Victims' Responses to Overt Bullying and their Effect on the Attitudes and Reactions of Peer Bystanders and Teachers

Nicole Sokol

BPsych (Hons 1)

Centre for Emotional Health, Department of Psychology,

Faculty of Human Sciences, Macquarie University

This thesis is presented as partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy and Master of Clinical Psychology

Submitted: December, 2015

Table of Contents

Thesis Summary **iv**

Statement of Candidate **v**

Acknowledgements **vi**

Thesis Introduction **1**

Definitions and Conceptualisations of Bullying 3

The Social Ecology of Bullying 7

Bullying Prevalence and Associated Demographic Variations 9

Individual Factors Associated with Involvement in Bullying 13

Victims' Responses to Bullying 15

The Role of Peer Bystanders in Bullying 19

Teachers as Bystanders to Bullying 21

Bystander Cognitions, Emotions, and Behaviours under Investigation 24

Individual & Situational Factors Influencing Bystander Attitudes and Reactions 25

The Present Thesis 27

Paper 1 33

Abstract 34

Introduction 35

Method 39

Results 46

Discussion 59

Paper 2 **69**

Abstract 70

Introduction 71

Method 75

Results 79

Discussion 88

Paper 3 **97**

Abstract 98

Introduction 99

Method 104

Results 112

Discussion 130

Paper 4 **143**

Abstract 144

Introduction 145

Method 149

Results 155

Discussion 166

Thesis Discussion **175**

Review of Thesis Papers 176

Implications for Anti-Bullying Interventions 180

Thesis Strengths 187

Thesis Limitations and Future Research Directions 188

Thesis Conclusions 192

References **195**

Appendices **225**

Appendix A: Hypothetical Videotaped Bullying Scenarios 226

Appendix B: Validation of the Hypothetical Videotaped Bullying Scenarios 232

Appendix C: Student Questionnaire Measures Utilised in Papers 1 and 3 242

Appendix D: Teacher Questionnaire Measures Utilised in Papers 2 and 4 248

Appendix E: Ethics Approval Letters 257

Thesis Summary

This thesis presents four empirical papers investigating victims' responses to overt bullying and their impact on peer bystanders and teachers within the social ecology of bullying. Research indicates that victims' responses can influence the bullying trajectory and subsequent adjustment difficulties. However, further research is needed to determine the particular responses victims must adopt to achieve particular outcomes. Using quantitative and qualitative approaches, Papers 1 and 2 extended past research by exploring different victim responses from student and teacher perspectives, respectively. Building on preliminary evidence suggesting the potential influence of victims' responses to bullying on bystanders, Papers 3 and 4 studied victim response effects on the attitudes and reactions of peer bystanders and teachers, respectively. Papers 1 and 3 examined a sample of Australian fifth and seventh grade students (N = 206, M_{age} = 11.13 and 13.18 years, respectively), while Papers 2 and 4 utilised a sample of 289 Australian teachers (M_{age} = 41.22 years, SD = 11.81, 59 males). All four studies utilised hypothetical videotaped bullying scenarios that depicted victims responding to being bullied in one of four different ways (labelled as angry, sad, confident, ignoring). To maximise ecological validity, victims' responses were portrayed through the combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction which were observable to bystanders. The results of Papers 1 and 2 deepened our understanding of how students and teachers evaluate different victim responses and the motivations and rationales underlying particular victim responses. Papers 3 and 4 identified the victim's response to bullying as a salient situational factor influencing the cognitions, emotions, and behavioural intentions of peer bystanders and teachers, respectively. Insights derived from this thesis have the potential to improve individual-level, peer-level, and teacher-level components of whole school programs which seek to attenuate the systemic problem of bullying.

Statement of Candidate

I certify that the work in this thesis entitled "Victims' Responses to Overt Bullying and their Effect on the Attitudes and Reactions of Peer Bystanders and Teachers" has not previously been submitted for a degree nor has it been submitted as part of requirements for a degree to any other university or institution other than Macquarie University.

I also certify that the thesis is an original piece of research which has been written by me, with support from my supervisors Professor Ron Rapee and Associate Professor Kay Bussey. Any help and assistance that I have received in my research work and the preparation of the thesis itself have been appropriately acknowledged. In addition, I certify that all information sources and literature used when preparing this thesis have been referenced appropriately.

The research presented in this thesis was approved by the Macquarie University Ethics Review Committee, reference number: 5201200457 on 7th August, 2012, and reference number: 5201200713 on 21st November, 2012. NSW Department of Education and Communities ethics approval was also obtained for the research presented in Papers 2 and 4, SERAP number 2012229 on 5th February, 2013.

Name: Nicole Sokol Signed:

Student ID: 42732417 Date:

Acknowledgements

I have been so privileged to have had such incredible guidance and support throughout my PhD journey from my wonderful supervisors, Ron and Kay. They provided the perfect balance of assistance, encouragement, constructive feedback, and confidence in my abilities and I have truly learnt so much about research with them as my role models.

I want to acknowledge Dr Alan Taylor for his invaluable statistical advice. He really went beyond the call of duty, even assisting me following his retirement, and for this I am incredibly grateful. I would also like to thank those people who supported my research by assisting with pilot testing, producing the videotaped scenarios, recruitment, or data collection. I so appreciate each of your contributions.

Finally, I want to extend my heartfelt thanks to my amazing family, friends, and colleagues for their on-going support, care, understanding, and encouragement throughout the eight years of my psychology studies. It has been a long but very enjoyable and rewarding road and I have you all to thank for that. In particular, I want to say a special thank you to my husband Daniel whose sacrifices and unwavering love and support have enabled me to not only pursue my goals, but to make the most of the experience.

THESIS INTRODUCTION

Thesis Introduction

School bullying is increasingly being recognised as a pervasive and systemic problem with negative correlates and consequences for all students involved (Berger, 2007; Juvonen & Graham, 2014; Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). However, school bullying does not affect all students equally (Terranova, 2009). Research suggests that victims' responses to bullying have the potential to perpetuate the cycle of victimisation or assist in minimising the risk of future bullying and maladjustment (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Salmivalli, Karhunen, & Lagerspetz, 1996; Waasdorp & Bradshaw, 2011). However, given the power imbalance inherent in bullying relationships (Olweus, 1993), responding to bullying is a complex and challenging task for victims. Although a wide range of victim responses have been described and evaluated in the literature, it is still unclear how particular victims should respond in different bullying situations to achieve specific outcomes.

While victim responses have typically been evaluated in terms of their effect on bullies and therefore future bullying (e.g., Camodeca & Goossens, 2005), the way victims respond to being bullied may also influence bystanders who witness bullying incidents. As observers of bullying, peers and teachers play important roles in the social ecology of bullying (Espelage, Rao, & De La Rue, 2013; Hong & Espelage, 2012b; Swearer & Espelage, 2011; Swearer et al., 2006). Research has therefore begun to explore the individual and situational factors that influence the perceptions and behaviours of peers and teachers in bullying situations (Craig, Henderson, & Murphy, 2000; Oh & Hazler, 2009; Yoon, Sulkowski, & Bauman, 2014). However, little is known about the effects of victims' responses to bullying on peer bystander and teacher attitudes and reactions. To fill this gap in the literature, this thesis aimed to examine student and teacher perspectives of victims' responses to bullying as well as the impact of this salient situational factor on the cognitions, emotions, and behavioural intentions

of peer bystanders and teachers. By elucidating the complex systemic processes involved in bullying, this thesis will offer insights relevant to guiding victims, peers, and teachers alike in how to address the problem of bullying.

Definitions and Conceptualisations of Bullying

Dan Olweus introduced the term 'bullying' in the 1970s to describe a sub-type of aggressive behaviour observed among school children (Olweus, 1978). According to Olweus (1994, p. 1173), the phenomenon of bullying is characterised by three core criteria:

1. Deliberate aggressive behaviour whereby bullies intentionally inflict or attempt to inflict injury, harm, or discomfort upon their victims.
2. Repetition such that these "negative actions" are carried out "repeatedly and over time", distinguishing bullying from singular incidents of aggression.
3. A power imbalance in the bully-victim relationship that may be of a physical nature (e.g., size, strength, grade, or number of students) or of a social nature (e.g., popularity, peer acceptance, part of ethnic majority versus minority, or possession of certain competencies or assets valued by the peer group such as leadership skills) (Hemphill, Heerde, & Gomo, 2014; Vaillancourt, Hymel, & McDougall, 2003).

Although Olweus' definition of bullying has been widely accepted (Smith & Brain, 2000), there has been considerable variability in the research literature with regard to how bullying has been defined, operationalised, and measured (Hemphill, Heerde, et al., 2014; Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010). Researchers have deliberated the necessary conditions for use of the term bullying, with intent to cause harm, repetition, and unequal power each having been the source of debate (Rigby, 2002; Smith & Brain, 2000). For example, while Tattum and Tattum (1992) conceived bullying as a "wilful conscious desire to hurt another and put him/her under

stress" (p. 147), behavioural psychologists emphasise the importance of bullies' behaviours rather than their intentions (Rigby, 2002). Some researchers have argued that bullying should not necessitate repeated actions by the bully, as one-off bullying incidents may still have a recurrent and lasting impact on victims (Arora, 1996). Furthermore, while bullying has been succinctly described as "a systematic abuse of power" (Smith & Sharp, 1994, p. 2), the power differential component has been omitted from the bullying definition on occasion, for example when describing non-physical forms of bullying (Kanetsuna, Smith, & Morita, 2006) or due to concerns about younger children's ability to understand the complex notion of power (Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O'Brennan, 2007).

Methods for operationalising the core features of the bullying definition have also varied across different studies. To outline the aggressive behaviours characteristic of bullying, the bullying definition included in the commonly utilised Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus, 1996) lists a range of specific hurtful behaviours that victims might be subjected to (Solberg & Olweus, 2003). Examples of physical bullying ("hit, kick, push, shove around") and verbal bullying ("say mean and hurtful things or make fun of him or her or call him or her mean and hurtful names") are outlined (Solberg & Olweus, 2003, p. 246), with both representing types of overt or direct bullying which denote the confrontational and face-to-face nature of these interactions. More covert or indirect bullying such as relational bullying, which aims to harm victims through actual or threatened damage to peer relationships, is also described using examples ("false rumors", "mean notes", "completely ignore or exclude him"; Solberg & Olweus, 2003, p. 246). Adopting a similar approach, more recent research has used specific examples when defining cyberbullying, which refers to bullying through electronic means such as the internet or via phone (Whittaker & Kowalski, 2014, p. 14). For example, cyberbullying may consist of "mean messages to

another person in an email" or "negative comments or information about that person via social media like Facebook" (Whittaker & Kowalski, 2014, p. 14). Bullying has also been described in terms of what it is not, with the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire distinguishing intentional aggressive behaviour from actions intended as a joke: "we don't call it bullying when the teasing is done in a friendly and playful way" (Solberg & Olweus, 2003, p. 246). By contrast, vignette studies have operationalised the "negative action" component of bullying as the victim's pain rather than the bully's intention to cause harm (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000).

The power differential in the bully-victim relationship has also been described in diverse ways. Some studies describe a specific power imbalance, such as an older child acting against a younger child (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000). Olweus often described the power differential in terms of the victim having "difficulty in defending himself/herself" and being "somewhat helpless" against bullies (Olweus, 1994 p. 1173). Furthermore, the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire stipulates that "it is not bullying when two students of about the same strength or power argue or fight" (Solberg & Olweus, 2003, p. 246). One past study which systematically varied the victim's response to aggression specifically avoided use of the term bullying due to the assumption that victims of bullying engage only in submissive, ineffective, and non-assertive behaviours (Courtney, Cohen, Deptula, & Kitzmann, 2003). However, power disparities in the bully-victim relationship may be more accurately described in terms of the difficulty victims have in putting an end to bullying and the feelings of helplessness that result, rather than necessitating particular victim reactions. This conceptualisation is supported by evidence that some students who self-identify as victims of bullying are able to behave assertively and stand up for themselves (Mishna, Pepler, & Wiener, 2006; Mishna, Scarcello, Pepler, & Wiener, 2005). Therefore, in the videotaped scenarios utilised in the current research, bullying is portrayed and described as

intentional aggressive behaviour that occurs repeatedly towards a victim who finds it hard to make it stop. This definition establishes the victim's limited power to escape their victimisation, while at the same time offering flexibility with regard to how victims respond to specific bullying incidents. It should also be noted that in the current research, the terms bullying and victimisation will be used to distinguish between bullying perpetrated by the bully and the resultant victimisation experienced by the victim.

In addition to the three core criteria of intentional aggressive behaviour, repetition, and unequal power, other characteristics of bullying have been described. Olweus (1993) indicated that bullying may be perpetrated by a single individual or by a group towards either a single individual or a group. Furthermore, bullying has often been conceptualised as proactive aggression rather than reactive aggression, suggesting that the hostile behaviour occurs in the absence of provocation, rather than in response to the actions of others (Elinoff, Chafouleas, & Sassu, 2004; Olweus, 1993). Bullying has also been described as the unjustified use of power and aggression that produces a sense of enjoyment for the bully and a sense of oppression for the victim (Rigby, 2002).

While these descriptions assist in illustrating what bullying is and help distinguish it from other forms of aggression, traditional conceptualisations of bullying and early empirical research focussed primarily on the bully-victim relationship, with little consideration or exploration of the social context in which bullying occurs (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al., 1996). By contrast, more recent conceptualisations, including the Participant Role approach pioneered by Salmivalli and colleagues (1996), emphasise that bullying is a group phenomenon that rarely exclusively involves a dyadic interaction between a bully and a victim. This understanding of bullying invites an investigation of the systemic processes involved in bullying and a consideration of the characteristics and behaviours of others involved in the social ecology of bullying

including peers and teachers, who may also represent bystanders in particular bullying situations.

The Social Ecology of Bullying

Borrowing from Bronfenbrenner's classic ecological theory (1977), the social-ecological framework has been applied to bullying in order to understand how students' involvement in bullying derives from the complex interplay between individuals and their broader social environment (Espelage et al., 2013; Hong & Espelage, 2012b; Swearer & Espelage, 2011; Swearer et al., 2006). By nesting individual students within layered contextual systems, this theoretical approach highlights that human behaviour is multiply-determined and multiply-influenced (Swearer & Espelage, 2011; Swearer et al., 2006). Each level of the model is described in turn with a focus on components of that system that may determine or influence involvement in bullying (Espelage et al., 2013; Hong & Espelage, 2012b; Swearer & Espelage, 2011; Swearer et al., 2006).

At the individual level, the theory considers the role of socio-demographic characteristics, such as ethnicity, gender, and age, as well as aspects of children's physical and psychological health. The contexts (e.g., home and school) and individuals (e.g., family, peers, and teachers) with which children have direct contact are referred to as the microsystem. At this level, involvement in bullying may be related to family relationships and parenting practices, peer influences and friendship networks, teacher attitudes and actions, and school climate and norms. The mesosystem refers to the interaction between components of the microsystem and may include parental influence on friendship selection and skills, the influence of school policies and procedures on teachers, parent-teacher consultations, and parental involvement with the school. Social contexts with which children do not have direct contact, but which affect them indirectly, are referred to as the exosystem. The exosystem may include teacher perceptions of the school environment and opportunities for professional development

around managing bullying, opportunities for recreational and extracurricular activities at school and in the community, access to mental health services, media violence, and the level of safety in the neighbourhood. The outermost layer of the child's environment is called the macrosystem and represents the cultural "blueprint" (Bronfenbrenner, 1977, p. 515) which influences the social structures and activities occurring at the other system levels. For example, the macrosystem includes cultural and religious norms and beliefs including cultural expectations regarding aggression and self-defence as well as broader values, customs, and laws. The theory also incorporates the dimension of time referred to as the chronosystem. External events (e.g., parental divorce) or internal events (e.g., puberty) may have direct influences on the child or the chronosystem could indirectly influence the child through social and cultural trends (e.g., access to social media) or historical events (e.g., economic recession).

