1-1-2011

A Psychological Investigation of the Expressed Attitudes of Middle School Aged Adolescents toward School Bullying

Jodi Marie Daly
Walden University

Walden University

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES

This is to certify that the doctoral dissertation by

Jodi Daly

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. Tracy Marsh, Committee Chairperson, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Tom Diebold, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Magy Martin, Committee Member, Psychology Faculty
Dr. Thomas Trocchio, University Reviewer, Psychology Faculty

Chief Academic Officer

David Clinefelter, Ph.D.

Walden University
2011

Abstract

A Psychological Investigation of the Expressed Attitudes of Middle School Aged Adolescents toward School Bullying

by

Jodi Marie Daly

MA, Pacific Lutheran University, 1994

BS, University of Montana, 1986

Dissertation Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Psychology

Walden University

August 2011

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

Abstract

International research on bullying suggests that bullying is pervasive in schools and the workplace. Most researchers concur that bullying behavior is a disruptive factor to the social and educational well-being of students. Previous research, grounded in social and family systems theory, has indicated those who bully tend to be involved in self-destructive and delinquent behaviors. Additionally, in the only-large scale study on bullying behaviors, 29% of the 10th-grade student body admitted to being bullied that school year. Further, in a new study conducted by the Josephson Institute of Ethics, half of all high school students reported that they have bullied another student. In spite of these studies, there remains a paucity of information in the literature regarding what distinguishes bullies from other students in terms of family factors such as family size, family composition, and birth order. Little has been conducted on which variables in the home contribute to being labeled a bully. The purpose of this quantitative study was to examine the relationships that exist between reported middle-school bullying and each of the above-named family variables. This study examined archival data from a standardized bully questionnaire completed by middle school students. A correlational analysis approach of the bully subscale score and family factors indicate that having a small family size and living with both parents are associated with a lower probability of engaging in bullying behavior. This research yields insight on relationships between bullying behaviors and family variables. Implications for social change included better assessment of, identification of risk factors of bullying behaviors which can lead to a more comprehensive model of bullying strategies that includes broadening our understanding of bullies as being part of a family system versus as an isolated individual.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Chapter 1: Introduction

Youth bullying, or the display of power between an aggressor and a victim, is a significant problem in middle schools. The only large-scale study on bullying in the United States was conducted in 1998, and 29% of the 15,686 sixth- through 10th-grade students surveyed reported involvement in bullying incidents, either as the aggressor or as both a victim and an aggressor (Espelange & Swearer, 2003). A 1993 survey also indicated that approximately 20% of students reported being bullied at some time (Macklem, 2003). Additionally, the American Medical Association's Council on Scientific Affairs concluded that 7% to 15% of children engage in bullying behavior, an increase of 7% in the past generation (Macklem, 2003). Thus, bullying is becoming a more pressing issue in middle schools.

The increasing amount of bullying occurring in middle schools has provoked a response by researchers and educators. Until very recently, teachers and administrators generally ignored bullying, passing it off as a normal part of growing up or dismissing it as another instance of how boys will be boys (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004, p. 260). A number of studies on teacher attitudes toward bullying have found that teachers continue to ignore bullying or hold antiquated views on the problem, and that they are not aware of the more relational and bias-crime aspects of bullying that occur today (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Some teachers fear that, if they punish the bullies, bullying will be driven underground or made worse (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). For these reasons, bullies have been free to engage in their attacks on student victims in most U.S. schools. However, with the incidence of bullying now reaching almost one-

third of the student body, more teachers and administrators are aware that a serious problem exists (Espelange & Swearer, 2003). For this reason, there has been a paradigm shift in the response of the educational community to bullying: Now, not only is bullying not tolerated, but research has explored the deeper societal forces that support and allow the persistence of bullying in schools, helping counselors go to the source of bullying and root out its causes (Swearer, Turner, & Givens, 2008).

One of the most significant aspects of this paradigm change with regard to bullying is that bullying, which was once viewed as an encounter between two persons, the bully and the victim, is now more often seen as a group or social interaction issue inherent within macro systems (Rigby & Johnson, 2006). This shift of attention to group interactions has brought into focus the supportive role that the bully's assistants, passive student bystanders, and teachers play in enabling bullying in schools. It has also heightened awareness that attitudes toward bullying allow bystanders and others to refrain from intervening against bullying. This focus has in turn made researchers more aware of the fact that bullying takes forms other than physical violence. Bullying can also be indirect and include spreading malicious rumors, restricting peers from group activities, social exclusion, and harassing individuals psychologically through name-calling over a prolonged period of time (Baldry, 2004; Espelange & Swearer, 2008; Naylor, Cowie, Cossin, de Bettencourt, & Lemme, 2006). Girls especially have been found to engage in a less direct form of bullying called relational bullying (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). The increased incidence of bullying of students based on sexual orientation, which appears to be supported primarily by accepted negative attitudes about

gay and lesbian students (Swearer, et al, 2008), has recently expanded the scope of bullying. Finally, the advent of cyberbullying is also changing the dynamic of the bullying construct, as bullying can now occur anonymously and in the sanctuary of the victim's bedroom (Dehue, Bolman, & Vollinik, 2008). This broader societal model of bullying changes the definition of bullying to include "an action or set of actions where one person or a group of persons verbally, physically or psychologically harass another person over a prolonged period of time" (Baldry, 2004, p. 584), and these behaviors can be perpetuated through communication technologies such as email, pagers, and phones (Aricak et al., 2008).

Bullying has also been the subject of life-course incidence studies attempting to pinpoint when bullying peaks. Studies have indicated that bullying is most prevalent during middle school, primarily because the stress of the transition to middle school causes a large proportion of students to use aggression (Pellegrini & Long, 2002). The fact that children transitioning into middle school are engaged in negotiating changes in all of their relationships renders students particularly vulnerable to this type of domination. After middle school, levels of domination by one group or another stabilize; thus, fewer bullying incidents occur in high school, as there is less need to jockey for a social position (Pellegrini & Long, 2002). As middle-school students transition from childhood to adolescence, their attitudes about bullying appear to focus on its more obvious forms, such as direct verbal and physical abuse (Naylor et al., 2006). Subsequently, as these middle-school students experience this transition, they may overlook signs of indirect forms of bullying such as name rumors and exclusion (Naylor

et al., 2006) at exactly the juncture at which the latter type of bullying is emerging. As a result, bullying in middle school may actually be underreported, as new forms of bullying may emerge unchecked in the gap between student and teacher perceptions, on one hand, and the reality of middle school social life on the other.

Still another problem linked to middle school bullying is that students' insecurities about their status in social matters render them much more likely to remain passive in the presence of bullying (Reid et al., 2004). Passive bystanders who observe bullying but do nothing about it have become a major focus of relational bullying research. Studies have shown how bystanders support a climate that engenders more bullying, not only by doing nothing about bullying but by remaining friends with bullies and then gossiping about the incident (Reid et al., 2004). The fact that social life in middle school is dominated by groups or cliques encourages student attitudinal alignment with accepted societal norms, often contributing to a culture tacitly supportive of bullying (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004).

Overall, the literature on bullying has demonstrated that the nature and definition of bullying is changing and that these changes have exacerbated the reported incidence of bullying, especially in the middle-school years. The literature on bullying describes tacitly supportive attitudes and other forms of enabling behavior among broad groups of students and teachers but has much less to say regarding possible explanations for why students would hold such views or participate in bullying, either directly or as bystanders. Thus, this study examines family-related correlates to determine if they contribute to the probullying attitudes observed among middle school students.

Statement of the Problem

Although the definition of bullying has expanded to include a more societal or group-oriented view of bullying, little effort has been made to identify relationships between bullying behavior and family variables. As a result, there remains a significant gap in the literature on bullying. It remains necessary to examine variables such as family size, birth order, and family composition; researchers must use these variables to develop more fully a comprehensive explanation of the conditions that may influence bullying behavior. Such family factors have been linked to increased juvenile delinquency, violence, and antisocial behaviors generally. Until now, little research has connected these variables to the specific phenomenon of bullying.

Nature of the Study

Building on the existing research base, this study explored attitudes about bullying among a sample group of seventh-grade students. The hypothesis that their views and behaviors regarding bullying correlate with data regarding family variables, including family size, birth order, and family composition (i.e., the presence of both biological and nonbiological parents) was tested. The ultimate goal of this study is to provide educational professionals with data regarding the correlation between family variables and student attitudes toward bullying. It is expected that such data could help educational professionals better understand the etiological dynamics of bullying and the relationship between bullying behavior and the bully's family life.

From this study, four research questions will be answered.

1. How strong is the relationship between the combined set of family demographics (family size, birth order, family composition) and the bully subscale score?
2. Are some predictors much more important than others in explaining the variance in bully subscale score?
3. How strong is the relationship between the combined set of family demographics (family size, birth order, family composition) and victim subscale score?
4. Are some predictors much more important than others in explaining the variance in victim subscale score?

Purpose of the Study

By answering these research questions, this study could contribute to the development of a more comprehensive model of bullying behavior that is grounded in social learning theory and systemic family theory. The idea that family variables contribute to bullying behavior and probullying attitudes is premised on a literature that has found previous correlations between family variables and delinquent behavior. One purpose of this study is to begin to reconcile the literature on family variables and the literature on the societal dynamics of bullying.

As a result of these studies (Brown, Birch, & Kancherla, 2005; Demaray & Malecki, 2003; Lake, 2004; Peskin, Tortolero, & Markham, 2006; Rigby & Johnson, 2006), it is apparent that researchers have begun to develop a sound research literature linking family variables, including family size, birth order, and family composition, with

delinquency. Thus, the overall purpose of this study is to undertake an empirical examination of the attitudes of middle-school students about bullying in order to establish the relationships between family variables and the behavior and attitudes of students in the context of bullying in school.

Hypotheses

The purpose of this study is to determine the extent to which self-reported bullying behavior by seventh-grade middle school students is related to family size, birth order, and family composition.

To answer the research questions, four null hypotheses will be tested.

Null Hypothesis 1: In a standard multiple regression (i.e., all predictors entered at once), the set of family demographics will not significantly predict bully subscale scores ($R = 0$ at alpha level of .05).

Null Hypothesis 2: From a standard multiple regression, the unique effects (i.e., part correlations) of each family demographic in predicting bully subscale score will be equal; that is, all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations will be nonsignificant ($p > .05$).

Null Hypothesis 3: In a standard multiple regression (i.e., all predictors entered at once), the set of family demographics will not significantly predict victim subscale scores ($R = 0$ at alpha level of .05).

Null Hypothesis 4: From a standard multiple regression, the unique effects (i.e., part correlations) of each family demographic in predicting victim subscale score will be

equal; that is, all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations will be nonsignificant ($p > .05$).

Definition of Terms

Birth order: Birth order is defined as a child's ordinal place in a family, vis-à-vis other siblings.

Bullying: Bullying was defined by Olweus (1993) as repeatedly and systematically harassing and attacking another. Bullying is also defined as "an action or set of actions where one person or a group of persons verbally, physically or psychologically harass another person over a prolonged period of time" (Baldry, 2004, p. 584). Bullying can, by this definition, be perpetrated by individuals or by groups. According to expanded definitions of bullying, bullying can be direct, indirect, or relational, and thus can take on many different forms including violent attacks, verbal abuse, threats and intimidation, extortion or theft, spreading rumors, exclusionary practices related to groups or cliques, and even harassing email or hacking on the Internet. Recent definitions have also focused on the power relations involved in the activity, with bullying being "a relationship characterized by continual aggression and with a power asymmetry," a definition that separates bullying from simple aggression between two parties of equal power (Monks & Smith, 2006, p. 802).

Bystander: A bystander is a student who simply stands by and watches bullying without intervening to stop it. Researchers have increasingly focused on bystanders due to the group-oriented nature of recent bully studies. Studies of bystanders have shown that the presence of such an audience encourages bullies in their behavior and offers tacit

approval of their actions. Bystander dynamics have also become the object of study. Paradoxically, research has shown that the more bystanders gather around a bullying incident, the less likely it is that someone will report the incident to authorities (the "diffusion of responsibility effect"; Reid et al., 2004, p. 247).

Cyberbullying: Cyberbullying is a new form of bullying that occurs anonymously and invades the privacy of the victim's home by way of the Internet. The dynamics of cyberbullying are believed to be even more psychologically damaging than "normal" face-to-face bullying because of the anonymity, the invasion of privacy, and the wide broadcast of bullying artifacts online (e.g., videos, pictures, etc.) that characterize cyberbullying. As such, the emergence of cyberbullying expands the definition to include indirect and relational means of bullying.

Family composition: For the purposes of this study, family composition refers to the nature of the parental presence in a given household. As such, family composition can consist of various configurations including biological (i.e., with both biological parents present), single (i.e., either biological parent may be present, with the other parent absent), mixed (i.e., one biological parent present and one nonbiological parent or stepparent present), and other arrangements (i.e., any family configuration that does not fit any of the above previous categories, including adoptive families).

Indirect or relational bullying: Indirect or relational bullying is bullying that occurs primarily through verbal aggression, through the spreading of rumors, or through acts of exclusion from social groups (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). Indirect bullying also takes on a covert nature often involving the use of third parties. Gossiping and rumor

spreading are forms of indirect bullying whose effects may extend far beyond the original grievance. Broader definitions of bullying also include indirect bullying, which is believed to be practiced by girls more than by boys.

Social identity theory: This theory, along with social categorization theory, explains the group dynamics of bystanders and other passive supporters of bullies. According to social identity theory, a person joins a group according to the norms of group-related behavior and thus conforms to the beliefs and actions of the group. At the same time, identification with one group tends to cause the group as a whole to develop a stereotyped view of persons from another group, creating frictions that can be utilized as a premise for bullying (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004).

Social learning theory: This theory posits that children learn social behaviors by observing others and modeling their behavior after them. Social learning theory is utilized to explain how bullying begets further bullying in student populations, as well as how bullying behavior can be passed from an older to younger sibling via modeling.

Family systems theory: This theory suggests that individuals cannot be understood in isolation of one another and must be viewed as interconnected and interdependent members of a system.

Assumptions, Limitations, and Scope

One of the most significant limitations of the present study is its geographical restriction. The study was undertaken with middle-school students in one school district in Butte, Montana; therefore, a demonstration of similarities between this local sample and the larger population of U.S. middle-school students would be required to enhance

the generalizability of the findings. The study is also limited to middle-school students and thus did not allow any analysis of students along lines related to age, grade level, gender, and ethnicity.

I assumed that the middle-school students responding to surveys would answer questions honestly, and that their answers were an accurate record of their attitudes toward bullying. As their answers are anonymous and confidential, the researcher also assumes that the middle-school students answering the questionnaires will feel free to be honest about their true attitudes about bullying, without expecting any negative response by peers, or even bullies, in their classes on the basis of their participation.

Significance of the Study

At present, the literature on the role of family variables and their correlation with bullying is weak. Some research has examined correlations between family variables and delinquency (Farrington, 2005) additionally, family-focused literature has found that such factors as family size, birth order, and family composition can and do have a negative impact on some children, who later engage in delinquent behavior (Begue & Roche, 2005). However, the specific links between these variables and bullying are less clear. This study is expected to contribute significantly to the literature by providing empirical evidence that the family characteristics of a group of middle-school students can impact the students' attitudes toward, and participation in, bullying.

The social change implications of this study are also significant. If the study's results indicate that there is a relationship between family size, birth order, family composition, and bullying behavior and attitudes among certain groups of siblings, such

findings would allow for the development of a more comprehensive model of the etiology of bullying and would offer insight into the family as an incubator of bullying behavior. Once demonstrated, such relationships could be utilized to construct new programs and interventions against bullying in schools that go beyond creating positive school climates or enlightening teachers and students about the problem of bullying and focus on the family itself as the cause of bullying. This focus could inform the development of parent training programs and sibling therapy treatments in the context of family therapy for bullies. It is expected that, if bullying behavior is placed in the context of family dynamics, bullying can be eliminated at its source. Conceivably, if family size, birth order, and family composition factors are found to be related to bullying, the presence of such factors in a child's profile could be used as an early warning system to identify children who are most likely to engage in bullying or hold accepting views of bullying. Thus, interventions could be attempted with these children at an early stage, preventing the emergence of bullying behavior in middle school.

Family size, birth order, and family composition are factors that have often been used in storied traditions to explain dysfunctional behavior in families and how certain siblings turn out well, whereas others do not. The fairy-tale quality of family discussion with regard to these values has led to the persistence of stereotypes that, despite having been disproved and rejected by empirical science, remain powerful in influencing family behavior. Although fixed notions of the impact of family factors on dysfunctional behavior have fallen into disrepute, the family dynamics surrounding these factors still appear to offer powerful explanations for the emergence of negativity and delinquent

behavior in some children. Most current studies regarding bullying in schools remain focused on the ecology of the school as the site of bullying, though some studies have expanded the boundaries of bullying to unstructured public spaces, as well as the Internet. Expanding the definition of bullying to include the group dynamics of bullying, the attitudes of bystanders, and relational aspects of bullying has increased focus on the student and teacher attitudes that enable bullying.

Although it is true that programs aimed at raising awareness of bullying and reducing tolerant attitudes about bullying in schools can curtail bullying, whether or not such programs can root out bullying remains a question. The evolution of the literature on bullying appears to demand the development of a more inclusive model of bullying that locates its etiology in family life. By examining correlations between reported family size, birth order, family composition, and attitudes toward bullying in a group of middle school students, this study hopes to forge a more inclusive model of bullying that takes into consideration both the home and school life of the bully, as well as the bystanders who support his or her actions.

Chapter 2 presents a full review of the current literature on bullying and the role of family life in bullying development, whereas chapter 3 outlines the methodology by which the current study will be carried out. Finally, the results will be presented in chapter 4, and chapter 5 will offer conclusions, implications and recommendations.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Introduction

Bullying in school has grown so prevalent that over the past decade it has become a subject of international interest and research (Monks & Smith, 2006). Studies have shown that bullying is pervasive, both in American schools and in schools in many countries around the world (Mishna, Scarcello, Pepler, & Weiner, 2005). Most studies acknowledge that bullying is a disruptive factor on a student's physical, emotional and educational well-being (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Until recently, many teachers and administrators ignored bullying and treated it as a normal part of growing up or as yet another way in which "boys will be boys." However, evidence concerning the extent of the negative impact of bullying has caused a change in paradigm, such that researchers, professionals, and educators now agree that bullying behavior and incidents should be examined and taken seriously (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Indeed, research has disproved teachers' beliefs that dealing with bullying will only drive it underground. Research has also shown that most current methods in dealing with bullying are not impacting the behaviors (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). More and more researchers view bullying as a normative behavior that must be curtailed. Studies have shown that in some schools up to 30% of all students are being bullied (Reid et al., 2004); in one survey it was found that 18% of students had been bullied in their current school year (Reid et al., 2004).

The Context of Bullying

In addition to changing discourse on bullying, research has also shifted with respect to the way researchers view the context of bullying (Baldry, 2004; Brown, et al, 2005; Demaray & Malecki, 2003; Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005; Fitzpatrick, Dulin, & Piko, 2007; Frisen, Jonsson, & Persson, 2007; Monks & Smith, 2006; Naylor et al., 2006; Nickel et al., 2006; Pellegrini & Long, 2002; Peskin, Tortolero, & Markham, 2006; Reid et al., 2004; Rigby & Johnson, 2006). Formerly, bullying was conceptualized as a matter between two people, the bully and his or her victim, and such variables as personality and physical strength were examined to determine why bullies bullied (Rigby & Johnson, 2006). Recently, there has been a shift toward understanding bullying in relation to the social or group context in which it occurs (Rigby & Johnson, 2006). This shift in paradigm has brought new attention to the attitudes that all students have regarding bullying and how an incident of bullying, whether directly experienced or witnessed, can both alter and be fed by student attitudes.

