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/bullying-factsheet508.pdf

Clarkson, P. (1987). The bystander role. *Transactional Analysis Journal, 17*(3), 82–87. https://doi.org/10.1177/036215378701700305

Creswell, J. W. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed). Sage Publications.

Creswell, J. W. (2013). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five approaches* (3rd ed.). Sage Publication.

Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*, 377–383.

Eliaeson, S. (2002). *Max Weber's methodologies*. Polity.

Eisner, M., & Malti, T. (2015). Aggressive and violent behavior. In R. Lerner & M.Lamb (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology and developmental science: Socioemotional processes 3* (7th ed., pp. 794–841). https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118963418.childpsy319

Elster, J. (2007). *Explaining social behaviour: More nuts and bolts for the social sciences.* Cambridge University Press. https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511806421

Eysenck, H. J. (1967). *The biological basis of personality.* Charles C Thomas.

García-Vázquez, F. I., Valdés-Cuervo, A. A., Martínez-Ferrer, B. & Parra-Pérez, L. G. (2020). Forgiveness, gratitude, happiness, and prosocial bystander behavior in bullying. *Frontiers in Psychology, 10.* https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2019.02827

Forsberg, C., Wood, L., Smith, J., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Jungert, T., & Thornberg, R. (2018). Students' views of factors affecting their bystander behaviors in response to school bullying: A cross-collaborative conceptual qualitative analysis. *Research Papers in Education, 33*(1), 127–142. https://doi.org/10.1080/02671522.2016.1271001

Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Edstrom, L. V., & Snell, J. L. (2009). Observed reductions in school bullying, nonbullying aggression, and destructive bystander behavior: A longitudinal evaluation. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 101,* 466–481.

Freud, S. (1913). *The interpretation of dreams.* MacMillan Co.

Freud, S. (1924). *A general introduction to psychoanalysis.* Washington Square Press.

Frisén, A., Jonsson, A., & Persson, C. (2007). Adolescents" perception of bullying: Who is the victim? Who is the bully? What can be done to stop bullying? *Adolescence, 42,* 749–761.

Gaffney, H., Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2019). Evaluating the effectiveness of school-bullying prevention programs: An updated meta-analytical review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 45*, 111–133. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.07.001

Giménez-Gualdo, A.-M., Arnaiz-Sánchez, P., Cerezo-Ramírez, F., & Prodócimo, E. (2018). Teachers' and students' perception about cyberbullying. Intervention strategies in primary and secondary education. *Comunicar: Media Education Research Journal, 26*(56), 29–38.

Guba, E. G. (1981). Criteria for assessing the trustworthiness of naturalistic inquiries. *Educational Resources Information Center Annual Review Paper, 29*, 75–91.

Hawkins, D. L., Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer interventions in bullying. *Social Development, 10*(4), 512–527. https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00178

Hawley, P. (2014). The duality of human nature: Coercion and prosociality in youths' hierarchy ascension and social success. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23,* 433–438.

Institute of Education Sciences. (n.d.). *National center for education statistics: Fast facts*. https://nces.ed.gov/fastfacts/display.asp?id=372

Iotti, N. O., Thornberg, R., Longobardi, C., & Jungert, T. (2020). Early adolescents' emotional and behavioral difficulties, student-teacher relationships, and motivation to defend in bullying incidents. *Child & Youth Care Forum, 49*(1), 59–75.

Jambon, M., Madigan, S., Plamondon, A., & Jenkins, J. (2019). Developmental trajectories of physical aggression and prosocial behavior in early childhood: Family antecedents and psychological correlates. *Developmental Psychology, 55*(6), 1211–1225. https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000714.supp

Johnston, A. D., Midgett, A., Doumas, D. M., & Moody, S. (2018). A mixed methods evaluation of the "aged-up" STAC bullying bystander intervention for high school students. *Professional Counselor, 8*(1), 73–87.

Johnson, S. B., Blum, R. W., & Giedd, J. N. (2009). Adolescent maturity and the brain: The promise and pitfalls of neuroscience research in adolescent health policy. *The Journal of Adolescent Health: Official Publication of the Society for Adolescent Medicine, 45*(3), 216–221. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.05.016

Jungert, T., Piroddi, B., & Thornberg, R. (2016). Early adolescents' motivations to defend victims in school bullying and their perceptions of student–teacher relationships: A self-determination theory approach. *Journal of Adolescence. 53:* 75-90.