The social-ecological model highlights the complex nature of bullying and assists in outlining the broad array of systemic processes involved. Despite limitations in its ability to guide the generation of specific hypotheses at each system level, this theory importantly asserts the need to understand bullying within its broader social ecological context and provides an overarching theoretical framework for exploring interactions between different components of the model. This approach also provides the theoretical basis underpinning the development of whole school anti-bullying programs which consist of multiple elements that operate simultaneously at different levels of the school community (e.g., Olweus, 1993; Kärnä et al., 2011). Whole school approaches may include: establishing an anti-bullying policy, dissemination of information about bullying, parent engagement, staff education, curriculum programs with all students, peer-led interventions, and individualised interventions for either victims or bullies (Smith, Schneider, Smith, Ananiadou, 2004; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). While meta-analytic findings suggest that whole school anti-bullying programs

tend to be effective in reducing overall rates of bullying and victimisation, individual-level and peer-level components of these interventions need to undergo improvements if they are to positively contribute to the efficacy of whole school programs (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Interventions may also benefit from further focus on the role of teachers, whose involvement is crucial to anti-bullying work (Richard, Schneider, & Mallet, 2012).

Drawing on a social-ecological framework, the current research focussed on individual characteristics of victims as well as the interactions between individuals and both peers and teachers within the microsystem. This investigation aimed to deepen our understanding of some key systemic processes affecting bullying in the school environment as a means of informing the development of improved individual-level, peer-level, and teacher-level components of whole school anti-bullying interventions. To provide a context for this enquiry, the prevalence of bullying is first outlined and individual factors which predict involvement in bullying are described. Past literature exploring victims' responses to bullying as well as the role of peers and teachers within the social ecology of bullying are then each reviewed in turn.

Bullying Prevalence and Associated Demographic Variations

Bullying is a pervasive public health problem with negative correlates and consequences for victims, bullies, and peers alike (Berger, 2007). Chronic victimisation is associated with serious adjustment difficulties spanning physical (e.g., headaches, stomach aches, sleep difficulties), psychological (e.g., low self-esteem, loneliness, depression, anxiety, emotional dysregulation, suicidal tendencies), social (e.g., social withdrawal, peer rejection, lack of friends, poor relationships), and academic domains (e.g., school avoidance, poor academic performance) (Due et al., 2005; Gini & Pozzoli, 2009; Hawker & Boulton, 2000; Hemphill, Tollit, & Herrenkohl, 2014; Isaacs, Hodges, & Salmivalli, 2008; Juvonen, Nishina, & Graham, 2000; Nansel et al., 2001; Nishina,

Juvonen, & Witkow, 2005; Perry, Hodges, & Egan, 2001; Rigby, 2001; Vessey, DiFazio, & Strout, 2013). There is even evidence that these difficulties may extend into adulthood (Gladstone, Parker, & Malhi, 2006; Isaacs et al., 2008; Lereya, Copeland, Costello, & Wolke, 2015). Like victims, bullies are prone to having physical and psychological problems as well as difficulties with school adjustment (Kumpulainen, Räsänen, Puura, 2001; Nansel, Craig, Overpeck, Saluja, & Ruan, 2004). Bullying is also associated with alcohol use, hyperactivity, street violence, weapon carrying, and criminal behaviour (Andershed, Kerr, & Stattin, 2001; Nansel et al., 2004; Olweus, 1993; Ttofi, Farrington, & Lösel, 2012). The presence of school bullying has been found to impact the broader peer group as well. For example, research suggests that uninvolved students experience more anxiety and dislike school more on days when they observe bullying (Nishina & Juvonen, 2005). Witnessing school violence has also been found to predict externalising problems and poorer school engagement (Janosz et al., 2008). In order to avoid these negative outcomes, school bullying needs to be actively prevented and effectively managed in the school environment.

According to observational and survey research, bullying occurs more frequently in the playground than in the classroom (Rivers & Smith, 1994), with episodes being on average approximately 30 seconds in duration (Craig, Pepler, & Atlas, 2000). A greater proportion of direct bullying episodes take place in the playground, whereas indirect bullying poses more of a problem in the classroom (Craig, Pepler, et al., 2000; Rivers & Smith, 1994). Overall, across contexts and school levels, direct verbal bullying tends to be observed and reported most frequently (Bradshaw et al., 2007; Craig, Pepler, et al., 2000; Rivers & Smith, 1994). A recent meta-analysis estimated mean prevalence rates of 35% for traditional (i.e., offline) bullying perpetration and 36% for traditional bullying victimisation (Modecki, Minchin, Harbaugh, Guerra, & Runions, 2014). However, reported prevalence rates of both

bullying and victimisation varied considerably between the 80 individual studies included in the meta-analysis, at least partly due to different definitions and measurement methods (Modecki et al., 2014). For example, rates of traditional bullying perpetration ranged from 9.68% to 89.6% (Perren, Dooley, Shaw, & Cross, 2010; Pornari & Wood, 2010), while rates of victimisation ranged from 9% to 97.9% (Pornari & Wood, 2010; Slonje & Smith, 2008).

Although bullying is universal, bullying prevalence has been found to vary depending on the nationality, ethnicity, and culture of the students being examined. For example, a large-scale international study comparing bullying prevalence among adolescents from 28 countries in Europe and North America found that rates of victimisation ranged from 5% to 41%, depending on the country (Due et al., 2005). Falling within this range, research assessing bullying prevalence in Australia has revealed that 27% of Australian students in Grade 4 to Grade 9 have been bullied either overtly or covertly at least every few weeks during the last term (Cross et al., 2009).

Gender differences in the prevalence of bullying and victimisation have been reported and appear to depend on the type of bullying being assessed. Physical bullying tends to be more prevalent among boys than girls (Card, Stucky, Sawalani, & Little, 2008; Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus, 1993), whereas rates of direct verbal bullying are similar across the two genders (Rivers & Smith, 1994). Research on indirect bullying and aggression has been mixed, however meta-analyses suggest that while findings vary by reporter, the magnitude of gender differences appears trivial overall (Archer, 2004; Card et al., 2008). It should also be noted that gender influences the formation of bully-victim dyads, with children more often targeting same-sex peers (Pellegrini & Long, 2002).

Research exploring developmental differences in rates of victimisation using self-report measures has typically revealed a fairly steady downward trend from age

eight to 16 years (Smith, Madsen, & Moody, 1999). Various explanations for this pattern have been offered including younger children having not yet acquired the assertiveness and social skills necessary to deal effectively with bullying incidents and to discourage further bullying (Smith et al., 1999). As students get older, there are also fewer children with an age advantage that may be in a position to bully them (Smith et al., 1999). Furthermore, the downward trend in self-reported rates of victimisation may be influenced by younger students' broader definitions of bullying which may inflate reports of bullying in this age range (Smith et al., 1999).

There is other research suggesting that bullying problems may peak during middle school (Bradshaw et al., 2007). A district-wide survey in the United States revealed a general pattern of middle school students experiencing and middle school staff witnessing several different types of bullying more often than at other school levels (Bradshaw et al., 2007). Middle school staff were also more concerned about bullying than elementary and high school staff (Bradshaw et al., 2007). This high level of concern among 59.9% of middle school staff was shared by the majority of middle school students (55%) who considered bullying to be a "moderate" or "severe" problem (Bradshaw et al., 2007). Consistent with this pattern, reports from bullies have suggested that most of their bullying took place when they were 10 to 12 years old (Frisén, Jonsson, & Persson, 2007). Retrospective studies further highlight the importance of investigating bullying during early adolescence, as bullying was most frequently remembered from around age 11 to 13 years, perhaps implying the severity of bullying in this age range (Eslea & Rees, 2001). In Australia, where school systems typically do not include middle school, it seems particularly critical to examine bullying among early adolescents as they transition from primary to secondary school (Cross et al., 2009). This enquiry may shed light on the changing nature of social relationships

during this developmental period and the subsequent effects on bullying processes (Espelage, Hong, Rao, & Thornberg, 2015; Pellegrini & Long, 2002).

Individual Factors Associated with Involvement in Bullying

In addition to demographic variables such as nationality, gender, and age, involvement in bullying is associated with a range of individual characteristics (Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, Sadek, 2010; Dake, Price, & Telljohann, 2003; Hunt, 2015). While certain predictors such as poor social problem solving skills are equally common among both bullies and victims, some variables more strongly predict one status over the other according to a recent meta-analysis (Cook et al., 2010). For example, bully status is more strongly predicted by externalising behaviours, poor academic performance, and possessing negative attitudes and beliefs about others, whereas victim status is more strongly predicted by internalising symptoms, low social competence, and holding negative attitudes and beliefs about themselves. Bully victims, who both engage in bullying and experience victimisation, share all of these risk factors and represent a relatively small, albeit particularly vulnerable group. Determining the factors that predict involvement in bullying may importantly assist in identifying students in need of preventative support or intervention. However, it should be noted that both bullies and victims form heterogeneous groups (Hunt, 2015; Schwartz, Proctor, & Chien, 2001). For example, while some bullies are socially rejected, other bullies possess leadership qualities and high levels of perceived popularity (Vaillancourt et al., 2003). Subtypes of victims have also been identified. Victims exhibiting more internalising symptoms are typically labelled passive victims, whereas victims with more externalising behaviours have been described as aggressive or provocative victims (Olweus, 1993; Schwartz et al., 2001). These victim subgroups will be explored in greater detail later.

Research examining student perceptions of why bullying occurs sheds further light on potential risk factors for bullying involvement. Qualitative data examining early

adolescents' perceived reasons for their victimisation revealed a range of explanations which were victim-related, bully-related, or related to the bully-victim relationship (Smith, Talamelli, Cowie, Naylor, & Chauhan, 2004). Victim-related reasons were the most frequently reported and included victim characteristics (e.g., physical characteristics, looks, social characteristics, race, being different), victim behaviour (e.g., stuck up for someone, said something wrong, did something stupid), and victim loneliness (e.g., no friends, no one to talk to, standing on their own, not popular, new in the area). Similarly, when middle school students described reasons why some children get victimised, approximately two thirds of responses pertained to victims, while the remaining responses attributed victimisation to characteristics of bullies or the school environment (Graham & Juvonen, 1998, 2001). Of the victim-related reasons, 52% were considered controllable (e.g., they show off or bad mouth others), 24% were considered uncontrollable (e.g., younger or weaker), while the other three categories (physical unattractiveness 9%, being different 8%, and being unpopular 7%) were ambiguous with regard to controllability.

It is concerning that victims are so often held responsible for their victimisation. Blaming the victim is a mechanism of moral disengagement, a self-regulatory process whereby moral reasoning is disengaged from behaviour by justifying immoral conduct (Bandura, Barbaranelli, Caprara, & Pastorelli, 1996). Victim blaming may therefore undermine the moral reactions of peers or teachers who witness bullying (Bandura et al., 1996). Victim self-blame is also problematic given its association with victim maladjustment (Graham & Juvonen, 1998). The aforementioned findings may, however, offer some important insights relevant to bullying prevention and intervention efforts. If many perceived reasons for bullying are within the victims' control, victims can be guided and assisted in making changes that help protect them against future victimisation. This assertion has motivated the development of individual-level

interventions with victims which aim to reduce their vulnerability to bullying by teaching emotion regulation, coping, and social skills (Berry & Hunt, 2009; DeRosier, 2004; Fox & Boulton, 2003a, 2003b; Rigby, 2011). Victims are likely to be particularly motivated to put an end to bullying and a victim-focussed approach can foster self-efficacy, self-esteem, and a sense of control as victims are empowered to play an active role in preventing future bullying and its negative consequences (Cowie & Berdondini, 2002; Craig, Pepler, & Blais, 2007).

Victims' Responses to Bullying

One key component of individual-level interventions is teaching victims adaptive coping strategies and effective ways of responding to bullying (Hunt, 2015). This focus is driven by evidence that individual differences in victims' responses to bullying influence future victimisation (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Smith, Talamelli, et al., 2004) as well as self-reported and teacher-reported psychological maladjustment (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Waasdorp & Bradshaw, 2011). In order to inform the development of individual-level interventions, research has begun to explore students' reported use of different victim responses (Gamliel, Hoover, Daughtry, & Imbra, 2003; Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Kristensen & Smith, 2003; Naylor, Cowie, & del Rey, 2001; Paquette & Underwood, 1999; Smith et al., 1999; Smith & Shu, 2000; Smith, Talamelli, et al., 2004; Tenenbaum, Varjas, Meyers, & Parris, 2011), their opinions about effective responses to bullying (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005; Oliver & Candappa, 2007; Kanetsuna & Smith, 2002; Kanetsuna et al., 2006; Landau, Milich, Harris, & Larson, 2001; Lightner, Bollmer, Harris, Milich, & Scambler, 2000; Scambler, Harris, & Milich, 1998), as well as the impact of different victim responses on the bullying trajectory (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Smith, Talamelli, et al., 2004; Waasdorp & Bradshaw, 2011).

Victims' responses to bullying have been conceptualised and measured in different ways. Some qualitative studies have asked students to describe their responses to bullying in their own words (Smith, Talamelli, et al., 2004). Others have assessed students' reported use of specified strategies for coping with bullying (e.g., Coping with Bullying Questionnaire; Murray-Harvey, Skrzypiec, & Slee, 2012) or specific responses employed during bullying episodes, such as "tell them you don't like it and ask them to stop" or "walk away and ignore them" (Elledge et al., 2010). Victim responses have at times been organised under different categories, such as counteraggression, helplessness, and nonchalance (Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996). On other occasions, research has instead drawn upon stress and coping paradigms (Causey & Dubow, 1992; Lazarus & Folkman, 1984; Roth & Cohen, 1986), which distinguish between approach or problem-focussed approaches and avoidance or emotion-focussed approaches. Approach or problem-focussed responses refer to direct attempts to alter stressful situations and include strategies such as social support-seeking, problem-solving, and conflict resolution. Avoidance or emotion-focussed responses instead focus on how individuals regulate their cognitive or emotional reactions, for example using cognitive distancing, internalising, and externalising behaviours.

As mentioned earlier, researchers have also typically referred to two sub-groups of victims: passive victims and aggressive victims (Olweus, 1993; Schwartz et al., 2001). Passive victims represent the majority and are generally socially withdrawn, submissive, avoidant of conflict, and unable to successfully employ persuasion or other conflict management tactics to end bullying (Mahady Wilton, Craig, & Pepler, 2000). These victims are often anxious, physically weak, peer-rejected and tend to cry easily and capitulate to their bullies, contributing to a reputation that they are easy targets (Olweus, 1994; Perry, Kusel, Perry, 1988; Perry, Williard, & Perry, 1990). Aggressive or provocative victims on the other hand are typically irritable, hostile, disruptive, and

over-reactive (Schwartz et al., 2001). These high-conflict victims are prone to displays of dysregulated anger and tend to engage in impulsive counterattacks which are rarely successful (Olweus, 1994; Perry et al., 1988; Perry et al., 1990; Schwartz et al., 2001). Broadly speaking, the passive and aggressive victim subtypes help differentiate victims who tend to adopt internalising responses, from those who typically display externalising responses to bullying.

Both internalising responses characteristic of passive victims (e.g., crying, running away; see Salmivalli Karhunen et al., 1996; Smith, Shu, & Madsen, 2001) and externalising responses characteristic of aggressive victims (e.g., 'fighting back'; see Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996; Spence, Young, Toon, & Bond, 2009) are thought to reinforce bullies (Perry et al., 1990), thereby increasing the likelihood of future victimisation. By contrast, several studies suggest that approach or problem-focussed approaches may help reduce victimisation, at least in some cases (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Smith et al., 2001; Smith, Talamelli, et al., 2004). For example, it may be helpful for victims to seek help from friends or adults or adopt problem-solving or conflict resolution approaches which involve trying to understand why the victimisation happened and attempting to do things differently in order to reduce the likelihood of future victimisation.

While the approach or problem-focussed strategies described above refer to approaches implemented after the bullying episode, there are several victim responses that are thought to be helpful during bullying episodes. For example, individual-level interventions often recommend that victims respond calmly, confidently, and assertively using neutral, non-provocative comments which aim to confuse the bully and diffuse the situation (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003a, 2003b). For example, some programs recommend that victims implement a verbal strategy called "fogging"

whereby victims make a general comment ("you could say that" or "you could be right about that") that appears to agree with the bully in a calm and neutral tone (Confident Kids Program; Bully & Hunt, 2009[1]; Cool Kids – Taking Control Online Treatment Program; Fitzpatrick et al., 2015; Social Skills Training Programme; Fox & Boulton, 2003b; Bully Busters; Newman, Horne, & Bartolomucci, 2000). Other programs have recommended the use of "clever comebacks" whereby victims adopt a calm and confident tone and use humour to diffuse the situation (Cool Kids Program; Rapee et al., 2006). Another victim response strategy that is commonly recommended by teachers, parents, researchers, and within individual-level interventions is calmly ignoring the bully and continuing what they are doing with a nonchalant expression (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Elledge et al., 2010; Harcourt, Jasperse, & Green, 2014; Leadbeater & Hoglund, 2006; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996; Shapiro, Baumeister, & Kessler, 1991). By not acknowledging the bully's presence and avoiding outward displays of distress, this response aims to avoid reinforcing the bully so that they lose interest in the victim.