A number of people other than the bully and his or her victim contribute to the context in which bullying takes place. Bystanders are students who witness bullying but, due to being involved in some power-based affiliation with the bully, do not report the incidents. Bullies also have assistants who help them abuse others. Whereas the bully alone was formerly blamed for his or her actions, and all research was devoted to examining the psychological variables that drove him or her to bully, it is now more common to place blame on the entire social dynamic of bullying and determine how

student attitudes are rooted in variables that may have been previously overlooked.

Defining Bullying

The shift of focus in the literature on bullying has continued to complicate researchers' efforts to define bullying. There are many different definitions of bullying, none of which have widespread acceptance (Macklem, 2003). According to Olweus (1993), a nationally recognized expert on youth bullying, bullying is defined as repeated and systematic harassment and attacks on others. Additionally, Baldry (2004) defined bullying as "an action or set of actions where one person or a group of persons verbally, physically or psychologically harass another person over a prolonged period of time" (p. 584). Bullying occurs and persists when there is an imbalance of power between bully and victim, based not only on physical strength but also on factors such as willpower, resolve, and strength of character (Baldry, 2004). Pellegrini and Long (2002) further refine the definition of bullying by distinguishing it from reactive aggression, pointing out that bullying is a deliberate behavior to acquire resources and, as such, is proactive. The most important definitional aspect of bullying may come from Olweus, who purports that bullying is systematic harassment and attacks on others. This being said, it appears that bullies apply power to devalue others, thereby making themselves feel superior (Reid et al., 2004). As a result, "bullying is thus a relationship characterized by continued aggression and with a power asymmetry—a picking on or harassment, which can appear unfair to onlookers and which can have serious effects for those who are victims" (Monks & Smith, 2006, p. 802). The importance of this definition is, again, that it separates bullying from simple aggression or from fighting. Moreover, this broad definition of

bullying has also brought attention to the fact that in the context of such a relationship, even behavior that normally would not be seen as bullying may be considered bullying if that is what is felt by the victim (Monks & Smith, 2006). With respect to attitude and perception, it has been noted that a bullying campaign can indeed consist of only a single incident, if that incident is used by the bully to create a long-lasting fear of its repetition (Monks & Smith, 2006).

Types of Bullying

In order to discriminate carefully among the ways in which bullying can manifest, some researchers have drawn distinctions between direct physical, direct verbal, and indirect bullying (Fitzpatrick et al., 2007). Whereas direct activities include hitting and tripping, the indirect activities involve name-calling, ethnic slurs, and sexual connotations (Reid et al., 2004). Verbal bullying can also involve sending notes or sending messages via cell phone or the Internet. Indirect bullying often takes on a covert nature, entails the use of third parties, and involves, for example, gossiping, spreading malicious rumors, and social exclusion (Naylor et al., 2006, p. 554). Researchers also have acknowledged that bullying can be aimed at unbalancing a person's well-being by causing stress through threats of future incidents (Naylor et al, 2006). Indirect bullying is also called *relational bullying* in that it is aggression directed at damaging friendships and other important social relationships (Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005).

How Bullies Develop

Researchers have begun to explore more carefully the character of bullies and what makes them bullies. It has been found that "children who bully often suffer from

low school bonding and adjustment" and are also "more likely to be involved in various self-destructive antisocial behaviors such as fighting, vandalism, carrying weapons, stealing and getting in trouble with the law" (Brown et al., 2005, p. 384). Other researchers seek to understand the bully better by trying to understand the predictive and risk factors associated with bullying behaviors (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). For example, Demaray and Malecki (2003) found that parent and teacher support lacking for students who bully, and, as a result, less support is a risk factor that may mediate or directly provoke bullying behavior. Additionally, Lake (2004) followed the life course of a bully and found that acts of bullying increased during middle school. Indeed, one in ten students is regularly harassed or attacked by bullies at the middle-school level, and most bullying at that age involves boys bullying boys (Lake, 2004). According to Lake's study, a bully who continues to bully in middle school will move on to delinquency and crime during high school.

Bullies and Victimization

The relational approach to the study of bullying has produced studies that directly examine bullying and victimization (Peskin et al., 2006). This research has been motivated by the fact that many school shooters, such as those at Columbine High School in Colorado, were reportedly bullied (Peskin et al., 2006). Studies have also shown that bullying can lead to suicidal thoughts as well as anxiety and depression among victims. A number of somatic symptoms have been linked to being a bully's victim, including sleep difficulties, bed-wetting, headaches, stomach aches, fatigue, and school-related problems (Brown et al., 2005). Bullying and victimization dyads appear to be prevalent among

ethnic minority students of low socioeconomic status and may be a major cause of school failure and health problems in this demographic (Peskin et al., 2006).

Bullying victims also tend to obtain low scores on extraversion tests (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). Demaray and Malecki (2003) examined the deeper complexities of bully-victim dyads by studying a group of students who were both bullies and victims and another group consisting only of victims. They found that the bully/victim group may be even more at risk for physical and mental health problems because they were receiving more bullying behavior than students classified only as victims (Demaray & Malecki, p. 484). This finding was attributed to the idea that there was simply more bullying going on all around in the mixed bully and victim group, meaning that members were being bullied more often, which caused them to bully others more often in turn (Demaray & Malecki, 2003).

An Australian study found that being a victim predicted poorer physical health in later adolescence (Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005). Furthermore, it was found that those who have been bullied repeatedly throughout middle adolescence had lower self-esteem and higher depressive symptoms as young adults (Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005). Finally, it has been found that those who have been victimized repeatedly experienced lower levels of academic success (Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005). Other studies found that victims of bullies are so chronically exposed to stress that the reactivity of their neuroendocrine system to acute stress lowers, placing them in danger of high blood pressure and other problems (Nickel et al., 2006).

Bullies and Gender

Most studies attempting to identify a profile of bullying have found that boys bully more often than girls (Frisen et al., 2007). Whether boys actually do bully more than girls or simply engage in different forms of bullying remains an issue (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004). Some studies find that girls simply engage in another type of bullying more closely linked to indirect bullying, involving verbal and social-exclusion tactics (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004). Some researchers have been clear that boys and girls bully differently (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). Overall, it appears that adolescent girls engage in more relational or indirect aggression and that, when they use verbal aggression, it is indirect verbal aggression (e.g., spreading rumors, encouraging a group to exclude someone) more often than direct verbal aggression (e.g., calling someone names to their face; Demaray & Malecki, 2003). Finally, it appears that girls use much less physical aggression when bullying than do boys (Frisen et al., 2007).

Bullying in Middle School

According to Monks and Smith (2006), rates of bullying behavior change as students transition through their developmental stage; that is, bullying increases during middle school, then declines. Various reasons have been cited for the increase of bullying in middle school in particular. For one thing, students in general are moving from the tight-knit world of elementary school to less supportive environments. During such transitions as the move from elementary to middle school, aggression is often used while students experience pecking orders and social status in the form of dominance relationships (Pellegrini & Long, 2002). In the context of such transitions, bullying is a

strategy used to gain dominance, which is defined as “a relationship variable that orders individuals in terms of their access to resources” (Pellegrini & Long, 2002, p. 260). The middle-school years are particularly volatile, as all such relationships are renegotiated as children move into new contexts and classes (Pellegrini & Long, 2002). Viewed from the perspective that bullying is used to establish dominance relationships, this approach also explains why bullying levels off and declines in later middle school: once dominance hierarchies are established, they tend to stabilize and therefore aggression is less needed (Pellegrini & Long, 2002). Another study found that bullying spikes between sixth and seventh grade. The results indicated that developmental differences between students at that age may contribute to bullying behavior (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). Indeed, another trend in the research found that reports of being bullied reveal a fairly steady decrease through ages 8 to 16 (Frisen et al., 2007). However, the fact that older students are bullying younger students explains that trend; one report found that 50% of bullied children in the lowest grades (8- and 9-year-olds) reported that older students bullied them (Frisen et al., 2007).

Having established some of the general characteristics of the bully—basically, that he is likely to be a male of middle-school age—researchers are now seeking ways to prevent children from developing into bullies by better understanding the factors that may lead boys to become bullies. Similar studies are also being conducted to determine why other students become assistants or bystanders in support of bullies. Most of these studies derive from previous studies on the development of aggressive behavior in adolescent males. These studies have found that general family characteristics, such as low

involvement with parents, low parental warmth, low family cohesion, and single-parent family structure, contribute to the development of children into bullies (Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005). Bullies are also more likely to have a history of physical discipline, to have been witnesses to family violence, and to have fathers who were also bullies as children (Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005). In school, bullies are supported by peer networks that validate their aggression because all problems within the group are dealt with physically. Correlations have also been found between bullying and other forms of health-compromising behavior (Fitzpatrick et al., 2007). In African American communities, bullying is linked to low-income status (Fitzpatrick et al., 2007). Other researchers have begun to explore various overlooked aspects of family life, such as family size and birth order, as such factors may or may not contribute to the etiology of bullies.

Bullies and Social Support

The social dynamic, fueled by student attitudes about bullying, appears to be gaining new ground at the cutting edge of bully studies. Researchers are currently studying in greater detail how bullies gain and are fueled by social support, as well as how and why other students support bullies (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). Indirect forms of bullying have been studied more often than other forms of bullying by researchers seeking to answer such questions, as it is suggested that bullies maintain social control of student attitudes by indirect bullying means. This line of research has sought to examine how student attitudes about various aspects of social life may contribute to or enable bullying.

For example, Frisen et al. (2007) found that when students were asked why someone in their class was bullied, most reported that it was because they looked different from their peers. Studies confirmed that the victim's physical appearance, which tended to be perceived by the bully and other children to be "less attractive" (Frisen et al., 2007, p. 759), was frequently given as a major reason for teasing or bullying that person. Weight, other studies have shown, was also related to teasing/bullying frequency, wherein the heaviest children were twice as likely to be victimized (Frisen et al., 2007). Additionally, short boys were twice as likely to be victims as boys considered to be of normal height (Frisen et al., 2007). In finding a common source of denigration between the attitudes of bullies and other students in general, Frisen et al. (2007) reinforced the idea that student attitudes about bullying, bullies, and victims play a major role in creating a climate in which bullying thrives. The attitudes of students who remain bystanders at bullying incidents are also part of this profile of student appeasement of bullies. Overall, then, student attitudes form the substance of a relational view of bullying, which is believed to better determine why bullying occurs than other views.

This literature review was constructed using the Google Scholar search engine as well as the Academic Premier data base and using keywords including *bullying, middle school, victims, bystanders, delinquency, social learning theory, family size, birth order* and *family dynamics*. It will review research on the role that student attitudes play in contributing to or eliminating incidents of bullying in their schools (Baldry, 2004; Brown et al., 2005; Demaray & Malecki, 2003; Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005; Fitzpatrick et al., 2007; Frisen et al., 2007; Monks & Smith, 2006; Naylor et al., 2006; Nickel et al., 2006;

Pellegrini & Long, 2002; Peskin et al., 2006; Reid et al., 2004; Rigby & Johnson, 2006). This literature review will consider student construal of bullying; the manner in which teacher attitudes frame student construal of bullying; the ecology of bullying; the problem of poor reporting of bullying; student involvement in bullying, either as bully, assistant, bystander, or witness; and the manner in which group dynamics controls student attitudes toward bullying. The special relationship between bullies and victims will also be examined, as well as the impact of group dynamics on student attitudes with regard to victims. Finally, with a focus on the relational aspects of bullying, it follows that preexisting relational experience of bullies or others in family contexts may create a blueprint for bullying (Adkins, 2003; Begue & Roche, 2005; Bredin & Rodney, 2002; Christie-Mizell, 2003; Cosentino, 2004; Dallos, 2004; Eriksen & Jensen, 2006; Farrington, 2005; Fitness, 2005; Flaskas, 2005; Harris, 2001; Kozlowska, 2007; Lyngstad & Skirbekk, 2006; Mancillas, 2006; Young, 2007). Thus, this study uses social learning theory to examine specific familial variables that may contribute to the emergence of antisocial behavior, delinquency, and bullying, either as bully or bystander. In considering such variables, family size and birth order will be examined particularly carefully. Other areas of discussion will include how birth order affects the character of only, first-, middle-, and later-born children, or their social roles and success in life; how family size impacts delinquency; whether or not sibling relationships and imitation of siblings leads to delinquency; how parental favoritism and the creation of familial roles such as black sheep or scapegoat leads to delinquency; and whether or not having an older sibling leads to a teenager taking up teenage habits sooner. Findings that have more

recently questioned some of the previous findings of the literature linking birth order, character deviation, and delinquency will also be reviewed.

Student Attitudes about Bullying

Most studies regarding middle-school bullying seek to curtail the negative influences of bullying and the spread of its negative impact to other students. However, a number of studies are suggesting that a positive attitude toward aggression is a predictor of bullying behavior (Baldry, 2004; Brown et al., 2005; Demaray & Malecki, 2003; Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005; Fitzpatrick et al., 2007; Frisen et al., 2007; Monks & Smith, 2006; Naylor et al., 2006; Nickel et al., 2006; Pellegrini & Long, 2002; Peskin et al., 2006; Reid et al., 2004; Rigby & Johnson, 2006). McConville and Cornell (2003) examined the relationship between student attitudes toward aggression and multiple indicators of aggressive behavior among middle school students. They discovered that students who had positive attitudes towards aggressive behavior were more likely to report threatening, bullying, and fighting their classmates (McConville & Cornell, 2003, p. 185). Social learning theory, as developed by Bandura, premised that belief. An ecosystemic model of bullying no longer finds the study of individual child bullying to be effective. In addition to personal factors, cognitive processes come into play in the development of a bully. These cognitive processes involve environmental influences and how the influences are perceived and observed by the person (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). That is, according to Bandura, children learn to be aggressive by observing aggressive behaviors in others (Bandura, 1973, in Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Aggressive behavior is further ingrained into a student if that student also receives

reinforcement from the culture after having been aggressive. Finally, such a system of influence can create a mindset filled with fixed attitudes about bullies and victims. For example, one result of learned aggressive behavior is the belief that those who are weaker or victimized deserve to be victims, resulting in "blaming the victim for being a victim" (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004, p. 260). Such findings suggest that student attitudes are predictive of bullying and, by extension, will lead to the emergence of an attitude among all students that appeases, if not condones, bullying.

Student Construal of Bullying

Research has shown that one complication in studying student attitudes regarding bullying is that student construal of bullying changes over time (Monks & Smith, 2006). At young ages, for example, children can only distinguish between aggressive and nonaggressive behavior, so they consider fighting a type of bullying. This over-inclusive view of bullying tends to ultimately limit the definition of bullying by focusing too much on physical aggression alone (Monks & Smith, 2006). By contrast, adolescents hold a more differentiated view of bullying; that is, they are able to distinguish between the various forms of bullying (Monks & Smith, 2006). Another differentiation that emerges in bullying research is the awareness of the extent to which others are involved in bullying. More and more researchers view bullying as a group process, including the ringleader bully, assistants who help the ringleader bully, defenders who stand up for the victim, reinforcers who reinforce the bullying behavior by laughing or cheering, and outsiders who stay out of the situation (Monks & Smith, 2006). Monks and Smith (2006) argue that one's construal of bullying may result from one's exposure to bullying, what

role one played in a group bullying process, and whether or not one was involved in supporting or defending against the bully. In assessing why student construal of bullying should change over time, Monks and Smith argue that the cause for such a change may be repeated exposure to bullying over time. Also, girls and boys may develop different attitudes about and perceptions of bullying based on their differential experience of bullying. At the same time, as children get older, they are able to maneuver through complex relationships with a better understanding of behaviors (Monks & Smith, 2006).

The degree to which students may develop more differentiated construals of bullying is also limited by the definitions held by parents and teachers of bullying. One study, unfortunately, found that most parents and teachers continue to focus on physical aggression as the hallmark of bullying and downplay the negative impact of indirect bullying (Monks & Smith, 2006). Like younger children, few parents mention the serial or repeated nature of bullying as part of their understanding of bullying. Monks and Smith (2006) tried to determine if the experience of bullying leads to a greater degree of differentiation toward a definition of bullying. Interestingly, they found that, by and large, the altered views are more generally related to an individual's cognitive development rather than to specific experience with bullying-related episodes (Monks & Smith, 2006). Moreover, additional research has found that these broad cognitive developmental changes hold across most cultures (Naylor et al., 2006).

In contrast to this finding, Naylor et al. (2006) found that, when defining bullying, children typically focus on the more obvious forms of bullying such as direct verbal and physical abuse and overlook indirect aggression and the repetitive and intentional aspects

of bullying. Studies of this discrepancy between theory and practice have found that fewer than 20% of students asked to define bullying ever mention psychological and repetitive aspects of bullying. Additional research has found that students tend to underplay the importance of an imbalance of power in their conceptions of bullying behavior (Naylor et al., 2006). Naylor et al. also explored the extent to which bullying induces fear in victims, and thus the need for researchers to consider not only the bully's behavior but also the target's thoughts and feelings about that behavior.

Teacher Attitudes about Bullying

An important gap in the study of attitudes about bullying opens up when comparing student and teacher attitudes about bullying. Bradshaw, Sawyer, and O'Brennan (2007) found that many teachers are unaware of the seriousness of peer victimization in their school. Teachers in middle school are particularly ill-equipped to discover the more social forms of bullying that begin to develop in those years. In middle school, non-physical forms of bullying are more covert and consequently harder for teachers to detect (Bradshaw et al., 2007). In one study, 13% of the staff believed that bullying is part of life that everyone has to go through (Bradshaw et al., 2007). More disturbingly, Bradshaw et al. found that staff were more likely to perceive bullies as both popular and feared, whereas students were more likely to perceive bullies as disliked.

Studies have indicated that adults are aware of only a small amount of the bullying behavior that takes place in schools (Naylor et al., 2006). To explain this phenomenon, researchers have argued that teachers and students have different perceptions and definitions of bullying (Naylor et al., 2006). In their study, Naylor et al.

(2006) found that too many teachers operate with very restricted conceptions of bullying, even though, in general, teachers tend to include social and serial aspects of bullying in their definitions. To explain this limited view, they suggested that an overall school culture develops in which context bullying is defined in a limited fashion.

In a school system where the saying "boys will be boys" is supported as a philosophy, the limited view of bullying may persist. Indeed, Naylor et al. (2006) found two remarkable aspects of student attitudes about bullying, indicating the strength of school culture. Girls, though they are known to participate in much more indirect forms of bullying, nonetheless paralleled boys in defining bullying as primarily consisting of acts of physical aggression. In the same vein, targets of bullying and nontargets of bullying tend to have similar beliefs about what constitutes bullying. Girls, however, report believing that bullying causes physical and/or psychological hurt or harm more often than boys (Naylor et al., 2006). Nonetheless, as students age their construal of bullying expands to acknowledge the power and social aspects of bullying.

The Ecology of Bullying

The importance of Naylor et al.'s (2006) finding is that it places the group above the individual in establishing attitudes about student bullying. According to the ecological systematic framework, "bullying does not reside solely with the child who bullies or who is victimized" but rather "bullying unfolds in the social context of the peer group, the classroom, the school, the family and the larger community" (Mishna et al., 2005, p. 719). That is, "because people are embedded in social and environmental contexts, multiple factors invariably influence social behavioral patterns (Mishna et al., 2005, p.

719). Attitudes about bullying therefore develop socially, and any weakness in attitudes must be ascribed to some dynamic in the social ecology of the bully.