Koomen, M., & Jellesma, C. (2015). Can closeness, conflict, and dependency be used to characterize students' perceptions of the affective relationship with their teacher? Testing a new child measure in middle childhood. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 84*(4): 479-497.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help*? Appleton-Century-Crofts.

Lee, T., & Cornell, D. (2010). Concurrent validity of the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Journal of School Violence*, *9*(1), 56–73.

Lester, D. (2013). Measuring Maslow's hierarchy of needs. *Psychological Reports, 113(1),* 15–17.

Longobardi, C., Borello, L., Thornberg, R., & Settanni, M. (2020). Empathy and defending behaviours in school bullying: The mediating role of motivation to defend victims. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*(2), 473–486.

Lorenz, K. (1967). *On aggression* (M. Kerr, Trans.). Bantam Books.

Marcus-Newhall, A., Pedersen, W. C., Carlson, M., & Miller, N. (2000). Displaced aggression is alive and well: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 78,* 670–689.

Maslow, A. H. (1954) *Motivation and personality.* Harper & Row.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. R. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Theory, findings, and implications. *Psychological Inquiry, 15*(3), 197–215. https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327965pli1503_02

Midgett A, Doumas DM, Sears D, Lunquist A, & Hausheer R (2015). A bystander bullying psychoeducation program with middle school students: A preliminary report. *The Professional Counselor, 5*(4), 486–500.

Mowrer, O. H. (1956). Neo-analytic theory. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 3*(2), 108–111.

National Center for Education Statistics and Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2020). *Indicator of school crime and safety.*

Nelson, H. J., Burns, S. K., Kendall, G. E., & Schonert-Reichl, K. A. (2018). The factors that influence and protect against power imbalance in covert bullying among preadolescent children at school: A thematic analysis. *Journal of School Nursing, 34*(4), 281–291.

Nocentini, A., & Menesini, E. (2016). KiVa anti-bullying program in Italy: Evidence of effectiveness in a randomized control trial. *Prevention Science :* T*he Official Journal of the Society for Prevention Research*, *17*(8), 1012–1023.

Olweus, D. (2002). *Bullying at school.* Blackwell Publishers.

Olweus, D., Solberg, M. E., & Olweus, D. (2003). Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior*, *29*, 239–268.

Olweus, D. (1995). Bullying or peer abuse at school: Facts and intervention. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 4*, 196–200.

Pavlov, I. P. (1927). *Conditioned reflexes: An investigation of the physiological activity of the cerebral cortex*. Oxford University Press.

Paull, M., Omari, M., & Standen, P. (2012). When is a bystander not a bystander? A typology of the roles of bystanders in workplace bullying. *Asia Pacific Journal of Human Resources, 50*(3), 351–366.

Peng, Z., Wang, Y., Chen, Q. (2019). The generation and development of road rage incidents caused by aberrant overtaking: An analysis of cases in China. *Transportation Research: Part F, 60,* 606–619.

Piliavin, J. A., Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Clark, R. D., III. (1981). *Emergency intervention*. Academic Press.

Polanin, J., Espelage, D., Pigott, D. (2012) A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behavior. *School Psychology Review*, *4*(1), pp. 47-65. https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/1feb/a3473d0dfd4221c5ee2637310b9c8d3abc85.pdf

Polit, D. F., Beck, C. T., & Hungler, B. P. (2001). *Essentials of nursing research: Methods, appraisal & utilization* (5th ed.). Lippincott Williams & Wilkins.

Pozzoli, T., & Gini, G. (2013). Why do bystanders of bullying help or not? A multidimensional model. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, *33*(3), 315–340.

Pronk, J., Olthof, T., & Goossens, F. A. (2016). Factors influencing interventions on behalf of victims of bullying: A counterfactual approach to the social cognitions of outsiders and defenders. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 36*(2), 267–291.

Ravitch, S. M., & Carl, N. M. (2016). *Qualitative research: Bridging the conceptual, theoretical, and methodological*. Sage Publications.

Ross, S. W., Horner, R. H. (2009). Bullying prevention in positive behavior support. *Journal of Applied Behavior Analysis, 42*, 747–759.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (2012). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A., Kaistaniemi, L., and Lagerspetz, K. (1999) Self-evaluated self-esteem, peer-evaluated self-esteem, and defensive egotism as predictors of

adolescents' participation in bullying situations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 25:* 1268–1278.

Saldaña, J. (2016). *The coding manual for qualitative researchers* (3rd ed.). Sage Publications.