However, there do not appear to be universally effective victim responses. Instead, the effectiveness of different victim responses has been found to depend on the victim's gender, age, and victimisation status as well as the type of bullying being addressed (e.g., Elledge et al., 2010; Frisén, Hasselblad, Holmqvist, 2012; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996; Terranova, 2009). For example, students have reported that in the case of male victims, nonchalance and the absence of counteraggression make bullying diminish or stop, whereas the absence of helplessness has this effect for female victims (Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996). Another study found that chronically-bullied boys who endorsed the strategy of walking away or ignoring the bully reported higher levels of verbal

[1] Also accessed Confident Kids Program Manual courtesy of Caroline Hunt, University of Sydney.

victimisation, whereas girls who endorsed this strategy reported less verbal victimisation (Elledge et al., 2010). There is also evidence that children's coping approaches may moderate the victimisation-maladjustment relationship differently for boys versus girls and depending on students' victimisation history. For example, while social support-seeking was associated with greater peer preference for victimised girls and nonvictimised boys, this strategy was associated with poorer social outcomes for nonvictimised girls and victimised boys (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002). Taken together, these studies highlight the complexity associated with effectively responding to bullying and the need for individual-level programs to tailor their recommendations to different types of victims.

The Role of Peer Bystanders in Bullying

Although individual-level interventions with victims have the potential to teach and encourage more effective responses to bullying, they are unlikely to be sufficient when tackling the systemic problem of school bullying. Even if victims respond in ways that are less likely to reinforce bullies' behaviour, the reactions of peer bystanders (e.g., joining in, smiling, laughing) may encourage future bullying (Salmivalli, 2010). The negative peer reputation of victims may also be resistant to new information (Hymel, 1986), limiting the speed with which victims' status may change in the peer group. Therefore, rather than relying on individual-level programs and informal coaching and support targeting victims, anti-bullying intervention must also initiate changes to the "social architecture" that supports victimisation (Pepler, 2006, p. 18). To this end, peer-level programs have focussed on enhancing peers' support of victims while also promoting a positive and pro-social school climate that is unsupportive of bullying (e.g., Cross et al., 2011; Frey et al., 2005; Kärnä et al., 2011; Salmivalli, 1999). This approach holds considerable promise, given evidence that peer support and friendship can protect victims from future bullying and its resulting adjustment problems (Flaspohler,

Elfstrom, Vanderzee, Sink, & Birchmeier, 2009; Hodges, Boivin, Vitaro, & Bukowski, 1999; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Sainio Veenstra, Huitsing, & Salmivalli, 2010; Schmidt & Bagwell, 2007; Tu & Erath, 2012).

Research has begun to examine the role of bystanders in bullying situations, in order to inform the development of peer-level anti-bullying interventions. Observational research has revealed that peers are present in approximately 85% of school bullying episodes (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Craig & Pepler, 1997) and self-report data has indicated that students commonly witness bullying (Rigby & Johnson, 2005; Trach, Hymel, Waterhouse, & Neale., 2010). Given that bystanders typically represent the majority of participants in bullying situations, peers have the potential to influence the power dynamics involved in bullying in either positive or negative ways (O'Connell, Pepler, & Craig, 1999). The Participant Role approach pioneered by Salmivalli and colleagues outlined the different roles bystanders may adopt in bullying situations (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al., 1996). Several bystander roles were identified: assistants join in the harassment initiated by bullies; reinforcers provide positive feedback to bullies by laughing, cheering, encouraging, or coming to watch the bullying; outsiders withdraw from bullying situations and avoid any involvement; and defenders stand up for victims, tell bullies to stop, and provide comfort and support for victims. Reporting bullying to teachers was originally conceived as part of the defender's repertoire (Olweus, 1993; Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al., 1996). However, more recent research has referred to a distinct role, the reporter role, to describe students who do not do anything during the bullying episode but who subsequently report the bullying to a teacher or adult (Rigby & Johnson, 2005; Sim & Tan, 2013).

When bystanders intervene on behalf of victims, they are often effective at terminating bullying incidents (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001). However, bystander intervention is rare overall, despite the fact that most children hold anti-bullying

attitudes and report intentions to support victimised peers in hypothetical situations (Rigby & Johnson, 2006; Rigby & Slee, 1991; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004; van Goethem, Scholte, & Wiers, 2010; Whitney & Smith, 1993). Several explanations for this pattern have been proposed. Perhaps bystanders do not know what to do or lack strategies necessary for effective intervention (Hazler, 1996; Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005). Alternatively, bystanders may fear becoming the next victim (Hazler, 1996; Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005; Rigby & Johnson, 2005) or may distance themselves from low-status victims in order to feel more accepted in the peer group (Garandeau & Cillessen, 2006). Various group mechanisms described in the social psychology literature have also been used to explain low rates of bystander intervention (Olweus, 2001). For example, the bystander effect predicts that helping will be less likely when multiple individuals witness bullying (Darley & Latané, 1968). This pattern may reflect the diffusion of responsibility whereby individuals do not feel personally responsible and instead expect others to intervene (Darley & Latané, 1968; Salmivalli, 2010). Alternatively, children might monitor each other and infer from others' inactions that the situation is not serious and does not necessitate intervention (Salmivalli, 2010). Social contagion may also play a role, such that patterns of bystander responding spread through peer networks (Olweus, 2001). Furthermore, certain cognitive processes including moral disengagement and changes in the perception of the victim may reduce the likelihood of bystander intervention (Obermann, 2011; Olweus, 2001; Terasahjo & Salmivalli, 2003). For example, peers may underestimate the seriousness of bullying or may believe that victims are deserving of their maltreatment (Obermann, 2011; Terasahjo & Salmivalli, 2003).

Teachers as Bystanders to Bullying

Teachers are frequently bystanders in school bullying situations, with self-report data indicating that approximately 70% of school staff report witnessing bullying within

the last month (Bradshaw et al., 2007). Although peer bystanders are more likely to witness bullying and therefore intervene more frequently than school staff overall, adults are nearly twice as likely to intervene when they are present when bullying occurs (Craig & Pepler, 1997). However, despite this trend, rates of adult intervention are still low according to observational data (Craig & Pepler, 1997; Craig, Pepler et al., 2000) and student report (Pepler, Craig, Ziegler, & Charach, 1994). By contrast, teachers themselves report much higher rates of intervention (Pepler et al., 1994), perhaps due to a self-serving bias or variations in what behaviours are thought to constitute bullying (Boulton, 1997; Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000). For example, teachers may view student aggression as normative or may at times mistake bullying for playful interactions (Hektner & Swenson, 2011; Mishna et al., 2005).

These findings are concerning given that teachers serve as powerful role models for students, including peer bystanders, and influence school climate via their beliefs and behaviours (Hektner & Swenson, 2011; Yoon & Barton, 2008). For example, teachers' beliefs that victims should assert themselves have been linked to lower peer empathy for victims, which in turn reduces peers' inclination to intervene in bullying episodes (Hektner & Swenson, 2011). The absence of teacher intervention is related to higher rates of peer victimisation (Hektner & Swenson, 2011) and even student perceptions of a lack of teacher intervention (whether intentional or not on the part of teachers) may reinforce students' bullying behaviours (Craig, Pepler, et al., 2000) and inhibit victims' help-seeking behaviours (Oliver & Candappa, 2007). By contrast, rates of bullying perpetration and in turn rates of victimisation decrease when teachers' attitudes become increasingly disapproving of bullying (Saarento, Boulton, & Salmivalli, 2015). The prevalence of bullying is also lowest in classrooms where students perceive the teacher as having high efficacy for dealing with bullying (Veenstra, Lindenberg, Huitsing, Sainio, & Salmivalli, 2014).

Teachers may employ a diverse range of intervention strategies when addressing bullying. The Handling Bullying Questionnaire (Bauman, Rigby, & Hoppa, 2008) outlines five categories of intervention employed by school staff including: disciplining the bully (e.g., make sure the bully was suitably punished); working with the bully (e.g., discuss with the bully options to improve the situation); working with the victim (e.g., encourage the victim to show that he or she could not be intimidated); enlisting other adults (e.g., refer to administrator or contact parents); or ignoring the incident (e.g., let the students sort it out themselves). Research that has measured intervention in this way has found that most teachers recognise the need to take some action, rather than ignoring bullying incidents (Bauman et al., 2008; Sairanen & Pfeffer, 2011). In both of the aforementioned studies, disciplining the bully was found to be the most favoured approach (Rigby, 2011), although other researchers have questioned the effectiveness of punitive and zero-tolerance approaches (Skiba & Peterson, 2000). Bauman and colleagues (2008) found considerable division among school personnel about the use of certain intervention approaches. For example, 36% of school staff agreed that victims should be told to stand up to bullies, whereas 40% disagreed and 24% were unsure. This research highlights the complexity associated with teachers selecting appropriate methods for handling bullying as well as the challenges teachers face when advising victims about how to respond to bullying.

Teachers recognise their important responsibility to prevent bullying in the school environment; however they often do not feel adequately trained in how to deal with bullying (Beran, 2005; Boulton, 1997; Nicolaides, Toda, & Smith, 2002). Teacher education programs have therefore been implemented either as standalone interventions (e.g., Bully Busters; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004; The GREAT Teacher Program; Orpinas & Horne, 2004) or within whole school anti-bullying programs (e.g., Cross et al., 2011) to train teachers in effective bullying prevention and management methods.

Bystander Cognitions, Emotions, and Behaviours under Investigation

While bystanders' actions may have a direct impact on bullying trajectories and may influence the school climate, research suggests that bystanders' decisions to intervene depend on other cognitive and emotional factors (Mishna et al., 2006; Thornberg et al., 2012). Therefore, when examining the role of peers and teachers in bullying situations, it is important to study a range of bystander variables spanning cognitive, emotional, and behavioural domains. On the level of cognition, peer attitudes towards victims and bullies have been investigated using ratings of liking and blame (Baldry, 2004; Courtney et al., 2003; Gini, 2008). These perceptions offer important information regarding the level of peer acceptance or peer rejection experienced by students involved in bullying and may influence the likelihood of bystander intervention (Thornberg et al., 2012). Teachers' attributions of blame towards victims and bullies are also worthy of examination given their potential impact on how teachers' manage bullying problems in the school environment (Mishna et al., 2005). Research has explored peer and teacher perceptions of victimisation by assessing how serious particular incidents are perceived to be and whether they are thought to constitute bullying (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000; Duy, 2013; Maunder, Harrop, & Tattersall, 2010; Yoon, 2004). These cognitions together with perceptions of distress or harm to the victim offer insights into how observers evaluate and ascribe meaning to bullying incidents, which in turn influences their likelihood of intervention (Duy, 2013; Ellis & Shute, 2007; Mishna et al., 2005; Thornberg et al., 2012).

Several studies have begun to explore bystanders' emotional reactions to bullying (e.g., Barhight, Hubbard, & Hyde, 2013), including anger and sadness (Rocke Henderson & Hymel, 2011) as well as empathy for the victim (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Mishna et al., 2005; Thornberg et al., 2012; Yoon, 2004). Peer bystander anger

has been identified as a significant predictor of intervention approaches (Rocke Henderson & Hymel, 2011) and empathy for the victim influences both peer bystander and teacher responses to bullying (Duy, 2013; Mishna et al., 2005; Thornberg et al., 2012). Finally, on the behavioural level, qualitative and quantitative research approaches (Bauman et al., 2008; Marshall, Varjas, Meyers, Graybill, & Skoczylas, 2009; Rocke Henderson, 2010; Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al., 1996; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004) have been used to explore the diverse ways peer and teacher bystanders report responding to bullying, many of which have been described above. By examining a broad range of bystander variables, the current research aimed to further current understanding of bystander roles in bullying and identify key factors amenable to intervention.

Individual and Situational Factors Influencing Bystander Attitudes and Reactions

Social cognitive theory highlights the complex interplay between behavioural, personal, and environmental factors (Bandura, 1986). Drawing on this broad theoretical framework, research has begun to explore the individual and situational factors that influence the attitudes and behaviours of peers and teachers in bullying situations (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000; Oh & Hazler, 2009; Yoon et al., 2014). On the individual level, students' age and gender have been found to play a role, with younger children and females tending to like (Gini, 2008) and defend victims more (O'Connell et al., 1999; Oh & Hazler, 2009; Pozzoli, Gini, & Vieno, 2012; Salmivalli, Lagerspetz et al., 1996) and to be more supportive and empathic towards victims (Menesini et al., 1997; Rigby & Slee, 1991), compared with older children and males, respectively. Students' bullying and victimisation history may also influence their bystander responses, with one study indicating that past experience as a bully or bully-victim predicts aggressive bystander behaviour such as assisting or reinforcing bullies (Oh & Hazler, 2009). Furthermore, research has revealed several other personal characteristics

of peer bystanders that are associated with higher rates of helping victims, including lower moral disengagement (Obermann, 2011), higher empathy (Caravita, Di Blasio, & Salmivalli, 2009; Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007; Pöyhönen, Juvonen, & Salmivalli, 2010), higher self-efficacy for defending (Pöyhönen et al., 2010), and higher peer status (Caravita et al., 2009; Pöyhönen et al., 2010). Similarly for teachers, pro-victim attitudes and intervention behaviours are more prevalent among females compared to males (Boulton, 1997; Yoon, Bauman, Choi, & Hutchinson, 2011) and are associated with higher empathy (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000) and higher self-efficacy for handling bullying (Bradshaw et al., 2007).

Situational factors can also impact the attitudes and behaviours of peer and teacher bystanders. The classroom context and in particular the presence of anti-bullying norms have been found to predict peer bystander behaviours (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). There is also some evidence that broad school factors such as school level (e.g., primary or secondary; Bradshaw et al., 2007) and the presence of anti-bullying policies and procedures (Bauman et al., 2008) may affect certain teacher outcomes, although these variables do not always bear a significant influence (Bauman et al., 2008; Boulton, 1997; Yoon et al., 2011). Research suggests that proximal situational factors pertaining to specific bullying episodes further influence bystander outcomes. For example, the type of bullying plays a role, with peers demonstrating less support for bullies who engage in direct physical or direct verbal aggression compared with those who engage in relational or indirect verbal bullying (Tapper & Boulton, 2005). In addition, teacher studies reveal a hierarchy in perceptions of seriousness and the need for intervention with physical bullying receiving higher ratings than verbal bullying followed by social exclusion (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000; Yoon et al., 2014). Preliminary evidence also suggests that teacher outcomes may vary depending on the gender of the students involved (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008; Yoon et

al., 2014), with teachers rating physically aggressive acts committed by female students as more serious and warranting of punishment compared to acts perpetrated by male students (Rogowicz, Del Vecchio, Dwyer-Masin, & Hughes, 2014).

Victims' emotional displays and behavioural reactions to bullying incidents are visible to bystanders and represent a salient situational feature of bullying episodes. As presented in more detail in Papers 3 and 4, several studies have alluded to the potential influence of victims' responses on peer and teacher perceptions and reactions to bullying. Connections between victims' coping responses and peer preference have been identified (Courtney et al., 2003; Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2003; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Lightner et al., 2000; Scambler et al., 1998). Preliminary evidence also suggests that victims' reactions may be considered when determining the seriousness of bullying episodes (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006) and when deciding whether or not to intervene (Blain-Arcaro, Smith, Cunningham, Vaillancourt, & Rimas, 2012; Smith et al., 2010). However, research has yet to specifically examine the effect of victims' responses to bullying on the ways in which peer bystanders and teachers interpret and respond to bullying interactions. Comparing different victim responses and furthering current understanding of the roles of peer bystanders and teachers in the systemic problem of bullying offers an important avenue for informing the development of individual-level, peer-level, and teacher-level components of whole school anti-bullying programs.