Mishna et al. (2005) specifically examined the attitudes of teachers about bullying. It was found that though the teachers had a clear definition of bullying, which included the social and power aspects of bullying as well as the intent of the bully to harm others, most teachers did not mention the repetitive aspect of bullying. In other words, when defining bullying, most teachers failed to consider the important dynamic of repetitiveness in bullying. A closer examination of the issue revealed that teachers underappreciated the serial or repetitive nature of bullying because they did not witness the behaviors (Mishna et al., 2005). Interestingly, Mishna et al. also found that teachers generally downplayed student attitudes toward bullying or students' subjective responses to bullying. Though teachers saw that a student was upset, they did not view the student's emotional state as having resulted from bullying, and in several cases the teachers believed their own perception while discounting children's perceptions as misperceiving the reality of the bullying (Mishna et al., 2005). Though such a response may be understandable given that teachers simply do not have time during the school day to pause and consider if such misbehavior is "normal" or bullying, and because many schools do not have clear guidelines regarding bullying, such responses still reflect a neglect of many bullying situations. Teachers have reportedly found responding to indirect bullying particularly problematic. Mishna et al. (2005) warn that "underestimating the harm caused by forms of bullying such as nonviolent victimization may lead to an inappropriate response, which can amount to further victimization" (p.

730). As a result, teachers should be educated to the devastating impact of repetitive behaviors on the student's physical, emotional and academic well-being (Mishna et al., 2005).

Reid et al. (2004) also examined teacher attitudes toward bullying, especially as they contributed to student attitudes. This study sought to examine why teachers tend to see physical events as bullying, and why they quite often fail to observe indirect acts of bullying (Reid et al., 2004). Studies have found that most students do not consider name-calling and spreading rumors to be bullying (Reid et al., 2004), a finding suggesting that teacher attitudes frame student attitudes. Female bullying may continue to be underestimated in schools because most female bullying occurs in an indirect manner.

Reporting Bullying

Another problem related to the nexus between teacher and student attitudes toward bullying is that many children do not report bullying at all. In one study, one half of all pupils who admitted to having been bullied in a private, anonymous questionnaire said that they had not told anyone about it, either at home or at school (Reid et al., 2004). At the middle-school level, students were much more likely to tell someone at home that they were being bullied, rather than their teachers. The reason why students fail to report bullying may be related to their bystander behavior as well. Studies have shown that most pupils failed to help someone being teased, as they fear repercussions from the bully (Reid et al., 2004). Many bystanders have reported feeling powerless in bullying situations, and many lack any strategy to report incidents. Because bystander weakness or

fear often can result in tolerance of bullying as part of a group norm, more research has been focused on targeting bystanders.

Bullies and Bystanders

The phenomenon of the bystander has greatly complicated the dynamic of support of bullying as a group norm. For example, although 90% of children report that it is unpleasant to watch bullying, a group of bystanders tends to stay around and watch the bullying behavior (Reid et al., 2004). One study found that many anxious or insecure students might be attracted to watching bullying (Reid et al., 2004). Some students might even be inclined to join in the bullying, especially if the bullying involved is physical and therefore arousing to some. As more and more students become part of the bystander crowd watching the bullying episode, research has shown that it becomes less likely that someone will step in to stop it. This is called the diffusion of responsibility effect, and it accounts for the fact that, as crowds grow, personal responsibility declines. The fact that the bully has skills in manipulating crowd response makes it still less likely that any bystander will intrude on the bullying episode (Reid et al., 2004).

The diffusion of responsibility effect is one of several group mechanisms discovered by Olweus in his classic study of bullies in the 1970s. Olweus found in his studies the bystander effect, or the mindset that can be found in a group of people who, through action or inaction, allow incidents to happen which, they would never have allowed happening if they were alone. He believed that this diffusion of responsibility also contributed to the negative group dynamic of bullying (Olweus, 2001, in Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). These probullying tendencies increase through age 15. In time,

students' normative beliefs or moral judgments regarding the acceptability or unacceptability of bullying behavior coalesce (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004, p. 247). Furthermore, boys are much more likely than girls to assist the bully or act as bystanders. One study found that boys who act as bystanders generally have self-esteem problems (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). This finding appears to be a more significant factor than contextual issues, which disproportionately influence girls. In their study on the linkage between attitudes and behaviors, Salmivalli & Voeten (2004) found that attitude-behavior links, although quite consistent for all grade levels and for both boys and girls, were rather modest. This finding is not surprising, since attitudes usually explain only up to 10% of variance in behavior (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). Salmivalli and Voeten's modest finding explains, at least in part, why children who think bullying is wrong remain bystanders or even support a bully nonetheless. Thus, group norms may regulate bullying-related behaviors through processes such as peer group pressure and conformity (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). As such, then, a student's individual attitudes may be overruled by prevailing social norms, and both normative beliefs and group-level norms may have unique effects on behavior (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). Because of this ongoing paradox, Salmivalli and Voeten (2004) argued that we still need a better understanding of social cognitive factors associated with different participant role behaviors related to bullying .

Salmivalli and Voeten (2004) also made an important distinction between normative beliefs and attitudes. They noted that the concept of attitude is a much more general construct, usually defined as general and enduring evaluation of a person, group,

or issue, not only based on beliefs but also containing emotional and behavioral components (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). However, in the literature on bullying, attitudes are often operationalized in a way that comes close to normative beliefs (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004).

Student Attitudes Versus Behavior

When interviewed away from the bullying episode, students espouse attitudes at odds with their behavior. At a distance, 50% of students are sympathetic to the victims and say that they would try and assist if able (Reid et al., 2004). Another study that videotaped bullying incidents found that bystanders spent most of their time (53.9%) watching the incident while only 25.4% of the time did they do something to discourage the bullying and assist the victim (Rigby & Johnson, 2006). One study showed that bystanders empathized with the victim, even though they did nothing to stop the episode. By and large, however, boys were less supportive of the victim than girls. All of these reported attitudes remain at odds with their tacitly supportive behavior during bullying. In reality, students may indicate support for bullying either passively (via not intervening, remaining friends with the bully, or gossiping about the incident) or actively (via providing verbal encouragement, holding the victim, or adopting the role of lookout) (Reid et al., 2004). However, many students report victim-sympathetic attitudes away from the scene, but their passivity during a bullying incident provides the bully with positive reinforcement, which in turn encourages the bully to continue his/her anti-social behavior and increases the likelihood of others joining the aggression (Reid et al., 2004).

In examining bystanders more closely, Rigby and Johnson (2006) examined several factors that might account for their behavior during bullying incidents. A sympathetic attitude toward victims in general was found to predict whether or not a bystander would respond to bullying. Another factor was self-efficacy, as outlined by social learning theory. According to this theory, "self-efficacy is the belief in one's ability to produce desired results by one's own actions" (Rigby & Johnson, 2006, p. 427). If one has a high degree of self-efficacy, then one has what is termed prosocial functioning. Bystanders with high self-efficacy would therefore be much more likely to intervene against bullying because they would expect that their actions could accomplish something positive. However, whereas one study found that teachers trained in dealing with bullying experienced improved self-efficacy, which encouraged them to intervene more often against bullying, no studies as yet have measured whether or not self-efficacy in bystanders actually causes them to intervene more against bullying. Rigby and Johnson found that, even though bystanders had positive attitudes toward the victim, the majority of students in this study did not indicate that they would act to support the victim. Rolider & Ochayon (2005) found similar results regarding the willingness of bystanders to intervene against bullying in a case study of bullying in Israel.

One cause for bystander and other tolerance for bullying is that bullies themselves often describe their actions as mere teasing. Nonetheless, research has demonstrated that most bullies are aware of the suffering caused to the victim; indeed, intent to do harm is one of the signal differences between bullying and other types of aggression (Baldry, 2005). That may be why bystanders either encourage the bully or do nothing about the

bullying. An Italian study found that in many cases such bystanders are simply bullies who have done their bullying elsewhere, and now stand by and watch bullying because they condone it. On the other hand, if the bystanders themselves have been victims of bullying, they may not be inclined to intervene directly against the bullying, but are much more likely to go to a teacher for help (Baldry, 2005).

The Group Dynamics of Bullying

As most instances of bullying are believed to take place in front of an audience (Tapper & Boulton, 2005), researchers have increasingly studied the group dynamics of bullying. Indeed, Tapper and Boulton (2005) found that 79% of bullying episodes occurred in the playground, and that in most cases peers showed support for the bully in group contexts. Ojala and Nesdale (2004) also examined bullying as a group process, as well as the degree to which peer influence played a role in bullying episodes. They framed their study in social identity theory, also called social categorization theory, which contends that "belonging to a social group or category provides its members with a sense of social identity which not only describes its members but also prescribes appropriate behavior" (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004, p. 23). According to Ojala & Nesdale, group-related behaviors such as ethnocentrism, in-group favoritism, intergroup differentiation, conformity to in-group norms, and a tendency to perceive oneself, in-group members, and out-group members in stereotypical terms all result from social identity theory. Group norms are an especially important construct, as they represent shared beliefs about the appropriate conduct for a group member and play a very important part in the construction of identity among group members (Ojala & Nesdale,

2004, p. 23). Previous research has found that children who tended to behave in either similar or supportive roles in bullying situations formed networks with each other (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004), reinforcing each others' behavior. Such mutual reinforcement is especially prevalent in groups such as street gangs in which hostile and aggressive behavior is the norm; that is, a subculture of violence develops with which one must identify. In gangs especially, violence is given legitimization as a lifestyle and often is used as a means of improving the group's status and power (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004). Of special concern in this line of research is that studies of groups of first-grade boys found that aggression becomes an acceptable way to respond to confrontation at a very early age.

Bullies and Victims

Group-oriented research has, surprisingly, found that bullies and victims may have more in common with each other than might be expected (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004). Studies have found that both bullies and victims tend to be in a rejected group and appear to represent the lower end of the scale in terms of status and popularity at the primary-school level (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004). According to social identity theory, bullies may choose their victims from within a similar group in order to differentiate themselves from the other, enhancing their own status (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004). Bullies only gain this sense of distinction in the minds of others in their groups; however, they believe that the bullying is somehow justified (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004).

Social learning theory has also been enlisted to counteract such group behavior and develop interventions that teach children positive role assignments and thus persuade

them to stop supporting bullies (Fast, Fanelli, & Salen, 2003). Role theory, with its concepts of role prescription and sanctions—two functions that explain how persons take on assigned roles, then alter their roles due to various social pressures—also assists researchers in finding ways to counteract the roles to which children fall prey in bullying groups (Fast et al., 2003). Studies have shown that positive role assignment interventions are successful in altering the roles that various students play in the context of a bullying episode (Fast et al., 2003). For the most part, programs designed to reduce bullying tend to work best at the elementary-school level; such programs become less successful when confronted with the tendency of young adults and teenagers to avoid reporting bullying or to abide by the rules of the culture of secrecy that often surrounds bullying (James et al., 2006).

Bystander behavior may also be "crucial to the discontinuation of bullying behavior" (McLaughlin, Arnold, & Boyd, 2005, p. 17). McLaughlin et al. (2005) found that many bystanders, especially those in their middle-school years, discovered that, if they stood up to the bully or in some way intervened against the bully, the bullying would stop (McLaughlin et al., 2005). Such knowledge was reinforced by the fact that these bystanders affirmed that their parents would intervene against bullying, and would expect them to do so too. These findings indicate a predilection among bystanders toward intervening.

The Impact of Witnessing Bullying

Nishina and Juvonen (2005) examined some of the intricacies involved in student reactions to being bullied or witnessing bullying. In particular, they examined the idea

that students who are exposed to conflict may experience compromised emotional well-being. Studies have shown that harassed students tend to be more socially withdrawn, feel more lonely and depressed, and have lower self-worth than children who are not harassed (Nishina & Juvonen, 2005). By and large, studies indicate that children suffer more from witnessing marital strife than from witnessing student harassment, but that both still impact their emotional state. A surprising side effect of witnessing the harassment of others is that a victim of harassment who had previously taken the bullying personally and thought it was only happening to him or her may come to see that peer victimization is a common event and thus lessen its personal nature (Nishina & Juvonen, 2005). This finding reflects a previous finding that, when individuals experience undesirable events, they regard them as less negative when they are common than when they are rare (Nishina & Juvonen, 2005). Also, observing that others are being harassed more severely than they are can help students minimize their own problems and cope better. Nonetheless, whereas victims and nonvictims who witness harassment both suffer anxious feelings, only victims directly experience humiliation. In neither case did experiencing or witnessing harassment change student attitudes about school (Nishina & Juvonen, 2005).

Victims

A good deal of research into student attitudes toward bullying has focused on the victim. It has been found that being a target of a bully has many negative consequences. One study found that being targeted left students feeling isolated, frustrated, and embarrassed (Wessler & De Andrade, 2006). Some students act out, whereas others learn

to hide identities for which they are targeted, such as religious affiliation, sexual orientation, or ethnicity (Wessler & De Andrade, 2006). With regard to degrading language, student attitudes appear to endorse the idea that "it is acceptable to use degrading words and slurs when their intent is benign—to be funny or clever" (Wessler & De Andrade, 2006, p. 525). However, research indicates that victims of degrading language do not make such a distinction. Following the emergence of African American rap culture into mainstream popularity, for example, it has become common practice for friends, both Black and White, to refer to one another using a racial slur that was previously unacceptable in U.S. culture. Many White students argue that it is acceptable to use this phrasing when addressing Black male students as a friendly way to refer to Black males (Wessler & De Andrade, 2006). However, Black students reported that the word, when used by a white student, is almost always viewed as degrading (Wessler & De Andrade, 2006). Thus, a disconnect exists between the impact of degrading language, slurs, and jokes and the intent of the student making the comment (Wessler & De Andrade, 2006). In the same manner as bystanders who do nothing when bullying occurs, too many students are similarly short-sighted in using words without an understanding of their hurtful and degrading impact (Wessler & De Andrade, 2006). This study therefore confirms another instance in which student attitudes toward negative social issues appear to fall short of a complete understanding of reality.

Victims of bullies have been the topic of intensive study because reports have indicated that bullying can lead to serious mental and physical problems (Kim, Koh, & Levinthal, 2005). The fact that victims of bullies tend to have more suicidal thoughts has

also raised concern (Kim et al., 2005). Of special concern is the fact that studies show that victims of bullies are reluctant to report being victimized (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). One theory explaining that phenomenon states that "chronic victimization might overwhelm children's resources, debilitating their coping mechanisms and damaging their adjustment to school" (Unnever & Cornell, 2004, p. 374). The experience of chronic bullying might also undermine the victim's belief that reporting the episodes to the authorities would result in corrective action. Unnever and Cornell (2004) enlist models of crime victim decision making, consisting of a rational choice framework based on the perceived benefits and costs of seeking help, in order to examine how victims of bullies report their victimization (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). In the general crime reporting literature, reporting is linked to the seriousness of the crime, whether or not the victim will be shamed or embarrassed by reporting, and whether or not the victim believes that the authorities will really help him or her (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). Overall, in this literature, male victims are much less likely to report being victimized than female victims, most likely due to the fact that stronger sanctions may exist in boys' peer groups against the expression of vulnerabilities (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). Older victims are also less willing to report crimes than younger victims, perhaps because they wish to be perceived as more independent and able to deal with life circumstances (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). Unnever and Cornell added to this general profile the variable of parental oversight. They argued that victims of bullies would be more likely to report bullying if their parents monitored their behavior more often, and would be less likely to report bullying if their parents parented in a coercive manner (Unnever & Cornell, 2004).

Unnever and Cornell also focused on the extent to which child-rearing techniques predict victim reporting. They base this claim on a number of studies that have shown that child-rearing techniques are related to the behavioral and social-cognitive characteristics that contribute to being bullied (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). In particular, studies have shown that victims of bullies tend to have been parented in intrusive, overprotective ways, with coercive, power-assertive parenting (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). Finally, Unnever and Cornell found that physical bullying is more likely to be reported than indirect or verbal bullying, which often goes unreported. The results of the study indicated that children do not report bullying in middle school because the culture of bullying prevents reporting, as most students in that culture do not believe that teachers will help them and many believe that bullying is part of life. Again, this interpretation enlists social learning theory, which argues that beliefs about social norms directly influence behavior (McConville & Cornell, 2003). That is, if the victim believes that the school tolerates bullying, he or she is less likely to come forward. Also, if victims believe that their teachers overlook bullying or do little to stop it, they will have little incentive to seek help from school authorities (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). School culture, then, influences reporting. By and large, research has found that middle-school students share a normative set of beliefs that constitute support for the culture of bullying (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). If victims share these normative beliefs, then they are also likely to think that nothing would be gained by reporting bullying.

Social Support and Victim Reporting

Davidson and Demaray (2007) investigated the issue of reporting further and found that, even when victims do not report bullying, their belief that they could report a bullying episode if they wished tended to decrease the negative impact of bullying. That is, "if one believes that support resources will be available in times of crisis, this belief improves that person's coping abilities to handle such a crisis" (Davidson & Demaray, 2007, p. 385). They built on Tardy's model of social support, which found that support from people in a social network (e.g., listening and providing time, information, or feedback), if given frequently and in a manner deemed important by the receiver, can help a person cope better with life problems (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). Perceived social support can also reduce the impact of a major stressor such as bullying. Studies have shown that social support in this manner could be used as a coping mechanism when the stress matches the type of support received (Davidson & Demaray, 2003). Social support may also serve as a buffer in victims' lives, and can even reduce the negative outcomes of bullying. The negative outcomes of victimization can therefore be neutralized, especially if the victim makes use of productive coping mechanisms such as problem solving, seeking social support, distancing, externalizing, and internalizing (Davidson & Demaray, 2003). In their study, Davison and Demaray found that parent support for females, and teacher, classmate, and school social support for males, were found to buffer victims from internalizing distress from bullying. By contrast, when the victims perceived less support from these parties, there was more internalizing of distress from bullying.

Another study also found that parental forms of discipline are an important factor when explaining reactions to peer victimization (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). Overall, victims were significantly less likely to report that they were bullied if their parents used coercive child-rearing techniques (Unnever & Cornell, 2004). By contrast, the type of bullying did not seem to influence reporting rates; however, the chronicity of bullying did. That is, as bullying became chronic and pervasive, the victim became much more likely to report it (Unnever & Cornell, 2004).

Student Attitudes toward Victims

A number of additional studies examined general student attitudes about victims of bullies, and whether or not developing more provictim attitudes in schools might curtail bullying. Researchers have made progress in this area. One study found that over 70% of most students believe that bullying is bad, and felt that they should act to intervene upon the bullying behavior (Baldry, 2004). However, there is still a high proportion of students who indicated that they could understand why some children enjoy bullying and thought that kids should stand up for themselves (Baldry, 2004). Such attitudes continue to subtly reinforce the idea that bullies are brave and to be admired, and that victims somehow deserve what they get from them. This attitude has not changed since Olweus discovered in 1978 that "even if children say they do not like peers who bully, they might be positively impressed by them because they are perceived as brave, strong and self-confident" (Baldry, 2004, p. 585). Such ideas may have originated in the deep-seated, macho stereotypes perpetuated in Western societies, where aggression is tolerated and often encouraged and submission is seen as a weakness, especially for

boys (Baldry, 2004). Thus, whereas more students are currently expressing provictim attitudes, many continue to hold deep-seated, tacitly probully attitudes that inhibit them from actively intervening against the culture of bullying (Baldry, 2004).

Student Attitudes toward Victims and Reporting Behavior

Finally, Brown et al. (2005) found that the specific student response to a bullying incident has bearing upon reporting. Brown et al. found that children who fight back when bullied also tend to watch or join in when others are bullied. This practice reinforces the finding, described earlier, that many so-called bystanders are also bullies in other contexts. However, children who talk to the bully when personally bullied are more inclined to help other bully victims (Brown et al., 2005). Also, children who tell when they are bullied usually tell when others are bullied (Brown et al., 2005). On the basis of these findings, Brown et al. concluded that there are tellers and fighters (or joiners) in bullying situations. Whereas the former believe telling authorities and having authorities deal with bullying is the best way to report bullying, the latter believe that direct discipline is the best way to stop bullying. As a result of these findings, Brown et al. argued that bullying and victimization do not seem to be exclusive categories but points on a continuum of experience and that there is a category of bullies, called victim-bullies, who suffer the most from bullying. Brown et al. reported that victim-bullies (i.e., those who bully and are also bullied by others) are more fearful of coming to school than victims in any other group. Such fears may result from their concerns about retaliation, as they usually bullied victims who are also bullies. These bullies in particular seem to be

trapped in their behavior and do not know how to stop bullying from occurring (Brown et al., 2005).