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

Sampson, H. (2004). Navigating the waves: The usefulness of a pilot in qualitative research. *Qualitative Research, 4*(3), 383–402.

Schlieper, K. (2012). Experience of bullying between genders: A quantitative study done at the University of New Hampshire. *Perspectives*, 28–34.

Shillington, K., Johnson, A., Mantler, T., & Irwin, D. (2021). Kindness as an intervention for student social interaction anxiety, affect, and mood: The KISS of kindness study. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology*, *6,* 23–44.

Shriberg, D., Burns, M., Desai, P., Grunewald, S., & Pitt, R. (2015). A multiyear investigation of combating bullying in middle school: Stakeholder perspectives. *School Psychology Forum, 9*(2), 143–161.

Song, J., Oh, I. (2018). Factors influencing bystanders' behavioral reactions in cyberbullying situations. *Computers in Human Behavior*, *78*, 273–282.

Staub, E. (1992). Transforming the bystander: Altruism, caring and social responsibility. *Genocide Watch*, *162*.

Stein, C. H. (2009). "I owe it to them": Understanding felt obligation toward parents in adulthood. In K. Shifren (Ed.), How caregiving affects development: Psychological implications for child, adolescent, and adult caregivers (pp. 119–145). *American Psychological Association*. https://doi.org/10.1037/11849-004

Trach, J., & Hymel, S. (2020). Bystanders' affect toward bully and victim as predictors of helping and non-helping behaviour. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 61*(1), 30–37.

Tremblay, R. (2000). The development of aggressive behavior during childhood: What have we learned in the past century? *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 24,* 129–141.

Varela, J. J., Fábrega, J., Carrillo, G., Benavente, M., Alfaro, J., & Rodríguez, C. (2020). Bullying and subjective well-being: A hierarchical socioeconomical status analysis of Chilean adolescents. *Children and Youth Services Review,* 118.

Vogt, W. P., Vogt, E. R., Gardner, D. C., & Haeffeke, L. M. (2014) *Selecting the right analyses for your data: Quantitative, qualitative, and mixed methods.* Guilford.

Volk, A. A., Dane, A. V., & Marini, Z. A. (2014). What is bullying? A theoretical redefinition. *Developmental Review, 34*(4), 327–343.

Wegge, D., Vandebosch, H., Eggermont, S., & Pabian, S. (2016). Popularity through online harm: The longitudinal associations between cyberbullying and sociometric status in early adolescence. *Journal of Early Adolescence, 36*(1), 86–107.

Weiner, B. (1980). A cognitive (attribution)- emotion-action model of motivated behavior: An analysis of judgments of help-giving. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39,* 186–200.

Weissberg, R. P., Durlak, J. A., Domitrovich, C. E., & Gullotta, T. P. (Eds.). (2015). Social and emotional learning: Past, present, and future. In J. A. Durlak, C. E. Domitrovich, R. P. Weissberg, & T. P. Gullotta (Eds.), *Handbook of social and emotional learning: Research and practice* (pp. 3–19). The Guilford Press.

Wood, P. (2012). *Snap: making the most of first impressions, body language, and charisma*. New World Library.

Appendix: Question Set

What are the lived experiences of a bystander or upstander during a bullying episode?		
Interview Question	Sub Questions	Probe
Can you describe what you think about bullying in general?	As you think about bullying, what does the act of bullying mean to you?	
Can you describe a specific bullying incident or incidents that you have experienced	Can you describe the context, the people involved? Where were you when you witnessed this incident?	Describe the similarities between most victims
Can you describe your feelings/thoughts/behaviors when you were watching this incident taking place?	What do you think made you feel this way? What do you think made you think this way? What do you think made you act or react to the incident this way?	Describe the similarities between most bystanders
When you witnessed the incident, can you describe the bully?	Did the characteristics of the bully play a role in how you thought/felt/acted during the incident?	Describe the similarities between most upstanders
When you witnessed the incident, can you describe the Victim?	Did the characteristics of the victim you described play a role in how you thought/felt/acted during the incident?	Delve deeper into the root of those feelings
During the bullying incident, did you or someone play the role of a bystander?	Can you describe the behaviors and characteristics of the bystanders? What do you think makes a person take on this role?	Can you provide examples?
During the bullying incident, did you or	Can you describe the behaviors and	Can you describe the scene?

someone play the role of a upstander?	characteristics of the upstander/s? What do you think makes a person take on this role?	