The Present Thesis

This thesis aimed to investigate victims' responses to bullying and their effect on the attitudes and reactions of peer bystanders and teachers. While various approaches have been used to investigate victims' responses to bullying, few studies have explored student and teacher evaluations of victims' emotional displays and behavioural reactions during bullying interactions. Furthermore, while there is some research

suggesting that the victim's response may affect how bystanders' interpret and respond to bullying situations (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Courtney et al., 2003; Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2003; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Lightner et al., 2000; Scambler et al., 1998), a direct examination of the causal impact of this salient situational factor has yet to be undertaken. This thesis aimed to fill these gaps in the literature, in order to deepen current understanding of the systemic processes involved in bullying. Based on preliminary evidence, victims' responses to bullying were predicted to vary in their perceived effectiveness and their relative impact on the cognitive, emotional, and behavioural reactions of peers and teachers who witnessed the bullying interactions.

The studies presented in this thesis utilised hypothetical videotaped scenarios (See Appendix A for video scripts) portraying incidents of physical or verbal bullying in which the victims' responses were experimentally manipulated. Building on past survey data (e.g., Oh & Hazler, 2009), this research adopted an experimental design to enable the study of causal influences affecting bystander reactions to bullying scenarios. This research focussed exclusively on overt forms of bullying given that victims are physically present and their emotional display and behavioural reactions are visible to bystanders during direct bullying interactions. The use of videotaped scenarios offered important benefits over written vignette methods (e.g., Yoon & Kerber, 2003), which rely on participants creating their own mental images that will inevitably vary from person to person (Yoon et al., 2011). Watching videos is also typically more engaging for participants and more closely imitates the visual and auditory information available to bystanders when witnessing bullying in the school environment. This research focussed on bullying among students in late primary school and early secondary school due to the high prevalence of overt bullying within this age range and to explore any differences across the transition from primary to secondary school in Australia (Cross et al., 2009).

The four victim responses that were compared (given summary labels of angry, sad, confident, ignoring) consisted of the combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction to maximise ecological validity and to reflect the victim responses described in past research. These four response types (validated using expert ratings, see Appendix B) enabled victim responses that are typically recommended by researchers, teachers, and within anti-bullying interventions (i.e., confident and ignoring responses) to be compared with common yet ineffective responses to bullying (e.g., externalising responses portrayed by angry victims and internalising responses portrayed by sad victims; Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996).

As a thesis by publication[2], this body of research consists of a general introduction, four empirical papers, and an overall discussion of findings. The background literature review presented here outlined the problem of school bullying, victims' responses to being bullied, and the role of peer bystanders and teachers in the social ecology of bullying. Papers 1 and 2 aimed to explore victims' responses to bullying using mixed methods and from the perspectives of students and teachers, respectively. This underutilised mixed method approach assisted with generating new insights and improving the validity of findings from each method (Hong & Espelage, 2012a).

Given that victim response evaluations and practices have rarely been investigated in the same study, Paper 1 aimed to compare students' evaluations of

[2] In preparing this thesis by publication, slight changes have been made to the empirical papers submitted or accepted for publication in order to create consistency throughout the thesis. For example, Australian spelling has been adopted, a single reference list has been included for the thesis as a whole, and other papers included in the thesis have been referenced according to their label in the thesis (e.g., Paper 1). Where other changes have been made, footnotes have been included to denote these variations. The four papers were derived from two distinct data sets, one using a student sample (Papers 1 and 3) and one using a teacher sample (Papers 2 and 4). The questionnaire measures completed by students and teachers are outlined in Appendices C and D, respectively. Due to the order in which papers have undergone the publication process, more detailed information about the sample and methodology is presented in Papers 3 and 4, compared with Papers 1 and 2. Some degree of overlap should also be expected given that the four manuscripts are presented as self-contained empirical papers. Each paper does however introduce new ideas and address a unique research question.

victim responses observed within hypothetical videotaped scenarios and their reported likelihood of adopting these responses when faced with bullying themselves. Qualitative methods were also used to elucidate the full range of reported victim responses and to explore the motivations underlying victims' responses to bullying which have received little attention in the literature to date. Paper 2 extended on this investigation by exploring victims' responses to bullying from the perspective of teachers. Few studies have explored this issue, despite teachers' key role in recommending and guiding responses to bullying. To complement this quantitative analysis and to address the lack of qualitative exploration of this issue in past literature, qualitative approaches were used to uncover teachers' victim response recommendations and related rationales.

Papers 3 and 4 aimed to build upon this exploration of victims' responses to bullying by examining their influence on peer and teacher bystanders. Typically, the effectiveness of different victim responses is evaluated in terms of their effect on bullies and therefore future bullying (e.g., Camodeca & Goossens, 2005). However, a consideration of victim response effects on other aspects of the social ecology, including peers and teachers, may offer a more comprehensive evaluation of victim response effectiveness. Examining the effect of victims' responses on the attitudes and reactions of peer and teacher bystanders also extends past research investigating how different individual and situational factors predict bystanders' perceptions and behaviours in bullying situations (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000; Oh & Hazler, 2009; Yoon, et al., 2014). Furthermore, this research aimed to further current knowledge about peer and teacher roles in bullying in order to guide interventions which encourage peers and teachers to use their influence over bullying interactions in more positive and constructive ways.

Paper 3 aimed to study the impact of victims' responses on peer bystanders' attitudes towards the victim, perceptions of the victimisation, emotional reactions, and

behavioural intentions in bullying situations. Variations depending on the bullying type and students' grade, gender, and personal experiences with bullying were also explored, given that the effectiveness of victim responses can vary according to these factors (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996). Paper 4 aimed to extend this investigation to teachers, who may also witness bullying incidents. Victim response effects on teachers' attributions of blame, perceptions of the victimisation, emotional reactions, and behavioural intentions to intervene were examined. Several other individual (e.g., teacher gender, moral disengagement, empathy, self-efficacy for dealing with bullying, current exposure to bullying), school (e.g., school level, school anti-bullying activities), and situational influences (e.g., student gender, bullying type) were also explored to better understand factors affecting teachers' cognitions, emotions, and behavioural reactions to bullying. Finally, the thesis concludes with a general discussion which critically examines the findings from these four studies in the context of the bullying literature. Thesis strengths, limitations, and future research directions are outlined and the broad implications of this body of research are discussed.

PAPER 1

Victims' Responses to Bullying: The Gap Between Students' Evaluations and Reported Responses

Authors:

Nicole Sokol, Kay Bussey, & Ronald M. Rapee

Centre for Emotional Health

Department of Psychology

Macquarie University

Publication Reference (*Note.* There were some slight edits in the published version):

Sokol, N., Bussey, K., & Rapee, R. M. (2016). Victims' responses to bullying: Comparing students' evaluations, response strategies, and motivations. *School Mental Health*. doi: 10.1007/s12310-016-9185-0

Abstract

Victims' responses to bullying have the potential to impact bullying outcomes. This study examined students' evaluations of and reported likelihood of adopting four different victim responses (angry, sad, confident, ignoring). Fifth- and seventh-grade students (*N* = 206; *Mean age* = 11.13 and 13.18 years, respectively) viewed hypothetical videotaped scenarios portraying either physical or verbal bullying among same-sex peers and completed online questionnaires. While students rated the confident and ignoring victim responses as more effective overall, they reported a greater likelihood of adopting sad and angry responses to bullying. This pattern suggests a gap between what students "know" and what students report they would actually "do" if faced with bullying themselves. Some gender and age variations were also identified. Qualitative data exploring participants' responses to bullying and their associated motivations provided further insights into how students approach bullying problems. These findings may inform interventions designed to train and empower students to adopt more effective responses to bullying.

Keywords: bullying; victimisation; victim response; victim reaction; peer aggression

Victims' Responses to Bullying: The Gap Between Students' Evaluations and Reported Responses

Students worldwide find themselves tackling the ubiquitous problem of school bullying (Due et al., 2005). Bullying refers to repeated and intentionally aggressive behaviour that represents an abuse of power (Olweus, 1994) and places victims at risk of a range of adjustment problems (Due et al., 2005; Hawker & Boulton, 2000). However, school bullying does not affect all students equally (Terranova, 2009). Research suggests that victims' responses to bullying influence both future victimisation and victim maladjustment (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996; Waasdorp & Bradshaw, 2011). These findings have encouraged the development of individual-level interventions designed to train victims in emotion regulation, coping, and social skills in order to promote more effective ways of responding to bullying (e.g., Berry & Hunt, 2009; DeRosier, 2004; Fox & Boulton, 2003b; Rigby, 2011). While the responsibility for ending bullying in no way lies with the victim, this victim-focussed approach aims to foster self-efficacy, self-esteem, and a sense of control by empowering and enabling victims to play an active role in preventing future bullying and reducing its negative consequences (Cowie & Berdondini, 2002; Craig et al., 2007). Preliminary evaluations of these programs have demonstrated modest success; however more focussed intervention may be needed to alter students' responses during bullying episodes (Berry & Hunt, 2009). Although working with victims is unlikely to be a sufficient method for tackling the systemic problem of bullying, improving individual-level intervention components offers an important opportunity to augment and improve the efficacy of whole school anti-bullying programs (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). By examining students' evaluations of different victim responses as well as their reported responses to bullying and associated

motivations, the current study aimed to inform the improvement of these interventions for victims.

The way a victim responds to bullying has the potential to perpetuate the cycle of victimisation or assist in minimising the risk of future bullying (Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). Although a range of emotional displays and behavioural responses have been identified, research indicates that there are two main types of victims: aggressive and passive victims (Schwartz et al., 2001). Aggressive victims typically display anger and respond to bullying with reactive aggression. Their emotionally and behaviourally dysregulated counterattacks tend to provoke further aggression and are often unsuccessful due to the power differential inherent in bullying relationships (Schwartz et al., 2001). Passive victims tend to be the majority and display sadness and anxiety while engaging in withdrawn and submissive behaviours. Their visible distress and acquiescence increases their risk of further victimisation by reinforcing the bully and creating the reputation that they are easy targets (Perry et al., 1990; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). Within anti-bullying interventions, it is often recommended that victims respond calmly and confidently using neutral, non-provocative comments which aim to confuse the bully and diffuse the situation (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b). To avoid reinforcing the bully, teachers and researchers also commonly advise victims to calmly ignore the bully and continue what they are doing with a nonchalant expression (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Elledge et al., 2010; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996; Shapiro et al., 1991). The present study examined students' perspectives on these four observable victim responses (labelled for the sake of brevity as: angry, sad, confident, ignoring), which span both active and passive behavioural responses and both high and low expressed emotion. These response types also offered a helpful template for comparing common yet ineffective responses with recommended responses to bullying.

Several quantitative (e.g., Camodeca & Goossens, 2005) and qualitative studies (e.g., Kanetsuna & Smith, 2002; Kanetsuna et al., 2006; Oliver & Candappa, 2007) have explored students' opinions about effective responses to bullying. Experimental studies utilising hypothetical videotaped scenarios have also been used to assess the perceived effectiveness of specific behavioural responses to teasing (Landau et al., 2001; Lightner et al., 2000; Scambler et al., 1998). Students' evaluations of different victim responses were further investigated in the current study, given that victims may be more inclined to adopt responses that they perceive to be effective (Black, Weinles, & Washington, 2010). This line of research draws upon students' knowledge and experience in order to inform the development of anti-bullying interventions which take into account students' perceptions (Gamliel et al., 2003).

The ways students typically respond to bullying should also be considered when designing programs for victims. However many past studies, both quantitative (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Kristensen & Smith, 2003; Smith & Shu, 2000) and qualitative (Gamliel et al., 2003; Naylor et al., 2001; Paquette & Underwood, 1999; Smith et al., 1999; Smith, Talamelli, et al., 2004; Tenenbaum et al., 2011), have explored broad coping styles (e.g., externalising versus internalising) rather than more specific responses characterised by particular emotional displays and behavioural reactions. Examining the latter might more directly benefit the development of interventions which train victims in emotion regulation and behavioural response skills. Furthermore, while previous research has investigated students' motivations for dealing with their bullying situation (Craig et al., 2007) and the reasons why victims of bullying are reluctant to seek help (Kanetsuna & Smith, 2002; Kanetsuna et al., 2006; Oliver & Candappa, 2007), the reasoning behind specific victim response selections has undergone only preliminary investigation (Bellmore, Chen, & Rischall, 2013). The current examination of the motivations underlying students' responses to bullying may

importantly reveal students' priorities when tackling bullying problems as well as the potential barriers to effective responding.

Students' evaluations' of different victim responses and actual responses to bullying have rarely been investigated in the same study. However, there is preliminary evidence suggesting that the responses students reportedly adopt are not always perceived as effective and vice versa (Black et al., 2010; Craig et al., 2007; Gamliel et al., 2003; Landau et al., 2001; Murray-Harvey et al., 2012; Scambler et al., 1998; Tenenbaum et al., 2011). The current study extended past research by specifically comparing students' evaluations of and reported likelihood of employing four different responses to physical or verbal bullying (angry, sad, confident, ignoring). To maximise specificity and ecological validity, hypothetical videotaped scenarios were used to portray each behavioural response and its associated emotional display. To supplement quantitative data assessing the frequency with which students report employing these four victim responses, qualitative measures were used to allow students to describe in their own words the different responses they adopt when faced with bullying and their underlying motivations. This mixed method approach assists with generating new insights and improving the validity of findings from either method (Hong & Espelage, 2012a). A sample of students in late primary school and early secondary school was selected due to the high prevalence of physical and verbal bullying within this age range (approximately equivalent to middle school in the USA) and to assess any differences in students' responses to bullying across the transition from primary to secondary school in Australia (Cross et al., 2009).

It was hypothesised that students would evaluate the confident and ignoring victim responses as more effective than the angry and sad victim responses (e.g., Landau et al., 2001; Lightner et al., 2000; Scamber et al., 1998; Tenenbaum et al., 2011), based on their school bullying experiences and exposure to common victim

response recommendations. Students were also expected to consider sad victims to be at greatest risk of future victimisation, given that visible distress and passivity can be reinforcing for bullies (Perry et al., 1990; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). Despite students' predicted ability to evaluate the differential effectiveness of witnessed victim responses in line with recommended approaches, it was predicted that students would report a greater likelihood to engage in unhelpful responses when faced with bullying themselves. More specifically, sad responses characteristic of passive victims were expected to be the most common in line with recognised prevalence rates (Schwartz et al., 2001). By contrast, confident victim responses were predicted to be the least common given the skills needed to remain calm and generate an immediate verbal response. Although no specific hypotheses were generated, the potential effects of grade, gender, bullying type, and students' personal experiences with bullying and victimisation were also explored, as the effectiveness of victims' responses has been found to vary depending on these factors (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). Supplementing this quantitative investigation, the qualitative data were expected to reveal the diverse ways students respond to bullying and the variety of motivations driving these responses. In this way, the current study aimed to uncover some preliminary insights into the predicted discrepancy between what students "know" and what students report that they would actually "do" in response to bullying.

Method

Participants

This study formed part of a larger research project investigating the effect of victims' responses to bullying on peer bystander reactions (Paper 3). Principals of two private schools, one boys' and one girls' school, in middle- to upper-class areas of a large Australian city consented to their school's participation. Parental informed consent

was requested with a 54% return rate, of which 95% consented. There were 21 absentees on the testing day and four students were excluded because missing data exceeded 20% of items.

The final sample comprised 206 students: 90 fifth graders (M_{age} = 11.13 years, *SD* = 0.33, age range = 10.33-11.67 years, 47 males) and 116 seventh graders (M_{age} = 13.18 years, *SD* = 0.33, age range = 12.33–14.25 years, 60 males), with the following ethnic backgrounds represented: 86% Caucasian, 10% Asian, and 4% Other. Participants came from 18 classes with the number of students per class ranging from four to 23 students. Participants' personal experiences with bullying and victimisation have been reported previously (Paper 3).

Design

Participants were randomly assigned to watch either four physical or four verbal bullying scenarios and viewed a different victim response each time. This method produced a 2 (gender: male, female) × 2 (grade: 5, 7) × 2 (bullying type: physical, verbal) × 4 (victim response: angry, sad, confident, ignoring) mixed experimental design, with the first three factors between-subjects and the last one within-subjects. The order of video presentation was counterbalanced using four fixed orders such that each victim response appeared in each position across the four orders. There were also four fixed sets of videos for each bullying type and gender which were counterbalanced across participants. Across these four sets, each actor dyad portrayed a scenario involving each of the four victim responses. In total, there were 64 different versions of the survey which varied in terms of child gender, bullying type, video order, and video set. Students' own responses to bullying were examined using a mixed method design with participants responding to both quantitative and qualitative measures focussed on the bullying type they viewed in the videos (physical or verbal).