In general, then, social learning theory, as well as social identity theory, has broadened the arena of bully studies. Studies now focus on student attitudes or norms as they pervade a group culture of bullies, victims, assistants, bystanders, and even other classifications of bullies such as victim-bullies. The literature on group-based student attitudes toward bullying provided some indication of a role for family dynamics. Baldry (2005), for example, found that victims of bullies were more likely to have been raised by coercive parents, and are less likely to report bullying. The group nature of bullying further suggests a parallel to family dynamics, raising an important question: to what extent do various family variables, from family size and composition to ordinal birth order, impact student attitudes about bullying, whether the student involved is bully, victim, bystander, or bully-victim?

Family Variables and Student Attitudes toward Bullying

Family therapy was originally developed to counteract the individual-focused nature of psychoanalysis, and to consider the mental health of persons in the context of their relationships with family members. Over time, as a relational perspective has become more dominant in other areas of psychology, family and individual therapy appear to be converging (Flaskas, 2005). The concept of the self, for example, is now more commonly studied in the context of a social or relational ecology. For example, Cooley's classic concept of the looking-glass self posits that "how others see the individual is reflected in that individual" (Cooley, 1902, in Christie-Mizell, 2003, p. 238).

In a study of why some children are aggressive, symbolic interaction theory has led to examining self-concept as the root of the problem. As a result, Christie-Mizell (2003) stated that a preponderance of the empirical research assessing the impact of positive self-concept on bullying has found an inverse relationship. Though Olweus did not find this to be true in his original studies of bullying, some researchers have found that low self-concept robustly predicts higher levels of bullying (Christie-Mizell, 2003). Other studies have also shown that children with positive self-concept are less likely to engage in delinquent behavior or be instigators of peer conflict (Christie-Mizell, 2003). With regard to family life, parental discord and other aspects of the parent-child relationship all impact self-concept. Because the family is the primary agent of socialization, many scholars believe that parenting styles along with violence and discord between parents are the chief causes of child behavior problems (Christie-Mizell, 2003). In the study undertaken by Christie-Mizell (2003), it was found that "bullying behavior is significantly tied to bullying behavior" and that "treatment or efforts that seek to modify or prevent bullying would do well to pay specific attention to the child's self-concept and interparental discord" (p. 246). Treatment may also involve delving into past parental injuries to determine how adult children continue to work through past problems in the here-and-now of their current family (Kozlowska, 2007). If the family members respond to each other in automatic ways, termed emotional reactivity, and also differentiate poorly between feelings and thoughts of different family members, that family needs to be helped to function better (Kozlowska, 2007). In addition, attachment theory has posited that children develop scripts regarding their interactions with others based on how

they first interacted with their parents. For example, when parents act in an inconsistent manner, children do not know what their parents will do, so they cannot organize their behavior using temporal information (Kozlowska, 2007). As a result, children are more likely to make use of exaggerated affective displays that function to increase parental predictability and to elicit parental care (Kozlowska, 2007). In many different ways, then, familial dynamics determine how a person comes to respond to the world.

Families and Antisocial Behavior

An area of particular concern to family studies is how antisocial behavior develops in children (Farrington, 2005). Childhood is of great interest to research because there is considerable continuity in antisocial behavior from childhood to adolescence and adulthood (Farrington, 2005). Studies have suggested that impulsiveness or hyperactivity in a child predicts later antisocial behavior (Farrington, 2005). One study found that hyperactive and restless 11- to 13-year-olds were more likely to be arrested for violence at age 22 (Farrington, 2005). Factors that have been found to contribute to childhood delinquency include poor parental supervision, poor maternal supervision, and inconsistent parenting. By far, it appears that poor parental supervision is the strongest and most replicable predictor of delinquency (Farrington, 2005). In addition, child abuse has been found to translate into violent behavior. Moreover, there seems to be significant intergenerational transmission of aggressive and violent behavior from parents to children (Farrington, 2005). The dynamic by which this occurs includes the fact that risk factors have intergenerational continuities between antisocial persons which can be reinforced over time. Genetic mechanisms, as well as the act of labeling of certain families as

criminal, may reinforce such transmission. Overall, however, children who witness interparental violence also become delinquent as adolescents. With regard to the outcomes of such violence, single-parent families tend to engender delinquents, especially when the parent is a never-married single woman (Farrington, 2005). Research suggests that reduced expression of affection among mothers also contributes to delinquency among boys. The reason for such an impact has been explained variously as the result of a trauma, as a separation in a life-course, or as a selection of risk factors within the family. In reviewing these theories as applied to single parent homes, however, the Cambridge Study found that the most telling factor was "the post-disruption trajectory," or the behaviors that are elicited after a disruption in the home environment (Farrington, 2005, p. 182). Life-course theory seems to best explain, for example, why it is that boys who stay with their fathers or foster parents are more likely to be delinquent (Farrington, 2005). Finally, antisocial parents tend to produce antisocial children, and the presence of drug or alcohol problems among parents also predicts delinquent or negative behaviors in children (Farrington, 2005).

Families and Delinquency

Many studies have indicated that families have a major impact on whether or not a child becomes a delinquent or bully (Adkins, 2003; Begue & Roche, 2005; Bredin & Rodney, 2002; Christie-Mizell, 2003; Cosentino, 2004; Dallos, 2004; Eriksen & Jensen, 2006; Farrington, 2005; Fitness, 2005; Flaskas, 2005; Harris, 2001; Kozlowska, 2007; Lyngstad & Skirbekk, 2006; Mancillas, 2006; Young, 2007). In particular, family size has recently been given more consideration. One study conducted in the United Kingdom

in 1979 found that boys were more likely to be delinquents if they came from families containing four or more children. Another study in Nottingham confirmed that "family size was one of the most important predictors of delinquency" (Farrington, 2005, p. 183). In the Cambridge study, a boy with more than three siblings by his 10th birthday was twice as likely to become a delinquent. Large family size predicted not only delinquency, but also the number of convictions for crime incurred by a family over time. These findings have caused other researchers to explore additional family factors, including birth order, as contributors to delinquency or bullying.

Birth Order and Character

As a formative force for personality, birth order has both a proverbial and a real profile. On the proverbial level, stereotypes abound—only children are spoiled, oldest children always get their way, middle children are overshadowed and confused, and youngest children are aggressive for attention. Thus, the oldest children are the great achievers; they display organizational skills and tend to be good at solving problems (Cosentino, 2004, Sulloway, 1996). By contrast, middle children are a mystery; they appear to have been left out of the family photo album, so they often clown around in order to get attention. They can also be temperamental, spoiled, and impatient (Cosentino, 2004). The babies of the family are often fun to be around and easy to talk to, work well with others, and tend to be the socialites of the family (Cosentino, 2004, Sulloway, 1996).

As theories of birth order and character have developed, some common understandings have been confirmed, and others have been disputed. Some models have

been developed to explain how ordinal position affects personality. For example, Adler developed the notion of "dethroning," in which the oldest child, confronted with the existence of a second child, responds to the trauma by identifying himself as an authority with power over the second child (Adler, 1990, in Begue & Roche, 2005). Sulloway's *Born to Rebel* (1996) has been the catalyst of much new research on birth order. According to Sulloway, children in families act in an almost evolutionary way to develop a niche that will maximize the resources that they obtain from their parents (Sulloway, 1996). Whereas oldest children assume a conservative and dominant position to take advantage of their temporary superiority, younger children (i.e., later-borns) would approach the quest for a familial niche through the adoption of conflictual attitudes toward authority, a higher attraction to risk, and a more open-minded and humanistic vision of the world (Begue & Roche, 2005). Overall, then, firstborns do not achieve great things; it is the younger children who are less conformist and more adventurous (Begue & Roche, 2005).

Begue and Roche (2005) drew a parallel between Sulloway's (1996) profile of the later-born and possible delinquency. They argue that it is legitimate to expect that the rebellious tendencies present in later-borns increase their probabilities of law infraction and deviance toward their parents or institutions (Begue & Roche, 2005). As far back as Glueck's study of 1950, middle-born children have been more often identified as future delinquents. At the same time, other studies find no correlation between middle children and delinquency, meaning that moderating factors may explain the link between birth order and delinquency. Further studies determined that ordinal position does not

influence future delinquency so much as how parents respond toward first versus middle children. Parental control, which social control theory affirms is widely recognized as preventing delinquent conduct, is exercised with much more care among firstborns than later children. Higher levels of parental supervision of firstborn children also inhibit the development of delinquency.

Overall, the literature on parenting concurs that parental attention is different with each new child added to the family (Begue & Roche, 2005). Not only do parents give more time to their firstborn, but firstborn children are more exposed to adult models and to adult expectations and pressures (Begue & Roche, 2005). As a result of firmer parental control, firstborns tend to identify with their parents more, a finding reinforced by observations that the older child is frequently playing the role of parent surrogate to the younger ones (Begue & Roche, 2005). By contrast, middle and later children experience less discipline, and thus have less self-control and are less likely to identify with their parents. Indeed, in the criminological literature, middle children have been singled out as having the highest level of deviance, due to their ordinal position in the family (Begue & Roche, 2005). Also, according to the theory of power-control, as developed by Hagan in 1989, girls are less likely to be delinquent because they receive a much higher level of parental supervision. In a similar way, firstborn children are less likely to become delinquents than middle children because of levels of parental supervision. Thus, Begue & Roche (2005) argued that firstborn children are less involved in delinquency and bullying than middle children, and that a differential parental control of the children depending on their ordinal position may constitute a viable interpretation of this

phenomenon. This decline in parental supervision is even more pronounced in larger families. Thus, birth order appears to impact whether children become bullies or not; however, parental supervision mediates the impact of birth order on bullying.

Family Size and Delinquency

Eriksen & Jensen (2006) explored the link between families and delinquents from a related perspective. They noted that most offenders tend to live in large families and wondered how siblings influenced delinquency in the family unit. Studies have shown that a small number of families often account for a large proportion of officially convicted or self-reported offenders (Eriksen & Jensen, 2006). Eriksen & Jensen (2006) studied the possibility that siblings are likely to engage in similar offending behaviors and emulate and/or influence one another's involvement in delinquent behavior. Criminological studies have again supported this idea, as in one study "having a delinquent sibling helped predict chronic offending for London males through age 32" (Eriksen & Jensen, 2006, p. 547). In their study, Eriksen and Jensen (2006) found a strong correlation between older and younger siblings involvement in delinquency. Most importantly, however, it is the nature of the sibling relationship itself, not broader familial issues, that predicts similarity. One detail worth nothing with regard to birth order is that younger siblings who have delinquent parents and siblings may be especially likely to become delinquent, especially if they live in single-parent homes where supervision may be lacking (Eriksen & Jensen, 2006).

Birth Order and Success

Birth order studies have explored the influence of birth order on other aspects of life as well, adding to a literature in support of linking birth order and bullying. Marital success is believed to be influenced by birth order, with marriages between spouses of different birth order being more successful than, for example, a marriage of two firstborns (Lyngstad & Skirbekk, 2006). A marriage between a firstborn and an only child may suffer because such individuals may be more likely to develop certain personality traits, such as anxiety and ambition, and marriages between them may result in a higher conflict level (Lyngstad & Skirbekk, 2006). By contrast, the marriage of a firstborn and a later-born may settle into a leader-follower type of relationship, in which different levels of domination lead to marital peace. Some argue that career orientation is a function of birth order. One study indicated that first children tend to lean toward intellectual, analytic, and cognitive pursuits, whereas later-borns have more interest in both artistic and outdoor-related careers (Cosentino, 2004). These findings were attributed to the fact that parents are overprotective of oldest children, but tend to become more open and relaxed when parenting younger children (Cosentino, 2004).

The Only Child and Social Behavior

Supporting birth order study is the study of the only child. Since 1898, when G. Stanley Hall declared that "being an only child is a disease in itself" (Mancillas, 2006, p. 26), the only child has remain stereotyped as spoiled, selfish, lonely, and maladjusted. Negative stereotyping of only children continues today in many cultures around the world, even though studies have repeatedly indicated that stereotypical concerns are not

true and that, for the most part, only children are not distinguishable from their peers who have siblings (Mancillas, 2006). Regarding the persistence of stereotyping in spite of the facts, Herrera observed that, because people's beliefs in personal differences according to birth rank showed strong and consistent patterns, it is thus entirely possible that people's beliefs about birth rank differences may induce differences in parents' expectations for their own children and about other children in general (Herrera, in Mancillas, 2006). That is, even if the stereotype is not true, family members may have accepted the pervasive negative perception and thus begun to live according to the stereotype itself—a finding that again highlights the pertinence of attitudes with regard to societal role issues. Such findings may account for why "in only children of elementary school age … only children were less liked by classmates and that they were more likely to be victimized and aggressive in the peer group" (Mancillas, 2006, p. 272). Research has suggested that this may also be due to the fact that only children do not learn how to resolve sibling conflicts as well as other children. This may be because only children do not share these experiences; they are at a disadvantage when it comes to resolving conflict in the classroom. This finding indicates the importance of attitudes in framing the realities of only and oldest children, which may contribute to their roles in bullying incidents.

Sibling Relationships and Delinquency

Young (2007) argued that sibling relationships may be as important as, if not more important, than parent-child relationships in a family. Research has indicated that younger siblings are better at "reading the intentions of older siblings than their older siblings are" and as a result may better develop the capacity of mentalization, or the

"capacity to think about thinking and feeling, in ourselves and others" (Young, 2007, p. 23). Such findings suggest that younger siblings may be better able to combat contradictions between group thinking and individual views when confronted with bullying.

Birth Order and Parental Favoritism

Parental favoritism is another construct that has been studied with regard to its effect on self-esteem, and whether the effects are based on birth order (Adkins, 2003). Adkins (2003) enlisted social learning theory to focus on the idea that behavior is shaped by reinforcement in the form of rewards. Adkins argued that a child whose parents favor him or her less will exhibit positive behavior infrequently or will repeatedly exhibit the negative behaviors for which he or she is getting attention. How favoritism plays into birth order is an added issue, as "how parents perceive these positions and interact with the children in these positions may also differ" (Adkins, 2003, p. 9). Whereas the firstborn experiences sole care for a time and the last-born child may be spoiled, it is (again) the middle-born child who may perceive parental favoritism toward others. According to one study, 64% of all respondents believed that favoritism did exist in their families. Individuals who believe that they were not favored by parents were left with more intense fear and more frequent shame (Adkins, 2003). In addition, an adolescent who perceived favoritism was more likely to also experience depressive and angry feelings (Adkins, 2003). However, Adkins found that birth order does not seem to be related to self-esteem issues and that siblings of all ages and birth orders believe at some time that the other sibling is receiving more favorable attention from the parent.

However, whereas birth order and its linkage with self-esteem were not confirmed, it remains true that different birth order elicits different methods of socialization from parents towards their children (Bredin & Rodney, 2002). In one study, a mother was found to have interacted more with, and been more affectionate toward, her first rather than her to her second born, a finding that suggests that socialization and intelligence may be linked. However, when Bredin and Rodney (2002) sought to operationalize this possible lead by determining if birth order is reflected in academic achievement, the relationship between the birth order of the participant, the amount of parental attention received, and the participant's success in school was not significant enough to show a correlation between these variables.

Adding to the complexity of birth order studies is Adler's original dynamic view that sometimes children of certain birth order may compete with others and assume other birth order roles. Recent research has also shown that birth order dynamics are typically dominated by a sibling's interactions with his or her immediately older sibling. Thus, the second child must contend with the perfect oldest child, whereas the third-born must cope with the perfectionist second-born (Cosentino, 2004). Also, studies have found that, if births are at least five years apart, then each child in a dyad remains, in effect, an only child, and if the family breaks down, then gaps created by such turmoil can dismiss the birth order theories in relation to that particular family (Cosentino, 2004).

Birth Order and Family Values

Fitness (2005) further explored Sulloway's theory of birth order niches in a family to examine how such tactics offer explanations in the tendency to comply with family

values. In this scenario, again, “middleborns are considered more likely to rebel than responsible firstborns or indulged lastborns” (Fitness, 2005). Middle-borns are also more likely to complain that others receive favoritism, and they may be as likely to reject their family as their family is to reject them for rebelliousness (Fitness, 2005). Indeed, Sulloway found that, although 58% of firstborns and 62% of last-borns believed that they were the family favorite, only 31% of middle-borns reported that they had favored status (Sulloway, 1996, in Fitness, 2005, p. 18).

Adding to birth order complexity in constructed families with stepparents and stepchildren is the fact that humans on the whole tend to invest more in genetically related others than in non-related others (Fitness, 2005), placing stepchildren at risk of unequal treatment by parents. Still another dynamic relative to birth order is the construct of family scapegoats, the children who are treated as though they are irretrievably bad and blamed for all the tension and strife in the family (Fitness, 2005). Although extremely painful for the person being scapegoated, such behavior helps a family maintain levels of solidarity and cohesiveness (Fitness, 2005). Often threatened with eviction from the family, the scapegoated child is also more likely to be filled with anger and rage, and ends up living on the fringe of the family’s environment (Fitness, 2005). In one study, 80% of families acknowledged that there was a black sheep in the family; even though birth order does not often correlate with black sheep status, stepchildren often end up tagged as black sheep (Fitness, 2005). Indeed, “perceived difference was the most frequently cited reason for black sheep status,” with most black sheep reporting that they had been so designated because they looked different from or acted differently than other

members of the family (Fitness, 2005). Relevant to a discussion of delinquency, "71% of male black sheep earned their status via trouble-making, becoming involved in drugs and engaging in rebellious (sometimes criminal) behavior" (Fitness, 2005). As a result, black sheep are often treated with coldness or completely excluded from family life, and other family members make no effort to keep the relationship stable or healthy (Fitness, 2005). Overall, becoming either the scapegoat or black sheep of a family resulted in a reduced sense of competence and self-worth among individuals; those individuals also developed psychological issues with regard to attachment. Although Fitness (2005) did not directly link scapegoat or black sheep status with bullies, Fitness's implication was that middle-born children who perceive parental favoritism toward siblings may end up rebelling, being labeled as such, and resolving their anger in bullying.

The Argument against Birth Order

Going back to research by Ernst and Angst in Switzerland in the 1980s, research on adults has shown that birth order has little or no effect on adult personality (Harris, 2001). Studies have also shown that firstborns are not necessarily higher achievers in school, and later-borns are not more likely to rebel in childhood by underachieving in elementary school, or to rebel in adolescence by dropping out of high school (Harris, 2001). Moreover, Rodgers (2000) found that birth order does not correlate with IQ; therefore firstborns are not smarter, on the average, than their younger brothers and sisters (Harris, 2001). Such results place in doubt theories that birth order leads to certain kinds of behavior. Harris (2001) also doubted Patterson's (1982) claim that, if a child is mistreated in certain ways by parents, he or she will take his or her anger out on others in

defiant and aggressive behaviors. Finding no proof for such an outcome, Harris argued that all children code-switch, just as bilingual persons do, from the language of the home to the language of public life, and that children are alert to signals in their social context, knowing which behaviors are deemed appropriate and not appropriate (Harris, 2001, p. 11). As a result, they are able to reject behavior at home as irrelevant to the realities of other social contexts, and behave in different ways when outside the family context (Harris, 2001). As a result, the idea that behavior in the family translates to behavior in school, for example, is suspect.