Materials

Video stimuli. Short hypothetical videotaped scenarios created by the first author were used to establish the experimental manipulation (see Appendix A). Each physical and verbal bullying incident was filmed with four alternative endings that depicted different victim responses, characterised by the combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction: *angry victim response* (displayed frustration and attempted retaliation in an unregulated way characteristic of aggressive victims), *sad victim response* (displayed signs of emotional distress and engaged in withdrawn or submissive behaviours characteristic of passive victims), *confident victim response* (displayed a confident expression and calmly and assertively used a neutral, non-provocative comment designed to diffuse the situation) and *ignoring victim response* (displayed a nonchalant expression and calmly ignored the bully and continued what he or she was doing). Expert ratings, pilot test data, and manipulation check data using the current sample confirmed the intended victim response patterns (Paper 3). In line with past research (Bellmore, Ma, You, & Hughes, 2012), participants viewed videos of same-sex actors, given that victimisation often occurs among students of the same gender (Pellegrini & Long, 2002) and because participants attended single-sex schools (which comprise a significant minority of Australian schools; Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015a). The incidents were also filmed in four distinct school settings (on a bench in the playground, near the school gate, in a hallway, or at the drinking fountain), using four pairs of actors for each gender that were unknown to participants. Each video was preceded by a voiceover which described the characters as "students in your class" and the bully and victim were consistently referred to as "Student 1" and "Student 2", respectively. The voiceover also established elements of the bullying definition: "you know that this is not the first time that something like this has happened and that it is hard for Student 2 to make it stop".

Questionnaires. Videos were embedded within online questionnaires which began with demographic questions (e.g., gender, age, and grade). Students then viewed photos and provided baseline liking ratings utilising a 5-point rating scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*) to indicate their first impressions of the same-sex child actors who later portrayed victims in the videos. Following each video, participants completed a questionnaire using the same rating scale. Manipulation check items assessed the victim's observable response (angry, sad, confident, calmly ignoring). Participants were then asked to make a series of ratings about the videos. Students' evaluations of the different victim responses were assessed using two single items: *victim response effectiveness* (i.e., "I think Student 2 handled the situation well") and *risk of future victimisation* (i.e., "I think Student 2 will be picked on again"). Students' attitudes towards the victim, perceptions of the victimisation, emotional reactions, and behavioural intentions were also measured and have been described elsewhere (Paper 3).

After the videos and their related questionnaires, participants completed additional questionnaires assessing their own experiences with bullying. Depending on whether they had viewed physical or verbal bullying scenarios, students read the statement: "As you saw in the videos, different students respond differently when another student does (or says) something hurtful to them at school". Using the same rating scale, participants' own responses to physical or verbal bullying incidents at school were assessed using four items which asked students to rate how likely they would be to respond using each of the victim responses portrayed in the videos (e.g., "get angry and say something back", "look away sadly and not say anything back", "say something in a confident tone", "stay calm and ignore them"). Two open-ended questions were then used to allow students to express in their own words "what you

would be most likely to do if another student did (or said) something hurtful to you at school" (victim responses) and "why you would respond this way" (motivations).

Participants read a brief definition of bullying (based on Olweus, 1994) before indicating how often they had bullied other students and been bullied by other students since the beginning of the school term (7-8 weeks) using a 6-point rating scale (1 = *not at all in the past term* to 6 = *many times a week in the past term*). In each case, three items assessed physical bullying (e.g., "shoved or pushed") and three items assessed verbal bullying (e.g., "called mean or hurtful names"). A principal components analysis with oblimin rotation revealed a two-factor solution explaining 64% of variance: bullying experiences (α = .86, eigenvalue = 2.15) and victimisation experiences **(**α = .91**,** eigenvalue = 5.58).

Procedure

After providing verbal assent, participants completed online questionnaires of approximately 30 minutes' duration which were administered in class groups during school hours. To randomly allocate students to different conditions, the experimenter distributed printouts of different survey URLs which took students to different versions of the survey. Students were told they would be completing an online survey which aimed "to find out what children think about different things that happen at school" and which involved viewing and answering questions about four videos of actors portraying real situations that have happened at schools like theirs. Wearing headphones, participants watched each video (with the option to re-watch it) and then filled in the associated questionnaire, one video at a time, before completing the remaining questionnaires. Participants were asked not to discuss the survey with other students and were invited to consult their teacher or school counsellor regarding any bullying concerns. The procedures were approved by the University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Coding Qualitative Data

Adopting a thematic analysis approach (Braun & Clarke, 2006), the first author familiarised herself with the qualitative data by reading and re-reading the students' responses and noting down any preliminary ideas. Initial codes were generated and collated into potential themes. In consultation with the second and third authors, these themes were reviewed and refined by checking that the themes fit with the coded extracts and the entire data set. Clear definitions and names for each theme and sub-theme were generated and the victim responses data and motivations data were each organised into content categories designed to reflect students' actual responses and so that all victim responses and motivations were classified. Students' responses were coded for all victim responses and motivations they stated in order to determine the proportion of students that offered each particular victim response or motivation. Statements were coded based on their content in cases where students provided victim response statements in response to the motivation probe and vice versa. The first author coded any ambiguous responses in consultation with the second or third author. Using the thematic map designed by the first author, an independent rater coded a randomly selected, stratified sample of 10% of the victim response and motivation statements. Inter-rater agreement was high (Cohen's κ = .96) and disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Data Analytic Strategy

Two distinct data analytic approaches were used to analyse the quantitative and qualitative data, respectively. For the quantitative data, the descriptive statistics reported are the estimated marginal means calculated in the analyses. Pearson's correlations between the victim response effectiveness and the risk of future victimisation variables were calculated for each victim response. Using an overall alpha of .05, a series of 2 (gender: male, female) × 2 (grade: 5, 7) × 2 (bullying type: physical, verbal) × 4 (victim

response: angry, sad, confident, ignoring) mixed model ANOVAs were conducted on the quantitative variables assessing students' victim response evaluations and own responses to bullying. This approach was appropriate given that students were clustered in classes. However, class effects were non-significant for all three quantitative variables ($p > .05$) with intraclass correlations ranging from <.001 to .075. Bonferroni adjustments were used to account for the two variables assessing victim response evaluations and when testing simple effects. Cohen's *d* was calculated as a measure of effect size when reporting on significant simple effects. The baseline liking variables which assessed students' first impressions of the students who later portrayed victims in the videos were included as a within-subjects covariate in these analyses. Order and video set were included as between-subjects covariates when assessing students' victim response evaluations. Secondary analyses which tested additional fixed effects involving order and video set were used to explore whether within-subjects or between × within-subjects effects varied depending on these methodological variables. Two binary variables (bully and victim status) were created to distinguish students who reported having bullied others (or experienced victimisation) at least once in the past term from those who had not bullied (or been victimised). The mixed model analyses were repeated with these variables added in order to explore whether the reported findings varied by bully or victim status. However, no significant results were found (*p*s > .05) and therefore these analyses will not be reported. Missing data were negligible for the quantitative variables (< 3%).

To analyse the qualitative data, a series of binary logistic regressions ($\alpha = .05$) were conducted on the broad content categories and lower-level sub-categories (if stated by a minimum 10% of students) to assess whether students' reported victim responses and motivations varied depending on gender, grade, bullying type, bully status, and victim status. These five variables were all entered into each binary logistic regression.

Binary logistic regression was selected given its ability to test hypothesised relationships between a dichotomous outcome variable and one or more dichotomous dummy-coded predictor variables.

Results

Evaluating Witnessed Victim Responses

Descriptive statistics and correlations. Table 1 shows descriptive statistics for all quantitative variables. Thirty-five percent of students denied any bullying and 25% denied having experienced any victimisation in the past term. There was a significant negative correlation between victim response effectiveness and the risk of future victimisation for all four victim responses (angry: $r(203) = -.23$, $p = .001$; sad: $r(204) = -.16$, $p = .03$; confident: $r(204) = -.22$, $p = .001$; ignoring: $r(204) = -.37$, $p < .001$).

Victim response effectiveness. Using a nominal alpha of .025, the mixed model ANOVA revealed a significant bullying type main effect, $F(1, 191) = 15.58$, $p < .001$. Victim response effectiveness ratings were higher among students who viewed verbal bullying ($M = 2.73$, $SD = 0.88$) compared to physical bullying situations ($M = 2.28$, $SD = 0.89$). A significant victim response effect was also obtained, $F(3, 584) = 26.02$, $p < .001$. This main effect was qualified by a significant Gender × Victim Response interaction, $F(3, 584) = 4.69$, $p = .003$. Follow-up simple effects analyses (see Table 2) exploring students' ratings of gender-consistent scenarios revealed that females thought that confident victims handled bullying situations better than angry, sad, and ignoring victims. Females also thought that ignoring victims handled bullying situations better than angry and sad victims. Although a similar pattern was present among males viewing gender-consistent scenarios, there was only one significant simple effect indicating that males thought confident victims handled bullying situations better than sad victims. No other simple effects were significant (ps > .002).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for the Victim Response Evaluations Variables and Own Responses to Bullying Quantitative Variable

	Angry Victim		Sad Victim		Confident Victim		Ignoring Victim	
Variable and Subgroup	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Victim Response Effectiveness								
Males (*n* = 107)	2.43	1.52	2.19	1.52	2.88	1.52	2.70	1.52
Females (*n* = 98)	1.89	1.48	1.98	1.48	3.31	1.48	2.69	1.48
Risk of Future Victimisation								
Grade 5 Males (*n* = 47)	3.52	1.73	3.97	1.73	3.41	1.73	3.54	1.73
Grade 7 Males (*n* = 60)	3.53	1.55	4.17	1.55	3.12	1.55	3.64	1.55
Grade 5 Females (*n* = 43)	2.99	1.77	4.25	1.77	2.61	1.77	3.46	1.77
Grade 7 Females (*n* = 56)	3.41	1.59	4.06	1.59	3.52	1.59	3.81	1.59
Own Response to Bullying								
Grade 5 (*n* = 89)	2.70	1.26	3.54	1.26	1.84	1.26	2.81	1.26
Grade 7 (*n* = 116)	3.23	1.25	3.69	1.25	1.71	1.25	2.63	1.25

Note. Descriptive statistics were obtained from the estimated marginal means.

Table 2

Inferential Statistics for Simple Effects Analyses.

Pairwise Comparison:	Angry vs. Sad Victim				Angry vs. Confident Victim				Angry vs. Ignoring Victim			
Dependent Variable	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*d*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*d*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*d*
Victim Response Effectiveness (α = .002)												
Males	0.24	.19	.21		0.45	.19	.02		0.27	.19	.15	
Females	0.08	.19	.65		1.41	.19	< .001*	0.96	0.80	.19	< .001*	0.54
Risk of Future Victimisation (α = .001)												
Male Fifth Graders	0.45	.23	.06		0.11	.23	.64		0.02	.23	.94	
Male Seventh Graders	0.64	.21	.002		0.41	.21	.05		0.11	.21	.60	
Female Fifth Graders	1.26	.23	< .001*	0.71	0.38	.23	.10		0.47	.23	.04	
Female Seventh Graders	0.65	.20	.001*	0.41	0.11	.20	.58		0.40	.20	.05	
Own Responses to Bullying (α = .004)												
Grade 5	0.84	.19	< .001*	0.67	0.86	.19	< .001*	0.68	0.11	.19	.55	
Grade 7	0.46	.16	.006		1.52	.16	< .001*	1.21	0.60	.16	< .001*	0.48

Pairwise Comparison:	Sad vs. Confident Victim				Sad vs. Ignoring Victim				Confident vs. Ignoring Victim			
Dependent Variable	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*d*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*d*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*d*
Victim Response Effectiveness (α = .002)												
Males	0.69	.19	< .001*	0.45	0.50	.19	.007		0.18	.19	.33	
Females	1.33	.19	< .001*	0.90	0.71	.19	< .001*	0.48	0.61	.19	.001*	0.42
Risk of Future Victimisation (α = .001)												
Male Fifth Graders	0.56	.23	.02		0.43	.23	.07		0.13	.23	.59	
Male Seventh Graders	1.05	.21	< .001*	0.68	0.52	.21	.01		0.52	.21	.01	
Female Fifth Graders	1.65	.23	< .001*	0.93	0.80	.23	.001*	0.45	0.85	.23	< .001*	0.48
Female Seventh Graders	0.54	.20	.008		0.25	.20	.21		0.29	.20	.16	
Own Responses to Bullying (α = .004)												
Grade 5	1.71	.19	< .001*	1.35	0.73	.19	< .001*	0.58	0.98	.19	< .001*	0.77
Grade 7	1.98	.16	< .001*	1.58	1.06	.16	< .001*	0.84	0.92	.16	< .001*	0.74

Note. Cohen's *d* has been included as a measure of effect size for significant simple effects only.

The secondary analyses revealed a significant Order × Victim Response interaction, F (9, 530) = 2.16, p = .02, although simple effects analyses indicated that there were no significant order variations in the ratings of each victim response (ps > .001). Order did not significantly moderate the Gender × Victim Response interaction interpreted in the main analysis. A significant Video Set × Victim Response interaction was obtained, F (9, 530) = 3.93, p < .001, although the three-way interaction with gender was non-significant (p > .025). Simple effects analyses revealed some video set variations in the perceived effectiveness of the ignoring victim response, with the ignoring victim at the drinking fountain being thought to have handled the bullying situation better than other ignoring victims. Inspection of the manipulation check variables revealed that the ignoring victim at the drinking fountain was observed to be more confident and less sad than other ignoring victims. This pattern suggests that the strength of the victim response manipulation may at least partially explain the identified video set variations in students' victim response effectiveness ratings.

Risk of future victimisation. Using a nominal alpha of .025, the mixed model ANOVA revealed a significant Gender × Grade × Bullying Type interaction, F (1, 194) = 8.68, p = .004 (see Table 3 for descriptive statistics). Follow-up simple effects analyses revealed a significant bullying type effect among female fifth graders, MD = 0.76, SE = .24, p = .002, d = 0.63, such that victims of physical bullying were considered at greater risk of future victimisation compared to victims of verbal bullying. A significant victim response effect was also obtained, F (3, 585) = 27.94, p < .001. This main effect was qualified by a significant Gender × Grade × Victim Response interaction, F (3, 585) = 4.51, p = .004. Follow-up simple effects analyses (see Table 2) exploring students' ratings of gender-consistent scenarios revealed that among female fifth graders, the sad victim was considered more likely to be victimised again compared to the angry, confident, and ignoring victims. The ignoring victim was also

considered more likely to be victimised again compared to the confident victim. Among female seventh graders, the sad victim was considered more likely to be victimised compared to the angry victim. Among male seventh graders, the sad victim was considered more likely to be victimised compared to the confident victim. No other simple effects reached significance (*p*s > .001).

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for the Risk of Future Victimisation Variable Organised by Gender, Grade, and Bullying Type

Gender	Grade	Bullying Type	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Male	Year 5	Physical	3.42	1.06	16
		Verbal	3.80	1.25	31
	Year 7	Physical	3.71	1.04	36
		Verbal	3.52	1.04	24
Female	Year 5	Physical	3.71	1.17	20
		Verbal	2.95	1.22	23
	Year 7	Physical	3.67	1.07	27
		Verbal	3.73	1.06	29

The secondary analyses revealed a significant Order × Victim Response interaction, F (9, 495) = 3.90, $p < .001$, although simple effects analyses indicated that there were no significant order variations in the ratings of each victim response (*p*s > .001). Order did not significantly moderate the Gender × Grade × Victim Response interaction interpreted in the main analysis. Some video set effects were identified including a significant Video Set × Victim Response interaction, F (9, 495) = 3.29, p =

.001, and Video Set × Gender × Grade × Victim Response interaction, F (48, 335) = 1.85, p = .001. These findings suggest that students' evaluations of victims' risk of future victimisation vary not only by victim response, grade, and gender, but also depending on other characteristics of the particular bullying episode being observed. For example, there may be variations depending on what exactly the bullies do, how victims implement their responses, and features of the specific students involved.

Participants' Own Responses to Bullying Incidents at School

Quantitative data. The mixed method ANOVA revealed a significant victim response effect, F (3, 776) = 74.30, p < .001, which was qualified by a significant Grade × Victim Response interaction, F (3, 776) = 3.63, p = .02. Follow-up simple effects analyses (see Table 2) revealed that both fifth and seventh graders reported being more likely to adopt the sad victim response compared to the confident and ignoring victim responses. Both fifth and seventh graders also reported being more likely to adopt the angry and ignoring victim responses compared to the confident victim response. While fifth graders reported being more likely to adopt the sad victim response than the angry victim response, this difference did not reach significance among seventh graders (p > .004). Furthermore, seventh graders reported being more likely to adopt the angry victim response than the ignoring victim response, whereas the reported likelihood of adopting these two victim responses did not differ significantly among fifth graders (p > .004). When examining the Grade × Victim Response interaction separated by victim response, a significant grade effect was found for the angry victim response only, MD = 0.53, SE = .18, p = .003, d = 0.42. Seventh graders were more likely than fifth graders to report they would adopt the angry victim response.

Qualitative data. Tables 4 and 5 outline the content categories and descriptive statistics for participants' reported victim responses and motivations, respectively.

Victim Responses. Binary logistic regression revealed several bullying type effects. Students who described their responses to verbal bullying, compared with physical bullying, were 3.15 times more likely to indicate they would give an unspecified verbal response (e.g., "say something"), $B = 1.15$, $SE = .49$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 5.56$, $p = .02$, were 1.94 times more likely to report behaviourally disengaged responses, $B = 0.66$, $SE = .33$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 4.09$, $p = .04$, and were 3.05 times more likely to describe ignoring the bully, $B = 1.11$, $SE = .43$, $Wald\ \chi2(1) = 6.68$, $p = .01$. By contrast, students reporting on physical (versus verbal) bullying were 1.78 times more likely to report intentions to tell someone about the bullying, $B = 1.24$, $SE = .34$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 13.28$, $p < .001$, and more specifically, were 1.76 times more likely to describe telling a teacher, $B = 1.06$, $SE = .35$, Wald $\chi^2(1) = 9.29$, $p = .002$.

Gender effects and variations depending on students' bullying and victimisation history were also evident. Compared to males, females were 2.60 times more likely to report that they would tell someone about the bullying, $B = 0.96$, $SE = .33$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 8.34$, $p = .004$, and were 2.28 times more likely to report that they would tell a teacher, $B = 0.82$, $SE = .34$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 5.95$, $p = .02$. Students who did not engage in any bullying behaviours in the past term were 3.89 times more likely to describe the response of defending themselves against bullying, compared to students who reported bullying other students at least once, $B = 1.36$, $SE = .56$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 5.92$, $p = .02$. Seventeen percent of participants provided complex responses (Smith et al., 1999) whereby they said their response would vary depending on the situation (e.g., "only if the situation is serious"). Students who had been victimised at least once in the past term were 5.98 times more likely to provide a complex response compared to students who had not experienced any victimisation, $B = 1.79$, $SE = .81$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 4.88$, $p = .03$.

Table 4

Percentage of Participants who Stated Particular Victim Responses.

Response to Bullying	Overall Sample (*N* = 206)	Males (*n* = 107)	Females (*n* = 99)	Grade 5 (*n* = 90)	Grade 7 (*n* = 116)	Physical Bullying (*n* = 99)	Verbal Bullying (*n* = 107)
During the Bullying Episode:	84	84	84	82	85	80	88
Behaviourally Engaged	65	61	69	60	68	64	65
Tell the bully to stop	23	22	25	10	24	28	19
Unspecified verbal response (e.g., “say something back”)	13	15	10	6	15	7	18
Defend myself (e.g., “stand up to bully”)	11	7	16	12	10	11	11
Reactive aggression (e.g., say something nasty”)	10	14	6	6	14	10	10
Ask the bully why they did it	6	4	9	4	8	8	5
Other (e.g., clever comeback, tell the bully they did wrong)	16	14	18	14	17	11	21
Behaviourally Disengaged	31	33	28	26	34	25	36
Walk away from the bully	18	19	17	13	22	17	19
Ignore the bully	16	16	16	17	16	9	22

Emotional Expression	28	20	25	28	18	21	23
Express confidence (e.g., “in a confident voice”)	10	8	11	12	8	8	11
Express negative emotions (e.g., “get really angry”)	8	10	6	6	10	10	7
Emotionally Disengaged (e.g., “act calm”, “not look upset”)	9	6	13	13	6	10	8
After the Bullying Episode:	35	26	44	39	32	46	24
Report the Bullying	33	23	42	37	29	44	21
School staff	28	21	36	34	23	37	20
Family	8	5	12	7	9	13	4
Friends	6	5	7	3	8	8	4
Manage the Bullying Independently (e.g., avoid the bully)	7	7	7	6	8	8	6
Uncoded:	8	8	8	7	9	9	7
Uninterpretable or irrelevant	3	3	3	1	4	3	3
Missing data	5	6	5	6	4	6	5

Note. Percentages reflect the proportion of participants within the sample specified in the column heading who stated a particular response. Sixty-three percent of students stated more than one response. Seventeen percent of participants provided “complex responses” whereby they indicated that their response would vary depending on the situation. Ten percent of participants referred to “trying” to adopt a particular response, although 2% of participants explicitly indicated that they would likely be unsuccessful in implementing the response.

Table 5

Percentage of Participants who Stated Particular Victim Response Motivations.

Motivation Driving Response to Bullying	Overall Sample (*N* = 206)	Males (*n* = 107)	Females (*n* = 99)	Grade 5 (*n* = 90)	Grade 7 (*n* = 116)	Physical Bullying (*n* = 99)	Verbal Bullying (*n* = 107)
Interpersonal Processes:	51	50	53	47	55	49	53
Avoid Conflict	41	39	43	41	41	40	42
Stop the bullying	22	22	21	22	22	22	21
Avoid future bullying	15	13	17	16	15	13	17
Avoid making situation worse	6	4	9	3	9	7	6
Influence the Bully	23	25	21	20	26	21	25
Demonstrate a point to the bully (e.g., “realise doing wrong”)	12	11	12	10	13	9	14
Avoid reinforcing the bully (e.g., “won’t see the fun in it”)	10	10	9	9	10	9	10
Affect the bully’s feelings (e.g., “will get fed up and bored”)	4	5	3	3	4	4	4
Intrapersonal Processes:	39	31	47	37	41	40	37
Response to emotions	17	14	19	16	17	18	15
Negative emotional response (e.g., “I would be upset”)	11	10	12	9	13	13	9
Reduce negative emotions (e.g., “I would feel better”)	6	4	9	9	4	5	7

Personal Identity	19	13	25	18	20	18	20
Personality characteristics (e.g., “that is my nature”)	13	10	16	13	13	10	16
Identity protection (e.g., “stand up for myself”)	7	4	10	6	8	8	6
Personal Preferences (e.g., “want to know why”)	6	5	8	6	7	7	6
Beliefs and Ethical Processes:	36	34	38	37	35	43	29
Beliefs about Bullying	24	18	30	24	23	28	20
Beliefs about the role of others (e.g., “teacher able to help”)	14	8	20	16	13	18	10
Beliefs about handling bullying (e.g., “right thing to do”)	10	9	11	9	11	11	9
Moral Reasoning	18	20	16	21	16	19	17
Bullying is wrong	12	14	9	13	10	14	9
Avoid being a bully	5	2	8	6	4	5	5
Other (e.g., retribution)	3	6	1	3	3	3	4
Uncoded:	10	12	8	8	11	10	10
Uninterpretable or irrelevant	3	5	2	2	4	4	3
Missing data	7	7	6	6	7	6	7

Note. Percentages reflect the proportion of participants within the sample specified in the column heading who stated a particular motivation.

Victim Response Motivations. Binary logistic regression analyses revealed several gender variations. Compared to males, females were 2.29 times more likely to report personal identity motivations, $B = 0.83$, $SE = .38$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 4.85$, $p = .03$, were 2.09 times more likely to report motivations based on beliefs about bullying, $B = 0.74$, $SE = .35$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 4.56$, $p = .03$, and were 2.84 times more likely to report being motivated by beliefs about the role of others in bullying, $B = 1.05$, $SE = .44$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 5.59$, $p = .02$. Overall, 41% of participants stated more than one motivation however females were 2.07 times more likely to report multiple motivations compared to males, $B = 0.73$, $SE = .31$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 5.68$, $p = .02$. Students' victimisation history also affected their reported victim response motivations. Students who had not experienced victimisation in the past term, compared to those that had, were 4.03 times more likely to state motivations of trying to avoid conflict, $B = 1.39$, $SE = .44$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 10.10$, $p = .001$. Whereas students who had been victimised were 9.57 times more likely to state trying to avoid reinforcing the bully, $B = 2.26$, $SE = 1.10$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 4.21$, $p = .04$, compared to those that had not been victimised.

Discussion

Notwithstanding some minor gender and grade variations, overall, students rated the confident and ignoring victim responses as more effective than sad and angry responses, with sad victims generally being considered at greatest risk of future victimisation. In contrast, students reported being most likely to adopt sad or angry responses if faced with bullying themselves. In addition to outlining students' broad range of victim responses, the qualitative data assisted in explaining the identified gap between what students "know" and what students report they would "do" by revealing the variety of motivations underlying their responses to bullying.

Evaluating Witnessed Victim Responses

As hypothesised, confident and ignoring victims were thought to have handled bullying situations better than sad and angry victims (Landau et al., 2001; Lightner et al., 2000; Scambler et al., 1998; Tenenbaum et al., 2011), although many of these victim response differences only reached significance among females. These findings indicate that female students in particular recognise the relative effectiveness of the confident and ignoring victim responses that are often recommended by teachers, researchers, and within anti-bullying interventions (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Elledge et al., 2010; Fox & Boulton, 2003b; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996; Shapiro et al., 1991). However it should be noted that even the highest average rating of victim response effectiveness (i.e., females' rating of confident victims) fell just above the "somewhat" anchor, indicating that students generally did not consider victims to have handled the bullying situations very well.

Students evaluated the risk of future victimisation depending on victims' responses to being bullied and ratings also varied depending on students' gender and grade. Overall, sad victims were considered to be at greatest risk of future victimisation, consistent with evidence that bullies find the combination of visible distress and passivity particularly reinforcing (Perry et al., 1990; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). By contrast, more active victim responses (i.e., confident or angry) tended to be associated with reduced evaluated risk of victimisation, although in the majority of cases average risk of future victimisation still fell above the "somewhat" anchor. There is some evidence suggesting that students who "fight back" mostly find this strategy effective (Black et al, 2010), although this approach is often compromised by the inherent power imbalance present in bullying situations (Smith et al., 2001). Other research highlights students' beliefs that counteraggression makes bullying start or continue (Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996), which is consistent with observational

evidence suggesting that children who respond emotionally to bullying, be it submissively or aggressively, are likely to experience more prolonged bullying (Mahady Wilton et al., 2000). The continued use of dysregulated anger and aggression despite their negative impacts may be partly explained by underestimates of the influence of these reactions on future victimisation by some students. Anti-bullying interventions should address this misconception, emphasising to students that counteraggression is often associated with continued bullying (Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996) as well as other risks (e.g., escalated violence or punishment from adults; Black et al., 2010; Tenenbaum et al., 2011) and disadvantages (e.g., higher attributions of victim blame among peer bystanders; Paper 3).

Participants' Own Responses to Bullying Incidents at School

Of the four victim responses viewed in the videos, students reported being most likely to adopt the sad victim response if they were faced with bullying. This result is consistent with evidence that the passive victim subtype represents the majority of victims (Schwartz et al., 2001). The angry victim response characteristic of the aggressive victim subtype was also commonly endorsed. Grade variations were however evident, with seventh graders being more likely to adopt the angry victim response compared to fifth graders. This grade difference is consistent with past research which found that middle school children reported a greater tendency to fight back or hit or push as strategies for dealing with bullies, compared to elementary school students (Elledge et al., 2010.) Students reported being least likely to adopt the confident victim response whereas ignoring responses were slightly more common in line with previous evidence (Black et al., 2010; Elledge et al., 2010). This pattern may reflect the relative demands of these commonly recommended victim responses (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Elledge et al., 2010; Fox & Boulton, 2003b; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al.,

1996; Shapiro et al., 1991). While both responses involve remaining calm, the confident response involves the additional need to generate an immediate verbal response.

Students' open-ended responses about responding to bullying were very diverse and included some approaches that were essentially the direct opposite of each other (e.g., "show them it doesn't affect me" versus "make a remark showing I didn't like what they did"). Interestingly, the most commonly stated response employed during the bullying episode was "telling the bully to stop" (23%), although this approach has been rated as ineffective in past research (Smith et al., 1999) given that verbal protests may be reinforcing to bullies especially when used by chronically victimised children (Elledge et al., 2010). There were some variations in reported victim responses depending on the bullying type and students' gender and personal history with bullying and victimisation. For example, ignoring the bully was more commonly employed in response to verbal bullying, whereas students were more likely to tell someone about physical bullying (Craig et al., 2007; Kanetsuna et al., 2006). Compared to males, females were more likely to report the bullying (Smith & Shu, 2000), in line with evidence that females perceive telling school staff as more effective (Craig et al., 2007). Interestingly, students who had experienced victimisation in the past term were more likely to report complex responses whereby their response varied depending on the situation. Complex responses have been rated as highly effective within past research (Smith et al., 1999) and involve adapting the victim response to a particular bullying situation (e.g., "depending on how the insult is constructed") or using a different response under certain circumstances (e.g., "if things get worse").

Explaining the Knowing-Doing Gap

While students tended to be able to recognise the effectiveness of confident and ignoring victim responses, they reported being more likely to adopt sad and angry responses if faced with bullying themselves. This apparent discrepancy is in line with

past research implying some inconsistencies between students' perceptions of effective responses and their own response practices (Black et al., 2010; Craig et al., 2007; Landau et al., 2001; Scambler et al., 1998; Tenenbaum et al., 2011).

There are several possible explanations for this knowing-doing gap. Students' previous experiences with victimisation may have informed their evaluations of particular victim responses (e.g., Black et al., 2010; Tenenbaum et al., 2011). However, inconsistent with the present findings, this learning would be expected to result in students stating behavioural intentions to adopt more effective responses in the future (Smith et al., 1999). Although still a potential contributor, the influence of students' past experience on their victim response evaluations does not appear to be a sufficient explanation for the identified knowing-doing gap.

While students appear to be aware of how victims should respond, the knowing-doing gap may imply that students do not possess the skills and resources necessary to implement effective responses when bullying is personally encountered. This suggestion is supported by several qualitative statements implying that students "try" yet sometimes fail to implement certain responses (e.g., "I would probably attempt to stay calm but would fail"). In explaining this phenomenon, researchers have distinguished between students' rational response recommendations and their more emotionally-driven responses when actually faced with bullying (Gamliel et al., 2003; Landau et al., 2001). To address this issue, intervention programs should move beyond educating students about effective responses to bullying to focus on building students' self-efficacy and skills in emotion regulation and assertiveness within the context of bullying interactions. Skills-training interventions should model effective responses using videos and role plays and should build self-efficacy by providing students with the opportunity to practise skills until they become learned and habitual, thereby increasing the likelihood that students will implement these responses when faced with

bullying. Furthermore, several identified variations in students' evaluations and reported responses depending on students' gender, grade, victim status, and the type of bullying highlight the importance of tailoring these anti-bullying interventions to their relevant audience.

Finally, it is possible that the knowing-doing gap reflects the fact that other motivations interfere with students' implementation of the victim response they perceive to be "most effective". In the current study, students' evaluations of victim response effectiveness were based on the extent to which they thought the victim "handled the situation well". While it is not entirely clear on what basis these judgments were made, identified differences in the pattern of students' victim response effectiveness and risk of future victimisation ratings suggest that students take into account multiple factors, not only the impact on future bullying. The qualitative data outlining the range of motivations driving students' responses to bullying further support the idea that students may rate victim response effectiveness and may select different victim responses depending on the outcomes being prioritised. In addition to avoiding conflict, students were motivated to influence the bully, satisfy personal goals, and act in line with their morals and beliefs. Victim response motivations were also found to vary by victim status. Students who had experienced victimisation in the past term, compared to those that had not, were less motivated to avoid conflict and were more motivated to avoid reinforcing the bully.