Birth Order and Initiation in Antisocial Behavior

However, there is one area in which research continues to find that birth order can impact behavior outside the family: studies have found that "tobacco and drug use were more prevalent among laterborns" (Harris, 2001, p. 30). Another study found that younger siblings become sexually active at an earlier age than their older brothers and sisters (Harris, 2001). In reviewing those outcomes, however, Harris (2001) determined that the reason why younger siblings take up such adolescent activities earlier is either because they imitate their older siblings or because they are initiated into these habits by their older siblings, and thus (in either case) observe modeling from their older siblings so as to experience the temptation of adolescent life earlier (Harris, 2001). The same dynamic is at work in girls who mature physically sooner than other girls their own age; these girls begin to hang around with kids who are older than themselves (Harris, 2001), and thus are initiated into the behavior of teenage life earlier. Though these studies indicate, then, that birth order can have a direct impact on early involvement in problem

teenage behavior, the effect is enacted by sibling-to-sibling interaction, not child-to-parent interaction. Thus, even though birth order appears to have little or no effect on adult development, it does affect the age at which adolescents begin experimenting with things their parents do not want them doing (Harris, 2001).

In sum, birth order, although it exerts a powerful fascination over the storytelling in which families engage in terms of defining favorites and black sheep, in fact exerts no direct influence on the psychology, personality, intelligence, or ultimate achievement of children of different birth orders. Firstborns, middle-borns, and later-borns all achieve and fail more or less equally. The degree to which the parent-child relationship develops in the context of different birth order niches may, according to attachment theory, result in persons who are secure, insecure, or avoidant in their attachment relations with others; however, whether or not an insecurely attached person becomes a bully remains a question (Dallos, 2004). Whereas family therapists try to trace the transgenerational genogram by which a family passes down behaviors from generation to generation (e.g., when the "cycle of family violence" is discussed); the above studies have noted that fathers who bully tend to have sons who bully. Finally, more pragmatic evidence has been found to support the idea that, if a person has older siblings, then he or she is much more likely to be introduced to teenage problems at an earlier age. According to this mechanism, combined with the above-noted idea that siblings of similar age tend to imitate each other, birth order presents itself as a more pragmatic Petri dish for the emergence of bullies.

Birth order also parallels the manner in which various students position themselves in the group context of bullying. By presumption of birth order studies, the bully is most likely to be the rebellious middle-born child, whereas his or her assistants, it stands to reason, would be later-born followers. Perhaps bystanders come from the ranks of later-born children, unused to challenging the hegemony of an older child. The rest of the student body, aware of and gossiping about bullies, might also fall into the role of later-born children. One would expect, finally, that firstborns among the student body would have already developed attitudes against bullying, and that they would be more likely to stand up to and report bullying. However provocative such parallels between family and school groups involved in bullying may be, the research has not yet made a concrete case for the theory that birth order in the context of family size leads to particular attitudes and behaviors among students in bullying episodes, either as bullies, assistants, or bystanders (Dallos, 2004).

Conclusion

This literature review has explored the issue of school bullying in middle school to determine the role that student attitudes play in supporting or preventing bullying (Baldry, 2004; Brown et al., 2005; Demaray & Malecki, 2003; Eisenberg & Aalsma, 2005; Fitzpatrick et al., 2007; Frisen et al., 2007; Monks & Smith, 2006; Naylor et al., 2006; Nickel et al., 2006; Pellegrini & Long, 2002; Peskin et al., 2006; Reid et al., 2004; Rigby & Johnson, 2006). In general, the literature has found that student attitudes in a group context are instrumental in keeping the culture of bullying alive in schools. If teachers are unaware of the accepted definition of bullying today and do not consider

indirect or relational bullying to be bullying, then they merely reinforce student tendencies not to report bullying (Baldry, 2005; Bradshaw et al., 2007; Davidson & Demaray, 2007; Fast et al., 2003; James et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2005; McConville & Cornell, 2003; Mishna et al., 2005; Monks & Smith, 2006; Naylor et al., 2006; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004; Nishina & Juvonen, 2005; Ojala & Nesdale, 2004; Reid et al., 2004; Rigby & Johnson, 2006; Rolider & Ochayon, 2005 ; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004; Tapper & Boulton, 2005; Unnever & Cornell, 2004; Wessler & De Andrade, 2006). A serious problem in the literature is that, whereas more and more students are speaking out against bullying when interviewed individually and know that bullying is wrong, many students still balk at challenging a bully in an actual group situation in school, and may even tacitly acknowledge the power and daring of the bully. Thus, at present, bully culture retains a stronghold over the minds of middle-school students, in particular, as a group, even though many students privately acknowledge that bullying must stop.

This literature review also examined the etiology of bullying with a special focus on the family. By and large, the criminological literature linking family life and delinquency has moved toward considering the issue of bullying. However, family researchers are finding that it is quite difficult to determine which factors lead one to become a bully, or to tolerate bullies. As a result, recent literature exploring the possibility that family size and birth order may contribute to the emergence of bullies and account for persistent attitudes about bullies has been taken into consideration. Birth order has been studied insofar as it is believed to differentiate children according to intelligence, achievement, bravery, skill, and emotional stability (Adkins, 2003; Begue &

Roche, 2005; Bredin & Rodney, 2002; Christie-Mizell, 2003; Cosentino, 2004; Dallos, 2004; Eriksen & Jensen, 2006; Farrington, 2005; Fitness, 2005; Flaskas, 2005; Harris, 2001; Kozlowska, 2007; Lyngstad & Skirbekk, 2006; Mancillas, 2006; Young, 2007). Family size has also been considered in light of studies that have found that most delinquents come from large families. No study, however, has directly linked birth order with bullying, or even with being a bystander. Indeed, the literature at present seems to have turned away from birth order as an explanation for adolescent behavior, except when an older sibling is responsible for introducing a younger sibling to teenage problem behaviors at a too-early age, which may or may not set them upon a path of bullying. At present, however, whereas the study of the group dynamic of bullying leaves a strong inference of relational role-playing related to family life, no clear connection exists, in the literature, linking birth order and bullying. Chapter 3 presents the methods, design and analysis used his study.

Chapter 3: Research Method

The purpose of this quantitative study was to determine the self-reported behaviors associated with school bullying from a sample of seventh-grade middle school students. Specifically, the study will examine archival data to determine the relationships that exist between self-reported middle-school bullies and self-reported victims with regard to the following demographic factors: family size, birth order, and family composition. The existence of such relationships can be vital information for professionals to use as a way to understand school-age bullying and predictors of bullying behavior.

Research Design and Approach

Bullying has recently become a major issue facing all aspects of society, from schools to the workplace. Despite awareness of the nature and extent of the problem as well as various efforts to eradicate it, bullying has not been studied in terms of its relationship to family variables. Interestingly, family factors have been linked to increased delinquency, violence, and antisocial behaviors generally, but a connection, if any, to the specific phenomenon of bullying is absent in the research (Stevens & De Bourdeaudhuij, 2001, 2002). A significant need exists for a comprehensive definition of bullying that describes relationships between bullying and family factors such as family size, birth order, and composition.

This quantitative study uses a survey research design to determine the extent to which self-reported bullying behavior by seventh-grade middle school students is related to family size, birth order, and family composition. The value of survey research is that it

will allow the researcher to ask many children what they are thinking, feeling, or doing in relation to the variables associated with bullying or being a victim of bullying (Booth, Colomb, & Williams, 2003; Mitchell & Jolley, 2004). Survey research is generally easily distributed to large numbers of participants, allows for their anonymity, and tends to not take an exorbitant amount of time. Furthermore, survey research is a nonexperimental design that allows evaluation of the proposed hypothesis, as well as the ability to generalize the results to specific groups (Mitchell & Jolley, 2004). This study will analyze archival data from a bully and victim survey given to middle-school students in January 2009.

The purposes of the study are (a) to determine the self-reported engagement in school bullying and victimization of a sample of seventh-grade middle school students; (b) to test the hypothesis that relationships exist between measures of family size, birth order, and family composition and students' reports of bullying and victimization in middle school; and (c) to provide the data and information so that professionals can better understand school-age bullying and victimization and their possible relationship to family size, birth order, and family composition. Additionally, descriptive statistics generated from survey responses are offered to provide a simple summary about the sample with regard to bullying and victimization behavior. For instances, findings reported include the percentages of girls and boys involved in bullying, percentages of boys and girls who self-identified as being a victim of bullying behavior, percentages of girls and boys who felt afraid of being bullied, and percentages of students who responded that they have attempted to help a bullied student.

From this study, four important research questions were answered. First, how strong is the relationship between the combined set of family demographics (family size, birth order, family composition) and the bully subscale score; and, second, are some predictors much more important than others in explaining the variance in bully subscale score? Third, how strong is the relationship between the combined set of family demographics (family size, birth order, family composition) and victim subscale score; and, fourth, are some predictors much more important than others in explaining the variance in victim subscale score?

To answer the research questions, four null hypotheses were tested.

Null Hypothesis 1: In a standard multiple regression (i.e., all predictors entered at once), the set of family demographics will not significantly predict bully subscale scores ($R = 0$ at alpha level of .05).

Null Hypothesis 2: From a standard multiple regression, the unique effects (i.e., part correlations) of each family demographic in predicting bully subscale score will be equal; that is, all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations will be non-significant ($p > .05$).

Null Hypothesis 3: In a standard multiple regression (i.e., all predictors entered at once), the set of family demographics will not significantly predict victim subscale scores ($R = 0$ at alpha level of .05).

Null Hypothesis 4: From a standard multiple regression, the unique effects (i.e., part correlations) of each family demographic in predicting victim subscale score will be

equal; that is, all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations will be non-significant ($p > .05$).

Setting and Sample

The population for this study includes seventh-grade students who attended a middle school in Butte, Montana beginning in August 2008. The projected number of enrollees was 315 students between 12 and 14 years in age.

East Middle School is the largest public middle school in southwest Montana and the only public middle school in Butte. It receives students from six feeder elementary schools. According to data from the 2006-2007 school year, East Middle School was the third-largest middle school in the state of Montana. The ethnic composition of East Middle School's 651 students is 90% Caucasian, 6% American Indian or Alaskan Native, 3% Hispanic or Latino, 0.5% Asian American, and 0.5% Black or African American. Thirty-nine percent of students at East Middle School receive free lunches.

Instrumentation and Materials

This study uses the results of the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (R-OBVQ) (Olweus, 1996) given to a middle-school student sample January 2009. A copy of the survey can be found in Appendix D. The R-OBVQ, Senior Version (Olweus, 1996) is a 40-item self-report inventory designed to measure forms of bullying and victimization behaviors of students in Grades 6 through 10. Behaviors measured by this questionnaire include exposure to physical bullying (e.g., " I was hit, kicked, pushed, and shoved around, or locked indoors"), sexual bullying (e.g., "I was threatened or forced to do things I did not want to do"),

and verbal forms of direct and indirect bullying and harassment (e.g., “Other students told lies or spread rumors about me and tried to make others dislike me”); various forms of bullying other students (e.g., “I called other students mean names and made fun of or teased them in a hurtful way”); the location where the bullying occurs (e.g., “I have been bullied in one or more of the following places: on the playground; in the hallways, etc.”); pro-bully and pro-victim attitudes (e.g., “When you see a student your age being bullied at school, what do you think or feel?”); and the extent to which the social environment (teachers, peers, and parents) is informed about and react to the bullying (e.g., “Have you told anyone that you have been bullied in the past couple of months?”) (Olweus, 1996). The questionnaire (see Table 1 for specific questions) utilizes Likert-scaled items and a multiple-choice scoring format that provides data at the ordinal level. Questionnaire results include the creation of two subscales: the bully subscale and the victim subscale. The bully subscale is a composite of items asked in Questions 25 through 33; the victim subscale is a composite of items asked in questions 5 through 13. Each question allows five response options, and each option is coded from 1 to 5. Bully subscores and victim subscores are computed by summing across the specific 10 items, creating scores with a possible range of 10 to 50. Higher scores indicate more bullying behavior (for the bully subscore) and more victimization (for the victim subscore) Additionally, scores on the two subscales are used to derive four categories of bullying behavior: (a) bullies, (b) victims, (c) bully-victims, and (d) neither a bully or a victim. Those respondents who score at or above the mean on the bully subscale are identified as

bullies. Those who score at or above the mean on the victim subscale are identified as victims. Any students who score at or above the mean on both subscales are labeled as bully-victims. Finally, students who do not score at or above the mean on either subscale are categorized as neither. This study will report the numbers of students identified in each of these categories and will analyze students' subscores in relation to family variables of interest.

The format of the R-OBVQ also allows schools to include their own subsets of school specific questions. East Middle School included questions on its forms to measure family factors. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Appendix D. The added questions are: "Which of the following best describes the adults living in your household?" (e.g., my mother only, my mother and stepfather); "How many of each of the following live in your household?" (e.g., number of brothers, number of stepsisters), and "Put an X on the line that correctly tells us about when you were born in the order of your family" (e.g., put an X next to the space for the firstborn child if you were the firstborn).

The R-OBVQ has been the most widely used and adapted questionnaire for measuring aspects of bullying and victimization variables (Lee, Cornell, & Cole, 2001;Olweus, 1994; Solberg & Olweus, 2003). Normative data were obtained by administering the questionnaire to a sample of 130,000 students between 8 and 16 years of age from Norway, the United States, and Britain. The R-OBVQ has proven to be an effective tool to evaluate large samples at a low cost, to improve validity

through anonymity, and to provide firsthand information generated by student self-report.

The R-OBVQ has been analyzed for internal consistency and test-retest reliability utilizing representative samples of more than 5,000 students (Genta, Menesini, Fonzi, Costabile, & Smith, 1996; Kyriakides, Laloyirou, & Lindsay, 2006; Olweus,1997). Cronbach's alpha has been reported to range from .80 to .90 for both R-OBVQ subscales of (a) bullying others and (b) being victimized (Kyriakides et al., 2006). Studies have provided varying information regarding the validity of the R-OBVQ questionnaire. In studies investigating the construct validity of the variable "being bullied," a positive association has been found between the degree or frequency of being bullied and variables such as depressed mood, lower self-esteem, and isolation (Solberg & Olweus, 2003). Further construct validity has also been supported in a study that measured bullying behavior and the degree of antisocial behaviors (Bendixen & Olweus, 1999).

Few studies have presented results on criterion-related validity (Lee, Cornell, & Cole, 2001). However, Solberg et al. (2003) presented data suggesting that the two subscales of being bullied and bullying others correlate positively with reliable peer ratings on related dimensions. Additionally, other studies have proved weak correlations (r=.12) between self-reported bullying behaviors and peer-nominated bullying behaviors and a moderate correlation ($r = .42$, $p < .05$) between self-reported victimization and peer-nominated victimization (Lee et al., 2001).

Data Collection and Analysis

For this study, archival data from East Middle School's administration of the R-OBVQ on January 14, 2009, have been used. A Data Use Agreement was signed before data collection began. It was projected that 90% of seventh-graders would complete the survey. This projection was assumed from a similar data collection effort the previous year, in which 95% of the students completed the survey. Per the R-OVBQ scales, results were calculated to analyze two subscale scores, namely bullying behavior and victimization.

A 90% completion rate would result in a sample size of about 280 students. This size is more than adequate for examining the effect of individual predictors in a multiple regression. Following the power analysis formula in Green (1991), 145 participants would be needed to detect medium effect sizes (partial-r^2 = .07) for each of the three predictors at power of .80 and alpha at .05. With the anticipated 280 participants, much smaller effect sizes (as low as partial-r^2 = .02) would be detectable.

Due to substantiated concerns of bullying behavior among their students, the East Middle School administration began implementing the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program during the 2007-2008 school year. The program's official kickoff date was in January 2008. To date, administrators, teachers, and interested parents have been provided with information on Olweus's model, resources, and tools to allow the schools to prevent bullying as well as to improve the school climate. Core components of the program implemented since January 2008 have included (a) forming a Bully Prevention Coordinating Committee, (b) training committee members and staff, (c) developing a

coordinated system of supervision, (d) adopting schoolwide rules, and (e) garnering the support of parents.

The R-OBVQ had not yet been given to the new seventh-graders prior to administration of the survey used in the present study. These students had not yet received any antibullying instruction, either, other than perhaps learning about the program from older students or from parents. Therefore, it was anticipated that students' responses would not be swayed by the significant antibullying messages previously shared with students at East Middle School.

Students' responses to the R-OBVQ were scored by creating a spreadsheet and utilizing SSPS software to compute composite scores across all relevant items. Descriptive statistics were computed for four groups identified from the R-OBVQ subscale scores: (a) those students who are victims of bullying behavior, (b) those students who are bullies, (c) those students who are both bullies and victims, and (d) those who are neither. The percentages of students identified in each group have been reported to provide a full description of the sample. Additionally, two specific subscale scores were analyzed using SSPS along with the responses to the demographic questions asked with the questionnaire. Specific analyses are discussed below in conjunction with each hypothesis.

Null Hypothesis 1: In a standard multiple regression (i.e., all predictors entered at once), the set of family demographics will not significantly predict bully subscale scores ($R = 0$ at alpha level of .05).

To test this hypothesis, a multiple regression was conducted to determine if bullying subscale scores can be significantly predicted by the combined effect of family size, placement in birth order, and family composition (i.e., $R \neq 0$, $p < .05$).

Null Hypothesis 2: From a standard multiple regression, the unique effects (i.e., part correlations) of each family demographic in predicting bully subscale score will be equal; that is, all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations will be non-significant ($p > .05$).

To test this hypothesis, a multiple regression was be conducted to determine if bullying subscale scores can be significantly predicted by the unique effects of family size, placement in birth order, and family composition, where all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations are non-significant ($p > .05$).

Null Hypothesis 3: In a standard multiple regression (i.e., all predictors entered at once), the set of family demographics will not significantly predict victim subscale scores ($R = 0$ at alpha level of .05).

To test this hypothesis, a multiple regression was conducted to determine if victim subscale scores can be significantly predicted by the combined effect of family size, placement in birth order, and family composition (i.e., $R \neq 0$, $p < .05$).

Null Hypothesis 4: From a standard multiple regression, the unique effects (i.e., part correlations) of each family demographic in predicting victim subscale score will be equal; that is, all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations will be non-significant ($p > .05$).

To test this hypothesis, a multiple regression was conducted to determine if victim subscale scores can be significantly predicted by the unique effects of family size, placement in birth order, and family composition, where all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations are non-significant ($p > .05$).

Protection of Participants

To ensure that the moral and ethical rights of the research participants were adhered to, all relevant legal and professional requirements, as well as agreed-upon standards for good research practice, were observed. First, all research activities followed the requirements set forth by the American Psychological Association and the Walden University Institutional Review Board (IRB), whose mission is to assure that all ethical guidelines are followed. The university IRB approved this project before any data were collected for it (approval #06-25-09-0101190). Second, all participants and their parents or guardians were informed about the nature of the study and signed releases; moreover, students were assured that they could stop answering questions at any time if they felt uncomfortable. The aforementioned tasks were carried out by the school staff. Anonymity was ensured because no names were requested on the R-OBVQ or the demographics questionnaire. Finally, the school superintendent signed a Data Use Agreement authorizing access to a Limited Data Set ("LDS") for use in research in accord with HIPAA and FERPA regulations. Chapter 4 reveals an analysis if data.

Chapter 4: Data Analysis

This study examined the relationships that exist between reported middle-school bullying and family factors, such as family size, family composition, and birth order. Through the analysis of archival survey data from middle-school students who completed a standardized bullying questionnaire, the study sought to clarify bullying behaviors and their possible antecedents by examining these relationships using multiple regression analysis. The study also examined the relationships that exist between experiencing middle-school bullying and family factors.

Summary of Demographic Data

Frequencies and percents for gender are presented in Table 1, where 135 (48.9%) participants were female and 141 (51.1%) were male. In SSPS, pairwise deletion was used, meaning that, if a student did not answer a question, he or she was not included in an analysis or descriptive statistic. A total of 284 students completed the Olweus Survey Tool and attached demographic questionnaire; eight did not identify their gender.