Past research has identified preliminary connections between victim response styles and victim response motivations. Bellmore and colleagues (2013) found that avoidance responses were associated with wanting to prevent escalation of the situation, whereas approach responses were associated with motivations to defend oneself. Links between students' social goal orientation and their responses to peer aggression have also been identified (Rudolph, Abaied, Flynn, Sugimura, & Agoston, 2011). Although

in the current research it was not possible to draw definitive links between specific victim responses and motivations due to the nature of the measures, the qualitative data did suggest potential connections that could be followed up in future research. For example, ignoring the bully and "not looking upset" was used so the bully does not "see the fun in doing it". However, another student suggested "if you stay there and do nothing, they will always pick on you". While past research highlights the disadvantages of expressing negative emotion during bullying episodes (Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Tenenbaum et al., 2011), research by Thornberg, Halldin, Bolmsjö, and Petersson (2013) revealed poor outcomes for students who adopted a "social shielding" approach whereby students hid how hurt and upset they were in front of bullies and bystanders. This contrasting evidence highlights the difficulty associated with victims balancing the priorities of avoiding reinforcing bullies, making it clear that bullying is not okay, and inviting assistance from bystanders (Paper 3).

There were also diverse opinions about whether students should report the bullying to adults. Some students said "I would feel better if a teacher or adult knew" and "adults can guide you through the bullying phase". Contrastingly and consistent with past research (Tenenbaum et al., 2011), other students indicated that "if you go to a teacher they do nothing and the bullying only becomes worse" or "they get too involved and the bullies can call you a dibber dobber (tattletale)". To build on these preliminary observations, future studies should utilise semi-structured interviews or guided prompts to more directly assess the links between particular responses and motivations. Understanding the factors that drive or inhibit specific victim responses may help explain the knowing-doing gap and may guide the improvement of anti-bullying interventions with victims.

Limitations and Future Directions

In the current study, students evaluated victim responses they observed within hypothetical videotaped scenarios involving students unknown to the participants. While a diverse range of scenarios were used varying in content, location, and individuals to assist with ecological validity, future research is needed to investigate students' evaluations of victim responses observed within their school environment among known peers. Significant video set effects for both the victim response effectiveness and risk of future victimisation variables suggest that students' victim response evaluations may vary depending on the particular bullying scenarios in which they are used. Order effects may further imply that victim responses may be judged in the context of other observed bullying incidents. Further research is needed to determine whether these video set and order effects are an artefact of the experimental manipulation or a real-life phenomenon.

While the qualitative and quantitative investigations of students' victim responses each had their own strengths and limitations, the current study was able to improve the validity of findings from either method by adopting a mixed method design (Hong & Espelage, 2012a). The qualitative analysis had the advantage of flexibility and allowed students to state their victim responses in their own words. However, this approach relied on students spontaneously reporting their behaviours and motivations. Also, without any prompts, the exact nature of the reported response was not always clear. For example, when a student stated that they would "say something back" or "stand up for myself", they could be referring to a neutral verbal response, a confident response, an act of self-defence, or a counterattack. The findings from the binary logistic regressions conducted on the qualitative data also require replication with a larger sample size, which would allow adjustments to be made to account for multiple analyses.

The quantitative analysis had the advantage of specificity and ecological validity as it assessed students' likelihood of adopting four observable victim responses, which represented the combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction. However, this approach was unable to differentiate the relative impact of victims' emotional display (e.g., anger) and behavioural reaction (e.g., aggression). The victim response descriptions also did not provide any contextual information and therefore were not as nuanced as the victim responses viewed in the videos. In the current study, students' own responses to bullying were assessed using self-report measures. While this approach enabled comparisons with their victim response evaluations, children's beliefs about what they are likely to do may differ from their actual behaviours in bullying situations. Future research would therefore benefit from assessing students' responses to bullying via multiple methods including peer or teacher report and direct observation. Providing this external feedback to victims, may assist in increasing students' awareness of how their victim responses appear to others (Tenenbaum et al., 2011).

The present study examined a relatively homogenous sample of students from two single-sex private schools, with the final sample constituting approximately 50% of the invited sample. More research is therefore needed to assess whether results generalise to other student samples that are more ethnically and economically diverse. While the current study focussed on same-sex interactions, it would be beneficial to examine students' victim response evaluations and reported likelihood of adopting particular responses within cross-sex bullying interactions and to extend the present enquiry to relational bullying and cyberbullying situations. While the videotaped scenarios depicted bullying between pairs of students, bullying typically occurs in the presence of a group of peers (Craig & Pepler, 1997). Future research should therefore examine whether students' victim response evaluations and practices vary depending on

the audience present, the number of bullies, the relationships between the students involved (Craig et al., 2007), and the presence of particular classroom and school norms.

Implications for Intervention

Taken together, the present findings highlight the complexity associated with victims selecting and implementing an effective response to bullying. While individual-level interventions recommend that victims adopt confident and ignoring responses when faced with bullying (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b), research suggests that these approaches may vary in their effectiveness depending on a range of individual and contextual factors. School-based mental health professionals as well as parents, teachers, psychologists, and anti-bullying program developers must acknowledge these complexities and take into account students' evaluations, behavioural tendencies, preferences, motivations, and skill-level when advising victims in how to respond to bullying. Children have reported that thinking through the outcomes of different victim responses in advance often led to more desired outcomes (Tenenbaum et al., 2011). This finding suggests the potential benefit of training victims in social problem solving techniques (e.g., Stop Think Do; Petersen, 1995), which involve generating and evaluating possible emotional displays and behavioural responses, practising and implementing the selected response, and then reflecting on how effective that particular response was in the given situation. This approach may allow students to think through the pros and cons of particular victim responses, consider their primary motivations, practice response implementation, and develop skills in self-reflection. Supporting and empowering victims to engage in social problem-solving may assist in building self-esteem and self-efficacy and will help students tailor their responses to particular bullying situations. This nuanced, skill-

driven approach may importantly help narrow the knowing-doing gap and assist students in responding more effectively to bullying.

PAPER 2

Teachers' Perspectives on Effective Responses to Overt Bullying

Authors:

Nicole Sokol, Kay Bussey, & Ronald M. Rapee

Centre for Emotional Health

Department of Psychology

Macquarie University

Publication Reference (*Note.* There were some slight edits in the published version):

Sokol, N., Bussey, K., & Rapee, R. M. (in press). Teachers' perspectives on effective responses to overt bullying. *British Educational Research Journal.* doi: 10.1002/berj.3237

Abstract

School communities worldwide are tackling the pervasive problem of school bullying. Teachers hold an important responsibility to prevent and manage bullying problems in the school environment and often play a key role in advising students about how to respond to bullying. This study examined teachers' perspectives on the most effective ways to respond to overt bullying. Australian primary and secondary school teachers (N = 289; M_{age} = 41.22 years, 59 males) completed online questionnaires about four hypothetical videotaped scenarios portraying different victim responses (angry, sad, confident, ignoring) to physical or verbal bullying. Qualitative measures assessing teachers' recommendations to victims about how to respond to bullying and the rationales underlying their suggested approaches were also obtained. Teachers considered confident and ignoring victim responses to be more effective than sad and angry responses. Furthermore, sad victims were perceived to be at greatest risk of future victimisation, while confident victims were considered to be at lowest risk. Teachers reported a broad range of victim response recommendations and rationales that at times varied depending on the type of bullying but did not differ according to students' gender. Understanding teachers' views about effective victim responding may inform professional education programs aimed at guiding teachers in how best to support and advise victims of bullying.

Keywords: bullying; victimisation; teacher; victim response

Teachers' Perspectives on Effective Responses to Overt Bullying

Teachers play an important role in addressing the pervasive problem of school bullying. Bullying refers to repeated and intentional aggressive behaviour characterised by a power imbalance in the bully-victim relationship (Olweus, 1994). Given this power differential, victims find it difficult to select and implement effective responses to bullying and instead often respond in ways that perpetuate the bullying cycle. The visible distress and submissive behaviour displayed by passive victims tends to reinforce bullies and creates a reputation that they are easy targets (Perry et al., 1990; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996). Aggressive victims on the other hand display anger and engage in unregulated counterattacks that may provoke further aggression (Schwartz et al., 2001). These common yet ineffective responses to bullying highlight the need to provide victims with support, guidance, and training in how to respond effectively to bullying. While individual-level interventions with victims have been designed for this purpose (e.g., Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b), teachers often provide informal advice to victims (Bauman et al., 2008; Spears, Campbell, Tangen, Slee, & Cross, 2015; Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). Teachers may also discuss how students should address bullying problems while delivering in-class curriculum-based anti-bullying programs (e.g., KiVa; Salmivalli & Poskiparta, 2012). Given teachers' key role in recommending responses to bullying and the potential influence of this advice on rates of future victimisation (Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015), it is important to understand which victim responses teachers consider to be effective and why.

Although students' opinions about effective responses to bullying have been examined within several quantitative (e.g., Camodeca & Goossens, 2005; Paper 1) and qualitative studies (e.g., Kanetsuna & Smith, 2002; Kanetsuna et al., 2006), research exploring teachers' perspectives and recommendations to victims is limited. Anecdotal

evidence suggests that students are often advised by school staff to tell a teacher if they are being bullied, although many students choose not to tell (Rigby, 2011). Within the teasing literature, the strategy of ignoring has been described as "conventional adult wisdom", with one study reporting that 91% of teachers recommended that victims ignore being teased (Shapiro et al., 1991). Two past studies have explored the strategies trainee teachers recommend students use to cope with bullying (Nicolaides et al., 2002; Spears et al., 2015). Seeking help and telling a teacher or parent were considered the most effective approaches across both studies. In Nicolaides and colleagues' research (2002), "walk away calmly", "tell bullies to stop", and "get help from friends" were all recommended at least "sometimes". According to both studies, passive (e.g., "ignore", "cry", "stand by and take it", "pretend it was not happening", "look indifferent") and aggressive responses ("fight back") were considered the least effective. Other research exploring teachers' responses to bullying has assessed the extent to which teachers advise victims to respond assertively, utilise avoidance strategies, or manage the problem on their own (Bauman et al., 2008; Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). Bauman and colleagues (2008) found considerable variability in the reported advice given to victims by school staff, suggesting that teachers may not always agree on how best to advise and assist victims. These variations in teacher recommendations may partly reflect teachers' beliefs about peer victimisation, including normative or dismissive beliefs about aggression and beliefs that victimised children should assert themselves or avoid their aggressors (Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). In order to clarify teachers' perspectives on effective victim responding, the current research will build on this literature by exploring the range of advice teachers give to victims as well as the diverse rationales underlying these recommendations.

A range of methodological approaches are needed to best understand teachers' views about victims' responses to bullying. However, past research has typically relied

on written descriptions of victims' behavioural approaches (e.g., Nicolaides et al., 2002; Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). One study explored the perceived effectiveness of different victim responses using videotaped teasing scenarios, however in this research trainee teachers were asked to respond as they thought children would (Landau et al., 2001). It is therefore not clear how teachers would rate the effectiveness of victims' responses to bullying when students' emotional displays and behavioural responses are viewed in the context of the bullying interaction. Utilising hypothetical videotaped bullying scenarios, a recent experimental study examined students' evaluations of the effectiveness of various victim responses (Paper 1). As predicted, effectiveness differed between victim responses, with students generally rating confident and ignoring responses as more effective than sad and angry responses. Sad victims were also considered to be at the greatest risk of future victimisation. The type of bullying was found to influence the effectiveness of victims' responses, with higher overall ratings of effectiveness occurring for responses to verbal as compared to physical bullying. The victim's gender also affects the extent to which different victim responses provoke further bullying or contribute to its resolution (Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996; Paper 1) and therefore the approaches used to cope with peer harassment are not necessarily equally effective for both genders. For example, seeking social support tends to be more adaptive and effective for females, while externalising responses pose fewer problems for males (Chung & Asher, 1996; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002).

The victim's gender has also been found to influence teachers' patterns of advice-giving (Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). For example, teachers were more likely to tell girls than boys to assert themselves and to manage the bullying problem on their own. The provision of victim response advice was also found to differentially affect levels of victimisation depending on the student's gender. For boys, advising assertion was linked to increased victimisation, while recommendations to cope independently

predicted lower levels of victimisation over time. Advising these approaches did not however predict victimisation among girls. While teachers' gender and the type of bullying have been found to have some influence on how teachers' perceive and respond to bullying incidents (Paper 4), few studies have explored how these factors impact teachers' perspectives on effective victim responding (Spears et al., 2015).

The present study adopted a mixed method approach in order to explore teachers' perspectives on effective responses to overt bullying. Teachers evaluated the emotional and behavioural responses adopted by victims within hypothetical videotaped scenarios and the effects of student gender, teacher gender, and bullying type were explored. Although a range of victim responses have been identified, the four victim responses (labelled as angry, sad, confident, ignoring) that were compared were designed to span both high and low expressed emotion and both active and passive behavioural responses. All four responses were also employed within the bullying episode, immediately after the bullying took place. Utilising an experimental design, this quantitative approach allowed for the controlled assessment of teachers' evaluations of victim responses. To supplement this investigation, qualitative methods allowed teachers to describe in their own words the victim responses they would advise and the rationales underlying their recommendations. This approach also built upon previous research exploring trainee teachers' advice to victims (Nicolaides et al, 2002; Spears et al., 2015).

Teachers were predicted to rate the confident and ignoring victim responses as more effective than the angry and sad victim responses, as was found among students using the same methodology (Paper 1). This pattern is line with trainee teachers' advice (Nicolaides et al, 2002; Spears et al., 2015) and the recommendations offered to victims in individual-level anti-bullying interventions (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b). It was also hypothesised that teachers would consider sad victims to be at

greatest risk of future victimisation, given the reinforcing combination of visible distress and passivity (Perry et al., 1990; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). When asked how they would advise victims to respond to bullying, teachers were expected to recommend a diverse range of responses. Differences in advice-giving depending on students' gender were also specifically explored in light of previously identified student gender variations (Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). Finally, the qualitative data were expected to uncover the range of rationales underlying teachers' recommendations about how to respond to overt bullying.

Method

Participants and Procedure

The sample comprised 289 Australian teachers (M_{age} = 41.22 years, *SD* = 11.81, age range = 21-67 years, 59 males). Most teachers (84%) were born in Australia or New Zealand, with 90% identifying as Caucasian. Sixty-three percent of the sample predominantly taught primary school (grades K–6), while 37% predominantly taught secondary school (grades 7–12). Most teachers (92%) reported having experience teaching students in grades five through to eight which represented the target population in the present study. Ninety-five percent of teachers worked at coeducational schools and 71% of the sample taught at government schools. On average, teachers had 15.84 years of teaching experience (*SD* = 11.76, range = 1-46 years). The majority of teachers (75%) had received at least some anti-bullying training either during their teacher training or while working as a teacher.

This study formed part of a larger research project investigating the effect of victims' responses to bullying on teachers' attitudes and reactions (Paper 4). Most participants (77%) were invited to voluntarily participate in the study via email by their school, while the remaining 23% of participants were informed about the study through personal contacts or teacher associations. Six participants were excluded due to

technical difficulties which prevented the viewing of one or more of the experimental videos. The study was introduced as research investigating bullying and peer relationships from the perspective of teachers. After providing consent online, teachers voluntarily participated in an online survey of approximately 30 minutes' duration at their own convenience. Some schools offered staff the opportunity to participate during staff meeting time. The procedures were approved by the University Human Research Ethics Committee and the state's education department.

Design

The study involved three between-subjects factors and one within-subjects factor, resulting in a 2 (teacher gender: male, female) × 2 (student gender: boy, girl) × 2 (bullying type: physical, verbal) × (4) (victim response: angry, sad, confident, ignoring) mixed experimental design. The order of video presentation was counterbalanced using four fixed orders, such that each victim response appeared in each position across the four orders. For each bullying type and student gender, there were four fixed sets of videos counterbalanced across participants. Each actor dyad portrayed a scenario involving each of the four victim responses across these four video sets. The online survey program randomly allocated participants to one of the 64 versions of the survey, which varied in terms of the student gender, bullying type, video order, and video set.