Table 1

Frequencies and Percentages by Gender

	n	%
Female	135	48.9
Male	141	51.1

Note: Eight participants did not respond.

Table 2 presents the percentage of students meeting criteria based on composite scores to Olweus Survey Tool as bully, victim, both, or neither.

Table 2

Percentage of Students Meeting Overall Criteria as Bully, Victim, Both, or Neither

Category	Female	Male	Total
Bully	7.5	5.2	12.7
Victim	6.0	6.7	12.7
Both	5.6	4.4	9.9
Neither	31.3	33.3	64.7

Summary of Olweus Survey Results

Based on the data collected, this study examined the prevalence of bullying and victimization in the schools surveyed. The results indicated that a significant number of students in the schools experienced bullying and victimization at school. Indeed, close to 30% of students reported victimization by others once or twice (Appendix A, Table 2). The proportion of being bullied among girls (12.1%) is slighter lower than that among boys (15.7%; Appendix A, Table 2). The reported magnitude of bullying was consistent with the related research. Additionally, the majority of students surveyed expressed being afraid of being bullied by other students in their school (54.8%) (Appendix A, Table 40). A higher proportion of girls (67.4%) expressed being afraid of being bullied by other students in their school than of boys (42.0%).

In terms of the self-reported bullying of others, approximately 41.5% students surveyed reported having bullied others at school during the past few months (Appendix A, Table 24). Specifically, 33.8% of students reported verbally abusing their peers. One-

fourth of students reported socially excluding others, while approximately 12% of students reported physical abuse or detainment (Appendix A, Tables 25, 26 and 27). About 15% of students reported ever having spread false rumors about their peers in an attempt to mortify their victims (Appendix A, Table 28). The students also reported less frequent ways of bullying others, such as stealing money or belongings or damaging personal property (5.0%), undue duress (4.6%), sexual harassment (7.8%), and other ways of bullying (12.7%; Appendix A, Tables 29, 30, 39, and 33).

Most of the students who engaged in bullying reported that no teacher had talked with them about their bullying another student at school in the past couple of months. About two-thirds of bullying students reported that adults at home have not talked with them about their bullying another student at school in the past couple of months (Appendix A, Table 37). More than half of those surveyed indicated that they had not joined in bullying a student whom they did not like (43.8%; Appendix A, Table 38). Only half of students surveyed expressed they should help or try to help if they see or learn that a student their age is being bullied by another student (Appendix A, Table 39).

Overall, the study showed that more girls reported being involved in bullying than boys; most of the bullying students reported that no teacher had talked with them about their bullying another student at school in the past couple of months; about two-thirds of bullying students reported that adults at home had not talked to them about their bullying another student at school in the past couple of months; and finally, more than half of the students surveyed indicated that they had not joined in bullying a student whom they did

not like. These percentages of bullying and victimization are comparable to those reported in previous surveys (Craig, 1998).

Summary of Family Demographics

Frequencies and percentages for adults living in the students' households are presented in Table 3, which shows that the majority of participants 150 (53.2%) lived with both their mother and father. Means and standard deviations for number of brothers, sisters, stepbrothers, and stepsisters living in the household are presented in Table 4.

Table 3

Frequencies and Percentages for Describing Adults Living in Household, Overall and by Gender

	Total		Female		Male	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Mother Only	34	12.1	19	14.2	15	10.8
Father Only	12	4.3	7	5.2	5	3.6
Both Mother and Father	150	53.2	67	50.0	79	56.8
Mother and Stepfather	35	12.4	22	16.4	12	8.6
Father and Stepmother	14	5.0	6	4.5	7	5.0
Mother and Partner	13	4.6	4	3.0	8	5.8
Father and Partner	3	1.1	1	0.7	2	1.4
Other	20	7.1	8	6.0	11	7.9

Note: Three participants did not respond.

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Number of Brothers, Sisters, Stepbrothers, and Stepsisters Living in Household, Overall and by Gender

	Total		Female		Male	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Number of Brothers	0.83	0.95	0.74	0.77	0.91	1.09
Number of Sisters	0.79	0.83	0.77	0.82	0.78	0.81
Number of Stepbrothers	0.10	0.39	0.11	0.44	0.07	0.31
Number of Stepsisters	0.07	0.31	0.07	0.31	0.07	0.28

Frequencies and percentages for birth order are presented in Table 5, which shows that the majority of participants were either the first or second child born in the family.

Table 5

Frequencies and Percentages for Participants' Birth Order, Overall and by Gender

	Total		Female		Male	
	N	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
First Child Born	113	40.1	54	40.3	57	40.7
Second Child Born	98	34.8	49	36.6	45	32.1
Third Child Born	49	17.4	21	15.7	27	19.3
Forth Child Born	15	5.3	8	6.0	6	4.3
Fifth Child Born	5	1.8	1	0.7	4	2.9
Sixth Child Born	1	0.4	1	0.7	1	0.7
Seventh Child Born	1	0.4	0	0.0	57	40.7

Hypothesis 1

Null Hypothesis 1: In a standard multiple regression (e.g., all predictors entered at once), the set of family demographics will not significantly predict bully subscale scores ($R = 0$ at alpha level of .05).

To test Hypothesis 1, a multiple regression was conducted to determine if bullying subscale scores could be significantly predicted by the combined effect of family size (brothers, sisters, stepbrothers, and stepsisters), placement in birth order, and family composition (mother only, father only, both mother and father, mother and stepfather,

father and stepmother, mother and partner, or father and partner). The result of the regression was significant, F (12, 249) = 2.66, $p < .01$, suggesting collectively that the independent variables predicted the bullying subscale and that the null hypothesis was thereby rejected. The independent variables accounted for (R^2) 11.4% of the variance in the bullying subscale. The results of the regression are summarized in Table 6 and suggest that, if participants lived with their father only, bullying increased by 3.29 units. For every additional sister, bullying increased by 0.73 units, and for every additional stepsister, bullying increased by 1.83 units.

Table 6

Multiple Regression with Family Size, Placement in Birth Order, and Family Composition Predicting Bullying Subscale

	B	*SE*	*t*	*P*
Mother Only	1.79	1.00	1.79	.075
Father Only	3.29	1.26	2.62	.009
Both Mother and Father	0.23	0.86	0.26	.792
Mother and Stepfather	0.22	0.99	0.22	.823
Father and Stepmother	1.78	1.28	1.39	.167
Mother and Partner	0.87	1.26	0.69	.491
Father and Partner	1.42	2.10	0.68	.500
Brothers	-0.05	0.22	-0.24	.809
Sisters	0.73	0.27	2.72	.007
Stepbrothers	0.17	0.60	0.29	.771
Stepsisters	1.83	0.74	2.47	.014
Birth Order	-0.19	0.20	-0.93	.352

Hypothesis 2

Null Hypothesis 2: From a standard multiple regression, the unique effects (e.g., part correlations) of each family demographic in predicting bully subscale score will be equal; that is, all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations will be non-significant ($p > .05$).

To test hypothesis 2, three regressions were conducted to assess the unique effect of each family demographic—family size (brothers, sisters, stepbrothers, and stepsisters), placement in birth order, and family composition (mother only, father only, both mother and father, mother and stepfather, father and stepmother, mother and partner, or father and partner)—in predicting the bully subscale score.

The results of family composition predicting the bully subscale score were significant, F (7, 254) = 2.17, $p < .05$, and family composition accounted for (R^2) 5.6% of the variance in the bully subscale score. The results of family size predicting the bully subscale score were significant, F (4, 257) = 3.99, $p < .01$, and family size accounted for (R^2) 5.8% of the variance in the bully subscale score. The results of placement in birth order predicting the bully subscale score were not significant, F (1, 260) = 0.19, $p = .667$, and placement in birth order accounted for (R^2) 0.1% of the variance in the bully subscale score.

Three Fisher's z tests were then conducted to examine if significant differences existed on each of the family demographics predicting the bully subscale score. The results of the Fisher's z comparing family composition and family size were not significant, $z = -0.06$, $p = .952$, suggesting that no differences exist when comparing

family composition and family size regarding the prediction on the bully subscale score. The results of the Fisher's z comparing family composition and placement in birth order were significant, $z = 2.44$, $p < .05$, suggesting that family composition was a better predictor of the bully subscale score compared to placement in birth order. The results of the Fisher's z comparing family size and placement in birth order were also significant, $z = 2.50$, $p < .05$, suggesting that family size was a better predictor of the bully subscale score than placement in birth order.

Hypothesis 3

Null Hypothesis 3: In a standard multiple regression (e.g., all predictors entered at once), the set of family demographics will not significantly predict victim subscale scores ($R = 0$ at alpha level of .05).

To test hypothesis 3, a multiple regression was conducted to determine if victim subscale scores could be significantly predicted by the combined effect of family size (brothers, sisters, stepbrothers, and stepsisters), placement in birth order, and family composition (mother only, father only, both mother and father, mother and stepfather, father and stepmother, mother and partner, or father and partner). The results of the regression were not significant, F (12, 252) = 1.05, $p = .400$, suggesting that collectively the independent variables do not predict the victim subscale and that the null hypothesis was accepted. The independent variables accounted for (R^2) 4.8% of the variance in the victim subscale. The results of the regression are summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

Multiple Regression with Family Size, Placement in Birth Order, and Family Composition Predicting Victim Subscale

	B	*SE*	*t*	*P*
Mother Only	1.04	1.71	0.61	.542
Father Only	1.13	2.19	0.51	.608
Both Mother and Father	-0.40	1.47	-0.27	.786
Mother and Stepfather	-0.72	1.70	-0.42	.673
Father and Stepmother	-1.14	2.15	-0.53	.596
Mother and Partner	0.83	2.18	0.38	.702
Father and Partner	7.53	3.70	2.04	.043
Brothers	0.00	0.38	0.01	.993
Sisters	0.23	0.46	0.50	.615
Stepbrothers	-0.10	1.07	-0.10	.923
Stepsisters	2.88	1.39	2.08	.039
Birth Order	0.02	0.35	0.07	.946

Hypothesis 4

Null Hypothesis 4: From a standard multiple regression, the unique effects (e.g., part correlations) of each family demographic in predicting victim subscale score will be equal; that is, all pairwise z-tests of Fisher transformed part correlations will be non-significant ($p > .05$).

To test hypothesis 4, three regressions were conducted to assess the unique effect of each family demographic—family size (brothers, sisters, stepbrothers, and stepsisters), placement in birth order, and family composition (mother only, father only, both mother and father, mother and stepfather, father and stepmother, mother and partner, or father and partner)—in predicting the victim subscale score. The results of family composition

predicting the victim subscale score were not significant, F (7, 258) = 1.07, p = .384, and family composition accounted for (R^2) 2.8% of the variance in the victim subscale score. The results of family size predicting the victim subscale score were not significant, F (4, 260) = 1.15, p = .332, and family size accounted for (R^2) 1.7% of the variance in the victim subscale score. The results of placement in birth order predicting the victim subscale score were not significant, F (1, 264) = 0.00, p = .997, and placement in birth order accounted for (R^2) 0.0% of the variance in the victim subscale score.

Three Fisher's z tests were then conducted to examine if significant differences existed on each of the family demographics predicting the victim subscale score. The results of the Fishers z comparing family composition and family size were not significant, z = 0.42, p = .675, suggesting that no difference existed when comparing family composition and family size regarding the prediction on the victim subscale score. The results of the Fisher's z comparing family composition and placement in birth order were not significant, z = 1.94, p = .052, suggesting that no difference existed when comparing family composition and placement in birth order regarding the prediction on the victim subscale score. The results of the Fisher's z comparing placement in birth order and family size were not significant, z = 1.52, p = .129, suggesting that no difference existed when comparing placement in birth order and family size regarding the prediction on the victim subscale score.

Summary

The results of the standard multiple regressions to examine hypotheses 1 and 3, which involved predicting the bully and victim subscale score when considering the set

of family demographics, proved different results. Null hypothesis 1 was rejected; instead, it was found that bullying did increase when participants lived with their father only. Additionally, bullying increased for every additional sister and stepsister added to the family. Null hypothesis 3, however, was accepted because no difference was found in the prediction of the victim subscale score when considering the combined set of family demographics.

When considering the effects of each of the family demographics as it related to the bullying and victim subscale scores, the results of the correlations of hypothesis 2 and 4 also differed. Hypothesis 2 found a significant difference between each of the family demographics as they related to the bullying subscale score. The Fisher's z tests revealed that family composition and family size were better predictors of the bully subscale score than placement in birth order. When considering the effects of each of the family demographics on the victim subscale score, statistical analysis found no significant differences when utilizing the standard multiple regression and the Fisher z tests.

Chapter 5 will open with a brief recapitulation of the literature, followed by a review of the Olweus survey results; it will end with a summary of the implications of the results found in this study.

Chapter 5: Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations

Bullying is prevalent in both American schools as well as in schools in many countries around the world (Mishna, et al, 2005). Bullying is a disruptive influence on students' physical, emotional, and educational well-being (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). Nonetheless, many teachers and administrators have treated bullying as a typical part of growing up and have not fully recognized the extent of the negative impact of bullying on the students who endure it. With the concentration of bullying reaching one-third of the student body, more researchers and educators are aware of youth bullying as a serious problem. Responses from educational communities have changed from simply ignoring bullying to zero tolerance, accompanied by efforts to explore the social antecedents of bullying and root out its causes (Swearer, Tuner, & Govens, 2008). The nature and definition of bullying are changing, as researchers have begun to explore societal or group-oriented perspectives. Researchers have identified bully-supportive attitudes and other forms of counterproductive behavior that enable bullying among students and teachers. Nevertheless, there is little information available regarding the relationship between bullying and family influences that have been said to be the cause of increased juvenile delinquency, violence, and antisocial behavior. The paucity of knowledge in this area highlights the need for studies to examine the relationships between bullying and family factors such as family size, birth order, and family composition.

This quantitative survey-based study sought to determine the extent to which self-reported bullying and victimization among seventh-grade students are related to family

size, birth order, and family composition. Archival demographic data and results from the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (R-OBVQ) were analyzed (Olweus, 1996). The study measured the degree of self-reported bullying and victimization of a sample of seventh-grade students. The study also sought to understand school-age bullying and victimization and its possible relationship to family size, birth order, and family composition. A quantitative correlational analysis approach was used to analyze the data and addressed four research questions: (a) How strong is the relationship between the combined set of family demographics (family size, birth order, family composition) and the bully subscale score? (b) Are some predictors significantly more important than others in explaining the variance in bully subscale score? (c) How strong is the relationship between the combined set of family demographics (family size, birth order, family composition) and the victim subscale score? and (d) Are some predictors significantly more important than others in explaining the variance in victim subscale score?

With regard to bullying, it was found that middle-school students who tend to live only with their fathers engaged in more bullying behavior. Accordingly, family composition was a better predictor of bullying behavior than birth order. Specifically, for every additional sister, bullying behavior also increased. Thus, family size was a better predictor of bullying behavior than birth order. With regard to victimization, it was found that the set of family demographics did not significantly predict the victim subscale score, nor was any one of the family demographics a better predictor of the victim subscale score than another.

In this final chapter, additional findings are presented, along with a discussion and analysis of these findings. Next, implications for social change are presented, followed by the recommendations for future action and research. The chapter concludes with a summary.

Interpretation of Findings

Family factors have been linked to increased delinquency, violence, and general antisocial behavior (Brown, Birch, & Kancherla, 2005; Demaray & Malecki, 2003; Lake, 2004; Peskin, Tortolero & Markham, 2006; Rigby & Johnson, 2006). The present study evaluated whether family factors such as family size, birth order, and family composition contributed to bullying and victimization in schools. A multiple regression analysis was conducted in order to consider the bully subscale and victim subscale of the R-OVBQ as dependent variables, and the family factors of family size, birth order, and family composition as predictor variables.

The results indicated that having a small family size and living with both parents are positively related to a lower probability of engaging in bullying behavior. As noted in the literature review, these results are consistent with previous research that found a correlation between family size and composition to delinquency (Erikson & Jensen, 2006; Farrington, 2005). It appears that large families and single-family households are more likely to be challenged by poor parental supervision, poor maternal supervision, and inconsistent parenting (Erikson & Jensen, 2006; Farrington, 2005). Although results with regard to the victim subscale score were not significant, they suggest that students who live with their father and his partner have an increase in their reported victim units of

7.53. Additionally, family size accounts for an increase in the victim subscale score by 2.88 units when there are additional stepsisters. These results are also consistent with the literature, as researchers have posited that victims of bullying may not report their concerns due to fear of repercussion from both peers and parents, especially if the parent utilizes a coercive parenting style (Unnever & Cornell, 2004; Wessler & De Andrade, 2006).

Birth order made no difference in the bullying and victim subscale scores. Despite the fact that most studies have implied that birth order has no influence over bullying behaviors, parental disciplinary styles towards firstborn, middle-born, and later-born children may be a topic worthy of further study.

Overall, I sought to determine the self-reported behaviors associated with school bullying from a sample of seventh-grade students. Specifically, the study examined the relationships that exist between self-reported middle-school bullying and self-reported victimization, and between bullying experience and each of three demographic factors: family size, birth order, and family composition. The results based on the comparative correlational analysis demonstrated that family size and family composition are significant predictors of bullying scores. Students who live with birth parents were found to score lower than students who live only with their father. Having a small family size and living with both parents are positively related with a lower probability of engaging in bullying behavior.

Conversely, family factors of family size, placement in birth order, and family composition were not found to be significant in predicting victim subscale scores.

Likewise, when tests were conducted to examine if significant differences between each of the family demographics existed when predicting the victim subscale score, the results produced no significant difference.

Implications for Social Change

The primary implication for social change in the current research is that more attention might be paid to how family factors influence the incidence of bullying among children. Numerous studies have documented bullying and victimization among students, amassing data on prevalence, frequency, intensity, duration, place of occurrence, and methods of bullying. Although these past studies have been instrumental in the development of school-based bullying programs, the programs developed to date lack a sociological perspective. The present study supports the need to consider family factors, specifically single-father parent households and the presence of additional siblings or stepsisters in a household. Considering these sociological factors warrants the development of additional curriculum components within bullying prevention programs. Specific curriculum changes could include family assessments, family counseling, and sibling counseling.

In the recent past, bullying was socially perceived as a norm that required no attention or even as an essential experience for most students in order to help facilitate their adjustment to the "real world." Additionally, bullying has been viewed as stemming from external factors independent of the school environment. However, studies have confirmed that bullying is a form of abuse that is counterproductive to a functional learning environment and negatively affects the emotional and psychological health of

those involved (Kim et al, 2005; Wessler & De Andrede, 2006) The results of the R-OBVQ are consistent with current research, which indicates that bullying is largely ignored or disregarded (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). In fact, the R-OBVQ results indicate that 67% of the students believe that teachers do nothing to address bullying in the classroom, and that 69% of adults at home do nothing to address bullying at school. Therefore, one of the first challenges facing bullying prevention programs is to identify systemic barriers to change within the school as well as in the community and family units. Most prevention programs deal with the aggressive behavior, missing the overall social context of bullying (Rigby & Johnson, 2006). A new sociological perspective must be developed, one that encompasses awareness of the influences that home and family environment, culture, race, and community have on a student's behavior.

The African proverb, "It takes a village to raise a child," seems appropriate to this study. Bullying is a community problem and it will take a community to fix it. Finally, society must alter its perception of bullying in order to maintain the optimal mental health of its youth.

Recommendations for Action

Building on the existing research base, this study explored family variables which may correlate to bullying among a sample group of seventh-grade students. The hypothesis that their views and behaviors regarding bullying and victimization would be correlated with data regarding family variables, including family size, birth order, and family composition (i.e., the presence of both biological and nonbiological parents), has been tested. The ultimate goal of this study was to provide education professionals with

data regarding the correlation between family variables and student attitudes toward bullying. These data may help education professionals understand the etiological dynamics of bullying and the relationship between bullying behavior and the bully's family life.

The results of this study offer suggestions for further research as well as contribute to the development of a more comprehensive model of bullying behavior grounded in social learning theory and systematic family theory. When they understand the evidence of correlations among bullying, victimization, and family variables, education personnel and juvenile correctional or detention personnel can look beyond the child's problematic behavior and work with the family toward better outcomes. Presenting the results of this study to school staff, correctional/detention staff, and counselors could assist the development and adoption of a more comprehensive therapeutic model of recovery for bullies and victims.

Recommendations for Further Study

Further research into this topic may contribute to our understanding of the factors that contribute to bullying and victimization. Studies that focus on family composition and family size may be of great benefit in clarifying the dynamics of bullying. Studies examining the impact of such interventions as parent training programs and sibling therapy, or looking at how families can actually serve as an incubator for bullying behavior, could advance knowledge and assist with development of better antibullying programming. Additionally, further studies that link general family characteristics such as parental support, parental warmth, and parental cohesion to bullying behaviors would

also be helpful. Current research on birth order and bullying is controversial at best, and so further research pertaining to birth order is warranted. Such research could focus on how bullying behaviors could be mitigated by parental disciplinary practices within the family context. Finally, future studies could also take into account demographic variables such as age, grade level, ethnicity, socioeconomic status, and parents' education levels.

Conclusion

The findings of this study indicate a need for further research regarding how family factors such as family size, birth order, and family composition predict bullying and victimization. The study hypothesized that family size, birth order, and family composition would be significant predictors of bullying behavior and victimization among middle-school students. According to the analysis, family composition and family size are significant predictors of the bullying subscale score. Students who live with their parents were found to score approximately 3 points lower than students who live with a single parent. The study also revealed the severity of the bullying problem among the middle-school student population. Nearly half of the middle-school students surveyed were found to have been involved in bullying as either perpetrators and/or victims. Whereas the majority of students indicated that they do not join in bullying activities and that they understand that bullying is wrong, only one-fourth of them expressed willingness to prevent bullying in an actual group situation in school.

In summary, the analysis yields valuable insight on relationships that exist between reported middle-school bullying and each of the three family variables examined. Results suggest that awareness of family system variables such as family

composition and family size is warranted when one is working with students who are either bullies or victims of bullying. If professionals work only with the victim or bully, healthy, positive outcomes may be less likely to occur. Changing behaviors and attitudes involves family and community involvement and intervention. Models of bullying should have a more comprehensive structure that includes a family systems perspective.

References

Adkins, K. L. (2003). Predicting self-esteem based on perceived parental favoritism and birth order. East Tennessee State Univ., Dissertation, available online.

Aricak, T, Siyahhan, S., Uzunhasanoglu, A., Saribeyoglu, A., Ciplak, S., Yilmaz, N., & Memmedov, C. (2008). Cyberbullying among Turkish adolescents. *CyberPsychology & Behavior, 11,* 253-261.doi:10.1089/cpb.2007.0016

Baldry, A. C. (2004). What about bullying? An experimental field study to understand students' attitudes towards bullying and victimization in Italian middle schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 74,* 583-598. doi: 10.1348/0007099042376391.

Baldry, A.C. (2005, June). Bystander behavior among Italian students. *Pastoral Care, 23,* 30-37. doi: 10.1111/j.0264.3944.2005.00329.x

Begue, L., & Roche, S. (2005). Birth order and youth delinquent behavior: Testing the differential parental control hypothesis in a French representative sample. *Psychology, Crime & Law, 11,* 73-85. http://www.tandf.co.uk/journals/titles/1068316x.html.

Booth, W. C., Colomb, G. G., & Williams, J. M. (2003). *The craft of research.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2007). Bullying and peer victimization at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff. *School Psychology Review, 36,* 361-383.

Bredin, V., & Rodney, D. (2002). Birth order: a factor in determining parental attention and academic achievement. Retrieved from Bucks County Community College web site. https://www.bucks.edu.

Brown, S. L., Birch, D. A., & Kancherla, V. (2005). Bullying perspectives: Experiences, attitudes and recommendations of 9- to 13-year olds attending health education centers in the United States. *Journal of School Health, 75,* 384-394.

Christie-Mizell, C. A. (2003). Bullying: The consequences of interparental discord and child's self-concept. *Family Process, 42,* 237-253. doi: 10.111/j.1545-5300.2003.42204.x

Cosentino, B. W. (2004). Throned and dethroned: The birth order matrix: How do the roles played by siblings define children's lives? Retrieved 07/06/2008 from http://nymetroparents.com/newarticle.cfm?colid=6822

Dallos, R. (2004). Attachment narrative therapy: integrating ideas from narrative and attachment theory in systemic family therapy with eating disorders. *Journal of Family Therapy, 26,* 40-65.

Davidson, L. M., & Demaray, M. K. (2007). Social support as a moderator between victimization and internalizing-externalizing distress from bullying. *School Psychology Review, 36,* 383-405. doi: 10.111/j.1467-6427.2004.00266.x

Dehue, F., Bolman, C., & Vollink, T. (2008). Cyberbullying: Youngsters' experience and parental perception. *Cyberpsychology and Behavior, 11*, 217-223. doi: 10.1089/cpb.2007.008

Demaray, M. K., & Malecki, C. K. (2003). Perceptions of the frequency and importance of social support by students classified as victims, bullies, and bully/victims in an urban middle school. *School Psychology Review, 32,* 471-489. https://www.nasponline.org.

Eisenberg, M. E., & Aalsma, M. C. (2005). Bullying and peer victimization. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 36,* 88-91. https://www.adolescenthealth.org.

Eriksen, S., & Jensen, V. (2006). All in the family? Family environment factors in sibling violence. *Journal of Family Violence, 21,* 497-507. doi: 10.1007/s10896-006-9048-9.

Espelage, D., & Swearer, S. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review, 32,* 365-383. https://www.nasponline.org.

Espelage, D., & Swearer, S. (2008). Addressing research gaps in the intersection between homophobia and bullying. *School Psychology Review, 37,* 155-159. https://www.nasponline.org.

Fagan, A. A., & Najman, J. M. (2003). Sibling influences on adolescent delinquent behavior: An Australian longitudinal study. *Journal of Adolescence, 26*, 546-558. doi: 1016/s0140-1971(03)00055-1.

Farrington, D. P. (2005). Childhood origins of antisocial behavior. *Clinical Psychology and Psychotherapy, 12,* 177-190. doi: 10.1002/cpp.448.

Farrington, D. P., & Welsh, B. C. (1999). Delinquency prevention using family-based interventions. *Children & Society, 13,* 287-303. doi: 10.1002/CHI570.

Fast, J., Fanelli, F., & Salen, L. (2003). How becoming mediators affects aggressive students. *Children & Schools, 25,* 161-174. https://www.socialworkers.org.

Fitness, J. (2005). Bye bye black sheep: The causes and consequences of rejection in family relationships. In *The social outcast: ostracism, social exclusion, rejection and bullying* (pp. 1-27). New York, NY: Psychology Press.

Fitzpatrick, K. M., Dulin, A. J., & Piko, B. F. (2007). Not just pushing and shoving: School bullying among African American adolescents. *Journal of School Health, 77,* 16-24. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2007.00157.x

Flaskas, C. (2005). Psychoanalytical ideas and systemic family therapy: Revisiting the question "why bother"? *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, 26,* 125-134. https://www.anzjft.com.

Frisen, A., Jonsson, A.-K., & Persson, C. (2007). Adolescents' perception of bullying: Who is the victim? Who is the bully? What can be done to stop bullying? *Adolescence, 42,* 749-764. https://www.elsevier.com.

Groenendyk, A. E., & Volling, B. L. (2007). Coparenting and early conscience development in the family. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 168,* 201-224. https:www.britannica.com

Harris, J. R. (2001). Why are birth order effects dependent on context?. Context-specific learning, personality, and birth order. Current Directions in Psychological Science, 9, 174-177.

Hertlein, K. M., & Killmer, J. M. (2004). Toward differentiated decision-making: Family systems theory with the homeless clinical population. *The American Journal of Family Therapy, 32,* 255-270. https:www.tandf.com.

James, D. J., Lawlor, M., Flynn, A., Murphy, N., Courtney, P., & Henry, B. (2006, December). One school's experience of engaging with a comprehensive anti-bullying programme in the Irish context: Adolescent and teacher perspectives. *Pastoral Care,* 39-50. doi: 10.1111/j.1468-0122.2006.00389.x

Kanetsuna, T., Smith, P. K., & Morita, Y. (2006). Coping with bullying at school: Children's recommended strategies and attitudes to school-based interventions in England and Japan. *Aggressive Behavior, 32,* 570-580. doi: 10.1002/ab.20156.

Kim, Y. S., Koh, Y. J., & Leventhal, B. (2005). School bullying and suicidal risk in Korean middle school students. *Pediatrics, 115,* 357-364. doi: 10.1542/peds.2004-0902.

Kozlowska, K. (2007). Intergenerational processes, attachment and unexplained medical symptoms. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, 28,* 88-99. doi: 10.1375/anft.28.2.88.

Lake, V. E. (2004). Profile of an aggressor: Childhood bullies evolve into violent youths. *Early Child Development and Care, 174,* 527-537. http://www.taylorandfrancis.metapress.com.

Lyngstad, T. H., & Skirbekk, V. (2006). Does the combination of spouses' birth orders influence their divorce risk?. Retrieved from http://www.princeton.edu.

Macklem, G. L. (2003). *Bullying and teasing: Social power in children's groups.* New York, NY: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.

Mancillas, A. (2006). Challenging stereotypes about only children: A review of the literature and implications for practice. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 84,* 268-277. http://www.aca.metapress.com.

McConville, D. W., & Cornell, D. G. (2003). Aggressive attitudes predict aggressive behavior in middle school students. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 11,* 179-187. doi: 10.1177/10634266030110030501

McLaughlin, C., Arnold, R., & Boyd, E. (2005, June). Bystanders in schools: What do they do and what do they think? Factors influencing the behavior of English students as bystanders. *Pastoral Care,* 17-24. http://www.jpcp.org.

Mishna, F., Scarcello, I., Pepler, D., & Wiener, J. (2005). Teachers' understanding of bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28,* 718-738. http://www.jstor.org

Mitchell, M. L., & Jolley, J. M. (2004). *Research design.* Toronto, Ontario: Thomson/Wadsworth.

Monks, C. P., & Smith, P. K. (2006). Definitions of bullying: Age differences in understanding of the term, and the role of experience. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24,* 801-821. doi: 10.1348/026151005x.82352

Naylor, P., Cowie, H., Cossin, F., de Bettencourt, R., & Lemme, F. (2006). Teachers' and pupils' definitions of bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76,* 551-576. doi: 10.1348/000709905x.52229.

Newman-Carlson, D., & Horne, A. M. (2004). Bully busters: A psychoeducational intervention for reducing bullying behavior in middle school students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82,* 259-269. http://www.counseling.org.

Nickel, M. K., Muehlbacher, M., Kaplan, P., Krawczyk, J., Bucshmann, W., Kettler, C., …..Nickel, C. (2006). Influence of family therapy on bullying behavior, cortisol secretion, anger and quality of life in bullying male adolescents: A randomized, prospective, controlled study. *Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 51,* 355-364. http://www.cpa-apc.org.

Nishina, A., & Juvonen, J. (2005). Daily reports on witnessing and experiencing peer harassment in middle school. *Child Development, 76,* 435-450. doi: 10.111/j.146-8624.2005.00855.x

Ojala, K., & Nesdale, D. (2004). Bullying and social identity: the effects of group norms and distinctiveness threat on attitudes towards bullying. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 22,* 19-35. doi: 10.1348/0261510047729001096.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.

Outpatient family therapy for bullying boys. (2005, September). *Brown University Child and Adolescent Behavior Letter,* 3. http://www.childreseacrh.net.

Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. *Developmental Psychology, 20,* 259-289. doi: 10.1338/026151002166442.

Peskin, M. F., Tortolero, S. R., & Markham, C. M. (2006). Bullying and victimization among black and Hispanic adolescents. *Adolescence, 41,* 466-485. http://www.elsevier.com.

Phillips, L. A. (2006). Literature review of research in family systems treatment of sexual addiction. *Sexual Addiction & Compulsivity, 13,* 241-246. doi: 10.1080/10720160600870794.

Reid, P., Monsen, J., & Rivers, I. (2004). Psychology's contribution to understanding and managing bullying within schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 20,* 241-260. doi: 10.1080/0266736042000251817.

Rigby, K., & Johnson, B. (2006). Expressed readiness of Australian schoolchildren to act as bystanders in support of children who are being bullied. *Educational Psychology, 26,* 425-440. http://www.tandf.co.uk.

Ringer, F., & Crittenden, P. M. (2007). Eating disorders and attachment: The effects of hidden family processes on eating disorders. *European Eating Disorders Review, 15,* 119-130. doi: 10.1002/erv.761.

Rolider, A., & Ochayon, M. (2005, June). Bystander behaviours among Israeli children witnessing bullying behavior in school settings. *Pastoral Care*, 36-41. doi: 10.1111/j.0264-3944.2005.00330.x

Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms and behavior in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28,* 246-258. doi: 10.1080.01650250344000488.

Sulloway, F., (1996). *Born to rebel.* New York, NY: Pantheon.

Swearer, S., Turner, R., Givens, J. (2008). "You're so gay!": Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males? *School Psychology Review, 37,* 160-173. http://www.nasponline.org.

Tapper, K., & Boulton, M. J. (2005). Victim and peer group responses to different forms of aggression among primary school children. *Aggressive Behavior, 31,* 238-253. doi: 10.1002.ab.20080.

Unnever, J. D., & Cornell, D. G. (2004). Middle school victims of bullying: Who reports being bullied? *Aggressive Behavior, 30,* 373-388. http://www.elsevier.com.

Wessler, S. L., & De Andrade, L. L. (2006). Slurs, stereotypes, and student interventions: Examining the dynamics, impact and prevention of harassment in middle and high school. *Journal of Social Issues, 62,* 511-532. doi: 10.111/j.1540-4560.2006.00471.x

Young, S. (2007). The forgotten siblings. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Family Therapy, 28,* 21-27. doi: 10.1375/anft.28.1.21.

Appendix A: Results of the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (R-OBVQ)

Peer Relationships

Question 3 of the R-OBVQ asks, "How many good friends do you have in your classes?" The results for this question are listed in Table A-1.

Table A-1

Peer Relationship Listed by Gender

	Girls		Boys		Total*	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
None	3	2.2	3	2.1	6	2.5
1 good friend	7	5.2	5	3.5	12	4.3
2-3 good friends	40	29.9	42	29.8	82	29.7
4-5 good friends	41	30.6	36	25.5	77	27.9
6+ good friends	43	32.1	55	39.0	98	35.5
Total*	134	100	141	100	276	100
* Missing data are excluded from the calculation.						

Self-Reported Victimization

Question 4 asks, "How often have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months?" The results for this question are listed below in Table A-2. Slightly more than half of the boys but virtually none of the girls reported never having experienced bully victimization; more than 30.6% of the girls reported being bullied at least once a week.

Table A-2

Results for Question 4 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not been bullied	73	54.9	78	55.3	153	55.2
Once or twice	44	33.1	41	29.1	85	30.7
2-3 times a month	4	3.0	10	7.1	15	5.4
About once a week	3	2.3	6	4.3	9	3.2
Several times/week	9	6.8	6	4.3	15	5.4
Total	133	100	141	100	277	100.0

Question 5 asks for the frequency with which "I was called mean names, was made fun of, or teased in a hurtful way"; the results for this question are listed below.

Table A-3

Results for Question 5 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not happened	75	55.6	76	53.9	152	54.5
Once or twice	40	29.6	37	26.2	78	28.0
2-3 times a month	7	5.2	10	7.1	18	6.5
About once a week	3	2.2	9	6.4	12	4.3
Several times/week	10	7.4	9	6.4	19	6.8
Total	135	100	141	100	279	100

Question 6 asks for the frequency with which "Other students left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from their group of friends, or completely ignored me"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-4.

Table A-4

Results for Question 6 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not happened	93	68.9	97	69.3	195	68.9
Once or twice	28	20.7	31	22.1	60	21.2
2-3 times a month	6	4.4	4	2.9	10	3.5
About once a week	2	1.5	3	2.1	6	2.1
Several times/week	6	4.4	5	3.6	12	4.2
Total	135	100	140	100	283	100

Question 7 asks for the frequency with which "I was hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked indoors"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-5.

Table A-5

Results for Question 7 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not happened	109	80.7	112	80.0	227	80.2
Once or twice	16	11.9	19	13.6	37	13.1
2-3 times a month	4	3.0	4	2.9	8	2.8
About once a week	1	.7	3	2.1	4	14
Several times/week	5	3.7	2	1.4	7	2.5
Total	135	100	140	100	283	100

Question 8 asks for the frequency with which "Other students told lies or spread false rumors about me and tried to make others dislike me"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-6.

Table A-6

Results for Question 8 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not happened	81	60.0	90	64.3	175	61.8
Once or twice	38	28.1	35	25.0	75	26.5
2-3 times a month	8	5.9	9	6.4	17	6.0
About once a week	1	.7	4	2.9	5	1.8
Several times/week	7	5.2	2	1.4	11	3.9
Total	135	100	140	100	283	100

Question 9 asks for the frequency with which "I had money or other things taken away from me or damaged"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-7.

Table A-7

Results for Question 9 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not happened	119	88.1	115	82.7	241	85.5
Once or twice	13	9.6	19	13.7	33	11.7
2-3 times a month	0	0.0	4	2.9	4	1.4
About once a week	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.4
Several times/week	2	1.5	1	0.7	3	1.1
Total	135	100	139	100	282	100

Question 10 asks for the frequency with which "I was threatened or forced to do things I did not want to do"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-8.

Table A-8

Results for Question 10 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not happened	117	86.7	125	89.9	247	87.6
Once or twice	16	11.9	11	7.9	30	10.6
2-3 times a month	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.4
About once a week	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.4
Several times/week	2	1.5	1	0.7	3	1.1
Total	135	100	139	100	282	100

Question 11 asks for the frequency with which "I was bullied with mean names or comments about my race or color"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-9.

Table A-9

Results for Question 11 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not happened	124	91.9	115	82.7	246	87.2
Once or twice	7	5.2	12	8	19	6.7
2-3 times a month	2	1.5	5	3.6	7	2.5
About once a week	1	0.7	2	1.4	3	1.1
Several times/week	1	.07	5	3.6	7	2.5
Total	135	100	139	100	278	100

Question 12 asks for the frequency with which "I was bullied with mean names, comments, or gestures with a sexual meaning"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-10.

Table A-10

Results for Question 12 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	109	80.7	108	77.1	224	79.2
Once or twice	18	10.4	18	12.9	32	11.3
2-3 times a month	2	1.5	6	4.3	8	2.8
About once a week	4	3.0	4	2.9	8	2.9
Several times/week	6	4.4	4	2.9	11	3.9
Total	135	100	140	100	283	100

Question 12a asks for the frequency with which "I was bullied with mean or hurtful messages, calls or pictures, or in other ways on my cell phone or over the Internet (computer)"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-11.

Table A-11

Results for Question 12a of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	96	72.7	124	89.2	226	81.0
Once or twice	31	23.5	13	9.4	45	16.1
2-3 times a month	2	1.5	0	0.0	2	0.7
About once a week	1	.7	0	0.0	1	0.4
Several times/week	2	1.5	2	1.4	5	1.8
Total	132	100	139	100	279	100

Question 12b asks whether respondents have been bullied via cell phone, Internet, or both; the results for this question are listed in Table A-12.

Table A-12

Results for Question 12b of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Only on cell phone	7	19.4	16	47.1	24	32.9
Only over the internet	13	36.1	15	44.1	29	39.7
In both ways	16	44.4	3	8.8	20	27.4
Total	36	100	34	100	73	100

Computational basis: Those bullied "once or twice" or more according to question 12a

Question 13 asks for the frequency of being bullied in another way; the results for this question are listed in Table A-13.

Table A-13

Results for Question 13 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	107	81.1	109	78.4	220	79.1
Once or twice	14	10.6	19	13.7	35	12.6
2-3 times a month	3	2.3	4	2.9	8	2.9
About once a week	3	2.3	4	2.9	7	2.5
Several times/week	5	3.8	3	2.2	8	2.9
Total	132	100	139	100	278	100

Question 14 asks, "In which class(es) is the student or students who bully you?" The results for this question are listed in Table A-14.

Table A-14

Results for Question 14 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not been bullied	75	56.8	83	60.1	162	58.3
In my class	12	9.1	21	15.2	34	12.2
Different class, same grade	25	18.9	18	13.0	44	15.8
In a higher grade	9	6.8	12	8.7	22	7.9
In a lower grade	1	.8	1	0.7	2	0.7
In both higher and lower grades	10	7.6	3	2.2	14	5.0
Total	132	100	138	100	276	100

Question 15 asks for the gender of people who bullied others; the results for this question are listed in Table A-15.

Table A-15

Results for Question 15 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	69	52.7	82	59.0	155	55.8
Mainly by 1 girl	18	13.7	4	2.9	24	8.6
By several girls	17	13.0	1	0.7	18	6.5
Mainly by 1 boy	7	5.3	21	15.1	28	10.1
By several boys	6	4.6	14	10.1	20	7.2
Both boys and girls	14	10.7	17	12.2	33	11.9
Total	131	100	139	100	278	100

Computational basis: Those bullied “once or twice” or more according to question 4

Question 16 asks for the number of people who have bullied the respondent; the results for this question are listed in Table A-16.

Table A-16

Results for Question 16 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	73	55.3	81	58.7	158	56.8
Mainly by 1 student	16	12.1	25	18.1	44	15.8
By 2-3 students	26	19.7	18	13.0	44	15.8
By 4-9 students	5	3.8	5	3.6	10	3.6
By 10 or more students	4	3.0	4	2.9	8	2.9
Different students/groups	8	6.1	5	3.6	14	5.0
Total	132	100	138	100	278	100

Computational basis: Those bullied “once or twice” or more according to question 4

Question 17 asks, “How long has the bullying lasted?” Results for this question are listed in Table A-17.

Table A-17

Results for Question 17 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	77	59.2	88	65.2	170	62.0
1 or 2 weeks	31	23.8	20	14.8	52	19.0
About a month	10	7.7	17	12.6	28	10.2
About 6 months	6	4.6	3	2.2	9	3.3
About a year	1	.9	2	1.5	4	1.5
Several years	5	3.8	5	3.7	10	3.6
Total	130	100	135	100	274	100

Computational basis: Those bullied “once or twice” or more according to question 4

Question 18 asks, “Where have you been bullied?” The results for this question are listed in Table A-18.

Table A-18

Results for Question 18 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	78	64.5	93	71.5	176	68.0
Has happened	43	35.5	37	28.5	83	32.0
Total	121	100	130	100	259	100
If has happened:						
Playground/athletic field	20	13.2	19	12.1	41	12.7
Hallways/stairwells	28	18.4	20	12.7	49	15.3
In class (teacher in room)	19	12.5	16	10.2	38	11.8
In class (teacher NOT in room)	16	10.5	24	15.3	41	12.8
Bathroom	8	5.3	5	3.2	14	4.4
Gym class	16	10.5	20	12.7	36	11.2
Lunchroom	19	12.5	20	12.7	41	12.7
Way to and from school	7	4.6	7	4.5	15	4.7
Bus stop	4	2.6	4	2.6	8	2.5
School bus	5	3.3	9	5.7	14	4.4
Somewhere else in school	10	6.6	13	8.3	24	7.5
Total times reported	152	100	157	100	321	100

Computational basis: Those bullied “once or twice” or more according to question 4

Question 19 asks, “Have you told anyone that you have been bullied in the past couple of months”? The results for this question are listed in Table A-19.

Table A-19

Results for Question 19 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not been bullied	73	54.9	89	65.0	167	60.1
Been bullied/not told	13	9.8	25	18.2	39	14.0
Been bullied/told somebody	47	35.3	23	16.8	72	25.9
Total	133	100	138	100	278	100
Who have you told?						
Your class teacher	11	10.0	5	7.9	16	8.7
Another adult at school	10	9.1	5	7.9	16	8.7
Your parent(s)/guardian(s)	36	32.7	14	22.2	52	28.4
Your brother(s)/sister(s)	10	9.1	7	11.1	19	10.4
Your friends	33	30.0	19	30.2	55	30.1
Somebody else	10	9.1	13	20.7	25	13.7
Total times reported	110	100	63	100	183	100

Computational basis: Those bullied "once or twice" or more according to question 4

Question 20 asks for the frequency with which "the teachers or other adults at school try to put a stop to it when a student is being bullied at school." Results for this question are listed in Table A-20.

Table A-20

Results for Question 20 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Almost never	14	10.6	26	18.8	40	14.4
Once in a while	24	18.2	31	22.5	56	20.2
Sometimes	25	18.9	23	16.7	49	17.7
Often	32	24.2	24	17.4	56	20.2
Almost always	37	28.0	34	24.6	76	27.4
Total	132	100	138	100	277	100

Question 21 asks for the frequency with which "other students try to put a stop to it when a student is being bullied at school"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-21.

Table A-21

Results for Question 21 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Almost never	43	32.6	68	49.3	116	41.9
Once in a while	36	27.3	37	26.8	73	26.4
Sometimes	39	29.5	25	18.1	66	23.8
Often	10	7.6	5	3.6	15	5.4
Almost always	4	3.0	3	2.2	7	2.5
Total	132	100	138	100	277	100

Question 22 asks, "Has any adult at home contacted the school to try to stop your being bullied at school in the past couple of months?" Results for this question are listed in Table A-22.

Table A-22

Results for Question 22 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Have not been bullied	82	61.2	91	66.4	176	63.3
No, not contacted school	37	27.6	36	26.3	76	27.3
Yes, once	11	8.2	3	2.2	15	5.4
Yes, several times	4	3.0	7	5.1	11	4.0
Total	134	100	137	100	278	100

Computational basis: Those bullied "2-3 times a month" or more according to question 4

Question 23 asks, "When you see a student your age being bullied at school, what do you feel or think?" Results for this question are listed in Table A-23.

Table A-23

Results for Question 23 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Probably deserves it	2	1.5	7	5.1	10	3.6
Do not feel much	5	3.8	23	16.9	29	10.6
Feel a bit sorry	48	36.1	55	40.4	104	37.8
Feel sorry and want to help	78	58.6	51	37.5	132	48.0
Total	133	100	136	100	275	100

Self-Reported Bullying of Others

Results for the bully subscale begin here.

Question 24 asks, "How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months?" The results for this question are listed in Table A-24.

Table A-24

Results for Question 24 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	83	61.9	76	55.5	162	58.5
Once or twice	39	29.1	44	32.1	84	30.3
2-3 times a month	7	5.2	8	5.8	17	6.1
About once a week	2	1.5	7	5.1	9	3.2
Several times/week	3	2.2	2	1.5	5	1.8
Total	134	100	137	100	277	100

Question 25 asks for the frequency with which "I called another student(s) mean names and made fun of or teased him or her in a hurtful way"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-25.

Table A-25

Results for Question 25 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	95	70.9	85	62.0	184	66.2
Once or twice	29	21.6	42	30.7	72	25.9
2-3 times a month	6	4.5	5	3.6	12	4.3
About once a week	2	1.5	2	1.5	5	1.8
Several times/week	2	1.5	3	2.2	5	1.8
Total	134	100	137	100	278	100

Question 26 asks for the frequency with which "I kept him or her out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from my group of friends, or completely ignored him or her." The results for this question are listed in Table A-26.

Table A-26

Results for Question 26 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Has not happened	98	72.6	115	83.3	220	78.3
Once or twice	28	20.7	17	12.3	45	16.0
2-3 times a month	4	3.0	2	1.4	7	2.5
About once a week	2	1.5	2	1.4	4	1.4
Several times/week	3	2.2	2	1.4	5	1.8
Total	135	100	138	100	281	100

Question 27 asks for the frequency with which "I hit, kicked, pushed, and shoved him or her around, or locked him or her indoors"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-27.

Table A-27

Results for Question 27 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	119	88.1	126	90.0	250	88.3
Once or twice	10	7.4	10	7.1	22	7.8
2-3 times a month	3	2.2	2	1.4	6	2.1
About once a week	2	1.5	1	0.7	3	1.1
Several times/week	1	0.7	1	0.7	2	0.7
Total	135	100	140	100	280	100

Question 28 asks for the frequency with which "I spread false rumors about him or her and tried to make others dislike him or her"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-28.

Table A-28

Results for Question 28 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	109	80.7	125	89.3	241	85.2
Once or twice	20	14.8	13	9.3	34	12.0
2-3 times a month	4	3.0	1	0.7	5	1.8
About once a week	2	1.5	0	0.0	2	0.7
Several times/week	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	.4
Total	135	100.0	140	100.0	283	100

Question 29 asks for the frequency with which "I took money or other things from him or her or damaged his or her belongings"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-29.

Table A-29

Results for Question 29 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	127	94.1	132	95.7	267	95.0
Once or twice	7	5.2	6	4.3	13	4.6
2-3 times a month	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
About once a week	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.4
Several times/week	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	135	100	138	100.0	281	100

Question 30 asks for the frequency with which "I threatened or forced him or her to do things he or she did not want to do"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-30.

Table A-30

Results for Question 30 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	128	94.8	134	96.4	268	95.4
Once or twice	5	3.7	5	3.6	11	3.9
2-3 times a month	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
About once a week	2	1.5	0	0.0	2	0.7
Several times/week	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	135	100	139	100	281	100

Question 31 asks for the frequency with which "I bullied him or her with mean names or comments about his or her race or color"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-31.

Table A-31

Results for Question 31 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	131	97.0	127	91.4	265	94.0
Once or twice	3	2.2	6	4.3	10	3.5
2-3 times a month	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.4
About once a week	1	0.7	2	1.4	3	1.1
Several times/week	0	0.0	3	2.2	3	1.1
Total	135	100	139	100	282	100

Question 32 asks for the frequency with which "I bullied him or her with mean names, comments, or gestures with a sexual meaning"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-32.

Table A-32

Results for Question 32 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	123	91.1	129	92.8	260	92.2
Once or twice	10	7.4	4	2.9	14	5.0
2-3 times a month	0	0.0	3	2.2	3	1.1
About once a week	1	0.7	3	2.2	4	1.4
Several times/week	1	0.7	0	0.0	1	0.4
Total	135	100	139	100	282	100

Question 32a asks for the frequency with which "I bullied him or her with mean or hurtful messages, calls or pictures, or in other ways on my cell phone or over the internet (computer)"; the results for this question are listed in Table A-33.

Table A-33

Results for Question 32a of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	111	83.5	124	91.2	241	87.3
Once or twice	17	12.6	12	8.8	30	10.9
2-3 times a month	5	3.8	0	0.0	5	1.8
About once a week	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Several times/week	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
Total	133	100	136	100	276	100

Question 32b asks for the ways in which the respondent has bullied others; the results for this question are listed in Table A-34.

Table A-34

Results for Question 32b of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Only on cell phone	13	46.4	8	40.0	22	44.9
Only over the Internet	6	21.4	9	45.0	15	30.6
In both ways	9	32.1	3	15.0	12	24.5
Total	28	100	20	100	49	100

Computational basis: Those who bullied "once or twice" or more according to question 32a

Question 33 asked for other ways of bullying others; the results for this question are listed in Table A-35.

Table A-35

Results for Question 33 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	116	87.9	118	87.4	241	87.6
Once or twice	15	11.4	15	11.1	31	11.3
2-3 times a month	0	0.0	0	0.0	0	0.0
About once a week	0	0.0	1	0.7	1	0.4
Several times/week	1	0.7	1	0.7	2	0.7
Total	132	100	135	100	275	100

Question 34 asks, “Has your class or homeroom teacher or any other teacher talked with you about your bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months?” The results for this question are listed in Table A-36.

Table A-36

Results for Question 34 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	91	68.4	96	70.1	194	69.8
No, have not talked with me	26	19.5	26	19.0	53	19.1
Yes, they have once	9	6.8	14	10.2	23	8.3
Yes, several times	7	5.3	1	0.7	8	2.9
Total	133	100	137	100	278	100

Computational basis: Those who bullied “2-3 times a month” or more according to question 24

Question 35 asks, “Has any adult at home talked with you about your bullying another student(s) at school in the past couple of months?” The results for this question are listed in Table A-37.

Table A-37

Results for Question 35 of R-OBVQ

Computational basis: Those who bullied "2-3 times a month" or more according to question 24

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Not bullied others	90	67.7	98	72.6	195	70.7
No, have not talked with me	30	22.5	18	13.3	49	17.8
Yes, they have once	7	5.3	15	11.1	22	7.9
Yes, several times	6	4.5	4	3.0	10	3.6
Total	133	100	135	100	276	100

Question 36 asks, “Do you think you could join in bullying a student whom you do not like?” The results for this question are listed in Table A-38.

Table A-38

Results for Question 36 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Yes	15	11.2	17	12.4	34	12.2
Yes, maybe	13	9.7	10	7.3	23	8.3
I do not know	22	16.4	41	29.9	63	22.7
No, I do not think so	16	11.9	20	14.6	36	12.9
No	25	18.7	20	14.6	46	16.5
Definitely no	43	32.1	29	21.2	76	27.3
Total	134	100	137	100	278	100

Question 37 asks, “How do you usually react if you see or learn that a student your age is being bullied by another student(s)?” The results for this question are listed in Table A-39.

Table A-39

Results for Question 37 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
I have never noticed it	28	21.1	32	22.9	63	22.8
I take part in the bullying	2	1.5	0	0.0	2	0.7
I do not do it, but I find it okay	2	1.5	2	1.4	5	1.8
I just watch what goes on	21	15.8	37	26.4	53	19.2
I ought to help	47	35.3	34	24.3	84	30.5
I try to help	33	24.8	35	25.0	69	25.0
Total	133	100	140	100	276	100

Question 38 asks, “How often are you afraid of being bullied by other students in your school?” The results for this question are listed in Table A-40.

Table A-40

Results for Question 38 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
Never	44	32.6	80	58.0	127	45.2
Seldom	30	22.2	29	21.0	61	21.7
Sometimes	38	28.1	19	13.8	58	20.6
Fairly often	6	4.4	1	0.7	8	2.8
Often	7	5.2	5	3.6	12	4.3
Very often	10	7.4	4	2.9	15	5.3
Total	135	100	138	100	281	100

Question 39 asks, “Overall, how much do you think your class or homeroom teacher has done to cut down on bullying in your classroom in the past couple of months?” The results for this question are listed in Table A-41.

Table A-41

Results for Question 39 of R-OBVQ

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	n	%
Little or nothing	12	8.9	18	13.2	31	11.2
Fairly little	14	10.4	20	14.7	35	12.6
Somewhat	42	31.1	40	29.4	82	29.5
A good deal	39	28.9	28	20.6	70	25.2
Much	28	20.7	30	22.1	60	21.6
Total	135	100	136	100	278	100

Finally, question 40 asks for the student's ethnicity. Results for this question are listed in Table A-42.

Table A-42

Students' Ethnicity

	Girls		Boys		Total	
	n	%	*n*	%	*n*	%
American Indian	9	6.4	8	5.7	18	6.2
Black or African American	3	2.1	4	2.8	7	2.4
Arab or Arab American	2	1.4	0	0.0	2	0.7
Hispanic or Latino	5	3.5	14	9.9	20	7.0
Asian American	2	1.4	1	0.7	3	1.0
White	99	70.2	92	65.3	197	67.9
Other	9	6.5	9	6.4	18	6.2
I do not know	12	8.5	13	9.2	25	8.6
Total	141	100	141	100	290	100

Appendix B: Research Approval Letter

Appendix C: Data Use Agreement

Appendix D: Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (R-OBVQ)

Curriculum Vitae

Jodi M. Daly, M.A., LCPC, CMHP

1914 Howard
Butte, Montana 59701
(406) 491-1211
e-mail: jdaly@wmmhc.org

ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE

2002-Present Candidate for Doctor of Philosophy – Counseling Psychology, ***Walden University,*** *Minneapolis, Minnesota*

1993-1995 Master of Arts – Counseling and Guidance, ***Pacific Lutheran University,*** *Tacoma, Washington*

1982 –1986 Bachelor of Science – Social Work, ***University of Montana,*** *Missoula, Montana*

RELEVANT PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2008-Present ***Southwest Deputy Director (full-time)***
Western Montana Mental Health; Butte, Montana

Responsible for the direction, planning, organization and administration of teams of professionals managing an array or support and therapeutic service to adults, children, and families in the Southwest Region of Western Montana Mental Health Center. This region includes Granite, Powell, Deer Lodge, Silver Bow, Beaverhead, Madison, Gallatin and Park Counties. Responsible for supervision of overall program operation, including management of personnel budgets and facilities. Additionally, as of 2010, responsible for the overall direction and management of a chemical dependency agency (Tri-County Services) that serves Deer Lodge, Powell and Granite Counties.

2005-2008 ***Butte Adult and Children's Services Director***
Western Montana Mental Health; Butte, Montana

Responsible for the clinical direction, planning, organization, and administration of teams of professionals and para-professionals providing an array of support and therapeutic services to adults,

children, and their families in Butte. Responsible for program operation, including clinical strength and management of personnel.

2002- 2004 ***Deputy Administrator – Programs and Treatment***
CCCS, Inc. RYO Correctional Facility, Galen, Montana
A federal juvenile prison

Responsible for the direction of all treatment and programs including addictions counseling, sex offender treatment, K-12 education, case management, food service, and medical units.

2000-2002 ***Licensed Professional Counselor (half-time)***
Independent Psychotherapy Practice

Responsible for intakes; diagnosis of mental and emotional disorders; treatment planning; individual counseling with children, adolescents and adults; and report writing.

Clinical Director - Butte Alcohol and Drug Services

Responsible for the clinical direction, planning, organization, and administration of Butte Silver Bow's county chemical dependency services. Initiated co-occurring services for Silver Bow County.

ASSOCIATED PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

2007-2008 ***Practicum Student***
Western Montana Mental Health Center
Program for Assertive Community Treatment (PACT)

Responsible for intakes; diagnosis under supervision; treatment planning; individual counseling with adults and families; charting and report writing; crisis intervention; development and implementation of group for the seriously disabled mental health population; and test administration and interpretation under supervision.

LICENSURE AND CERTIFICATIONS
Clinical Professional Counselor – MT965
(K-12) School Guidance Counselor – MT2665
Mental Health Professional License – MHP416

PROFESSIONAL ORGANIZATIONS

American Psychological Association, Student Membership
Montana Psychological Association, Student Membership

HONORS AND AWARDS

- *Selected by Governor Marc Racicot as one of 20 professionals from throughout Montana to serve on the Public Health Improvement Task Force creating the "The Montana Health Improvement Plan."*

CLINICAL/RESEARCH INTERESTS

As a former child protective service worker and administrator for a juvenile correctional facility as well as in my current role as the director of several community mental health centers, I have witnessed firsthand the impact, scope, and effects of bullying on the aggressor and the victim. Youth bullying is a significant social problem with various social and economic costs. Not only are the numbers of youth locally, nationally, and internationally who are perpetrators and victims astronomical, they are growing daily. I am interested in analyzing whether family variables such as birth order, family composition, and family size have any relation to being a bully or being a victim. The existence of such relationships can be vital information for professionals to use as a way to understand school-age bullying and predictors of bullying behavior.

REFERENCES

Available upon request.