Materials

Video stimuli. Short hypothetical videotaped scenarios created by the first author (see Appendix A) were used, in line with previous research utilising a student sample (Paper 1). The scenarios depicted either physical or verbal bullying incidents with one of four alternative victim responses which represented a combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction: *angry victim response* (displayed frustration and attempted retaliation in an unregulated way akin to aggressive victims described in the literature), *sad victim response* (displayed signs of emotional distress

and engaged in withdrawn or submissive behaviours similar to passive victims described in the literature), *confident victim response* (displayed a confident expression and calmly and assertively used a neutral, non-provocative comment designed to diffuse the situation) and *ignoring victim response* (displayed a nonchalant expression and calmly ignored the bully and continued what he or she was doing). Expert ratings, pilot test data, and manipulation check data using the current sample confirmed the intended victim response patterns (Paper 4).

The scenarios were filmed in four distinct school settings (playground bench, school gate, hallway, drinking fountain), using four pairs of same-sex actors for each gender. Students were described as same-grade peers in late primary school or early high school and "Student 1" and "Student 2" served as neutral labels for the bully and victim, respectively. To establish the bullying definition, each video was introduced with the statement: "Please think about what it would be like to watch this happen between two students at your school, Student 1 and Student 2. Student 1's behaviours are clearly intentional and you know that this is not the first time that something like this has happened and that it is hard for Student 2 to make it stop."

Questionnaires. Videos were embedded within online questionnaires which began with demographic questions. After each video, teachers completed manipulation check items assessing the victim's observable response (angry, sad, confident, calmly ignoring) and a series of other ratings using a 5-point rating scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*). Adapted from Paper 1, teachers' evaluations of the different victim responses were assessed using two single items: *victim response effectiveness* (i.e., "I think Student 2 handled the situation well") and *risk of future victimisation* (i.e., "I think Student 2 will be picked on again"). Teachers' attributions of blame, perceptions of the victimisation, emotional reactions, and behavioural intentions to intervene were also measured and have been described elsewhere (Paper 4).

After the videos and their related questionnaires, participants completed three open-ended questions. The first question examined teachers' recommendations about how victims should respond to bullying, focussing on the student gender and bullying type they viewed in the videos: "Briefly describe how you would advise a male/female student in late primary school/early high school to respond when another student does/says something hurtful to him/her." The second question assessed any differences in teachers' advice depending on students' gender: "How (if at all) would this advice differ if you were advising a female/male student in late primary school/early high school?" The third question explored the rationales underlying teachers' advice about how to respond to bullying: "Briefly describe why you would advise the female and male students to respond in these ways".

Coding Qualitative Data

Thematic analysis was used to analyse the qualitative data (Braun & Clarke, 2006). Through a process of reading and re-reading the data, the first author generated initial codes and collated them into potential themes. The themes were then reviewed and refined and clear labels and definitions were created for each theme and subtheme to reflect teachers' actual responses and so that all data were classified. Ambiguous responses were coded in consultation with the second or third author. Teachers' responses to the three open-ended questions were coded by content because at times teachers' comments stretched beyond the scope of the specific question.

Tables 1 and 2 display the content categories and frequencies for teachers' recommended victim responses and victim response rationales, respectively. Teachers' responses were coded for all recommendations and rationales they stated in order to determine the percentage of teachers that offered each particular response. An independent rater coded a randomly selected, stratified sample of 10% of victim

response recommendations and rationales. Inter-rater agreement was high (Cohen's κ = .96) and disagreements were resolved through discussion.

Results

Data Analytic Strategy

To analyse the quantitative and qualitative data respectively, two distinct data analytic approaches were adopted. The reported descriptive statistics pertaining to the quantitative data are the estimated marginal means calculated in the analyses. For each victim response, Pearson's correlations between the variables assessing victim response effectiveness and risk of future victimisation were calculated. Mixed model ANOVAs were conducted on teachers' evaluations of victim responses using an overall alpha level of .05. Bonferroni corrections were applied to account for the two variables assessing victim response evaluations and when testing pairwise comparisons and simple effects. Cohen's *d* was also calculated as a measure of effect size when reporting these follow-up analyses. When assessing teachers' evaluations of victim responses, order and video set were included as between-subjects covariates in the analyses. Secondary analyses which tested additional fixed effects involving order and video set were used to explore whether within-subjects or between × within-subjects effects varied depending on these methodological variables. Missing data were negligible for the quantitative variables (< 1%).

To analyse the qualitative data examining teachers' recommended victim responses and victim response rationales, a series of binary logistic regression analyses (α = .05) were conducted on the broad content categories and lower-level sub-categories (if stated by a minimum of 10% of teachers) to assess whether teachers' recommended victim responses and rationales varied depending on teacher gender, student gender, or bullying type. Missing data among the qualitative variables were as follows: 10% of teachers did not provide any victim response recommendations, 10% did not comment

on advice variations based on student gender, and 26% did not provide any victim response rationales. When percentages have been reported (e.g., Tables 1 and 2), sample sizes have been adjusted to account for this missing data.

Victim Response Evaluations

Descriptive statistics and correlations. Descriptive statistics are displayed in Table 3. There was a significant negative correlation between victim response effectiveness and the risk of future victimisation for all four victim responses (angry: $r(288) = -.29$, $p < .001$; sad: $r(288) = -.26$, $p < .001$; confident: $r(289) = -.15$, $p = .01$; ignoring: $r(289) = -.31$, $p < .001$).

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Teachers' Evaluations of Witnessed Victim Responses

Dependent Variable	Angry Victim Response		Sad Victim Response		Confident Victim Response		Ignoring Victim Response	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Victim Response Effectiveness	2.49	1.47	2.80	1.46	3.81	1.46	3.58	1.46
Risk of Future Victimisation	3.42	1.36	3.89	1.36	3.09	1.36	3.43	1.36

Victim response effectiveness. The mixed model ANOVA revealed a significant teacher gender main effect, F (1, 283) = 12.74, $p < .001$. Females ($M = 3.35$, $SD = 0.67$) considered the victims to have handled the bullying situations better than did males ($M = 2.99$, $SD = 0.67$), $MD = 0.35$, $SE = 0.10$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.53$. A significant victim response main effect was also obtained, F (3, 843) = 59.19, $p < .001$. Post-hoc analyses revealed that teachers thought that confident, $MD = 1.33$, $SE = .12$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.91$, and ignoring victims, $MD = 1.09$, $SE = .12$, $p < .001$, $d = 0.74$, handled bullying

situations better than angry victims. Confident, *MD* = 1.01, *SE* = .12, $p < .001$, *d* = 0.69, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 0.78, *SE* = .12, $p < .001$, *d* = 0.53, were also thought to have handled bullying situations better than sad victims. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (*p*s > .004).

While no significant order effects were identified, secondary analyses revealed a significant Video Set × Victim Response interaction, F (9, 824) = 5.43, $p < .001$. Simple effects analyses revealed that the ignoring victim at the drinking fountain was considered to have handled the situation better than the other ignoring victims. This pattern is consistent with the pattern observed in the manipulation check variables whereby teachers rated the ignoring victim at the drinking fountain as more confident and less sad than other ignoring victims. This finding implies that the strength of the victim response manipulation may at least partially explain video set variations in teachers' ratings of victim response effectiveness. The reported victim response pattern was however consistent across all video sets with only one exception whereby for one video set the ignoring victim response (at the gate) was not considered significantly more effective than the sad victim response (at the drinking fountain) although the means were in the expected direction.

Risk of future victimisation. The mixed model ANOVA revealed a significant victim response main effect, F (3, 843) = 23.44, $p < .001$. Post-hoc analyses revealed that sad victims were considered to be at greater risk of future victimisation compared to angry, *MD* = 0.48, *SE* = .10, $p < .001$, *d* = 0.35, confident, *MD* = 0.81, *SE* = .10, $p < .001$, *d* = 0.60, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 0.46, *SE* = .10, $p < .001$, *d* = 0.34. The angry, *MD* = 0.33, *SE* = .10, $p = .001$, *d* = 0.24, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 0.34, *SE* = .10, $p < .001$, *d* = 0.25, were also thought to be at greater risk of future victimisation compared to confident victims. There was no significant difference between the evaluated risk of future victimisation of angry versus ignoring victims (*p* > .004).

Table 1

Percentage of Teachers who Offered Particular Victim Response Recommendations.

Recommended Victim Response	Overall Sample (*N* = 260)	Male Teachers (*n* = 47)	Female Teachers (*n* = 213)	Boy Students (*n* = 129)	Girl Students (*n* = 131)	Physical Bullying (*n* = 127)	Verbal Bullying (*n* = 133)
During the Episode:	87	92	86	88	86	83	91
Behaviourally Engaged:	47	51	46	44	49	54	40
Tell the bully to stop	19	17	20	20	18	21	17
State effect on you (e.g., "make it clear you don't like it")	12	15	12	14	11	14	11
Stand up for yourself (e.g., "stand up to the bully")	7	9	6	5	8	7	6
Criticise behaviour (e.g., "it is hurtful")	6	9	6	3	9	7	5
Humour or clever comeback	5	2	6	5	5	6	5
Other (e.g., "ask them why they are doing it")	9	13	8	7	11	11	7
Behaviourally Disengaged:	51	47	52	56	47	36	65
Ignore the bully	39	36	40	43	36	27	51
Walk away from the bully	21	19	21	25	17	13	28
Behavioural Restraint (e.g., "don't retaliate", "non-aggressive")	12	17	10	12	11	14	9

Emotional Expression:	29	30	28	27	30	28	29
Express confidence (e.g., “look confident/assertive”)	22	23	21	18	25	19	24
Emotionally Disengaged (e.g., “stay calm”, “act indifferent”)	10	15	9	12	8	12	9
After the Episode:	79	75	79	78	79	81	76
Report the Bullying:	75	72	76	74	76	80	70
School staff	62	60	62	58	65	65	58
Adult	9	6	10	9	10	12	7
Family (e.g., parent)	8	6	9	8	8	9	7
Friends	7	11	6	6	7	8	5
Trusted person	5	0	7	8	3	9	2
How to report (e.g., “immediately”, “keep reporting”)	9	11	9	7	11	10	8
Position Yourself (e.g., around friends, avoid bully)	10	6	11	5	6	9	11
Cognitive Strategies (e.g., positive attitude)	5	4	6	3	8	6	5

Note. Sample sizes have been adjusted to account for missing data. Percentages reflect the proportion of teachers within the sample specified in the column heading who recommended a particular victim response within their own-ended response. In addition to percentages for the overall sample, percentages for sub-samples of teachers have been provided depending on teachers' gender, the gender of students viewed in the videos, and the type of bullying viewed in the videos. Eighty-eight percent of teachers stated more than one recommendation.

Table 2

Percentage of Teachers who Described Particular Victim Response Rationales.

Rationale for Recommended Victim Response	Overall Sample (N = 212)	Male Teachers (n = 37)	Female Teachers (n = 175)	Boy Students (n = 109)	Girl Students (n = 103)	Physical Bullying (n = 103)	Verbal Bullying (n = 109)
Impact on the Bullying:	42	49	41	40	44	37	47
Stop or avoid bullying	22	19	23	21	23	20	24
Avoid the situation getting worse	22	32	20	21	23	18	26
Impact on Bullies:	37	30	39	41	33	29	45
Avoid reinforcing the bully (e.g., “take away their power by not reacting”)	26	27	26	31	20	18	33
Demonstrate a point to bully (e.g., “let’s bully know their actions were hurtful”)	13	3	15	12	15	13	14
Impact on Victims:	55	49	57	58	52	57	53
Empower & strengthen victim position (e.g., “need to be strong and confident”	29	30	29	31	27	32	27
Learning & skill development (e.g., learn to resolve conflict”)	18	11	19	17	19	22	14
Support the victim	12	11	13	14	11	10	15
Self-esteem & character-building	9	5	10	6	14	12	7
Avoid victim retaliation & punishment	9	3	11	10	9	9	10

Systemic approaches:	51	43	52	46	55	55	46
Role of teachers	50	43	51	45	54	55	44
Teacher interventions	43	43	42	37	49	48	38
Teacher awareness, understanding, & documentation	13	11	14	13	14	14	13
Role of peers	6	8	6	6	6	4	8
Follow school policy	5	3	5	6	4	10	0
Beliefs & Morals:	18	22	17	17	18	18	17
Beliefs about bullying & victim rights (e.g., no one deserves to be bullied)	10	14	10	12	9	10	11
Beliefs about handling bullying (e.g., “best way to deal with bullying”)	7	8	7	6	9	8	6

Note. Sample sizes have been adjusted to account for missing data. Percentages reflect the proportion of teachers within the sample specified in the column heading who described a particular victim response rationale within their own-ended response. In addition to percentages for the overall sample, percentages for sub-samples of teachers have been provided depending on teachers' gender, the gender of students viewed in the videos, and the type of bullying viewed in the videos. Seventy-six percent of teachers stated more than one rationale.

Secondary analyses revealed a significant Order × Victim Response interaction, F (9, 823) = 4.05, p < .001. Simple effects analyses indicated that confident victims were evaluated to be at greater risk of future victimisation by teachers who viewed incidents involving confident victims first, as compared to last. This order variation may reflect the fact that these participants did not have a reference point from which to calibrate their responses. A significant Video Set × Victim Response interaction was also obtained, F (9, 823) = 6.57, p < .001. This result suggests that teachers' evaluations of victims' risk of future victimisation may vary not only by victim response, bullying type, and teacher and student gender, but also depending on other characteristics of the specific bullying episode being observed. For example, variations may stem from differences in what the bully does, how victims go about implementing their response, and the particular students involved.

The mixed model ANOVA also revealed a significant Bullying Type × Student Gender interaction, F (1, 282) = 5.33, p = .02, which was qualified by a significant Teacher Gender × Bullying Type × Student Gender interaction, F (1, 282) = 5.49, p = .02. Follow-up simple effects analyses did not reveal any significant effects at the level of the Bonferroni-corrected alpha (ps > .006), however the pattern suggested a student gender variation among male teachers reporting on physical bullying incidents, in the direction of girls (M = 3.82, SD = 0.71) being considered at greater risk of future victimisation compared to boys (M = 3.11, SD = 0.71), MD = .70, SE = .27, p = .01, d = 0.99.

Victim Response Recommendations

Table 1 outlines the content categories and descriptive statistics for the victim response recommendations offered by teachers. Thirty-four percent of teachers provided complex responses (Smith et al., 1999), whereby victim response recommendations varied depending on the situation ("if…then…"). A subset of these complex responses

included variations in victim response advice if the problem continued (e.g., "if it happens again"), which were reported by 25% of teachers. Binary logistic regression revealed several variations by bullying type. Teachers recommending responses to verbal bullying, as compared to physical bullying, were 3.50 times as likely to advise behaviourally disengaged strategies, $B = 1.25$, $SE = .26$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 22.52$, $p < .001$, and more specifically were 2.96 times as likely to advise the strategy of ignoring, $B = 1.08$, $SE = .27$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 16.38$, $p < .001$, and were 2.61 times as likely to advise walking away, $B = 0.96$, $SE = .33$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 8.57$, $p = .003$. By contrast, teachers recommending responses to physical (versus verbal) bullying were 1.77 times as likely to advise victims to use behaviourally engaged strategies, $B = 0.57$, $SE = .25$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 5.09$, $p = .02$. While overall 16% of teachers recommended that victims "try" implementing a particular victim response, references to "trying" were 2.42 times more likely among teachers describing responses to physical (22%) as compared to verbal bullying (11%), $B = 0.88$, $SE = .36$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 6.16$, $p = .01$.

Advice Variations Based on Student Gender

Overall, 86% of teachers reported that their victim response recommendations would not vary depending on students' gender. An additional 8% described only minor gender variations in their victim response advice. One teacher stated: "I look at the students as individuals and not male and female. I think it really depends on the case, contexts and particular students you are dealing with." Another noted: "it's irrelevant if male or female if the child is upset by the behaviour". Some teachers commented on gender differences in how children bully and respond to bullying (e.g., "boys are more physical"), although responses of a "verbal nature" were often recommended for both genders. Other teachers reflected on differences in how staff and parental support should be utilised depending on the student's gender. For example, one teacher said: "whether right or wrong, it is deemed differently when boys of this age group

consistently seek teacher help". Another teacher commented: "girls are much more problematic and need more backup from staff and parental support".

Victim Response Rationales

Table 2 outlines the content categories and descriptive statistics for the victim response rationales reported by teachers. Binary logistic regression revealed several bullying type effects. When reporting on responses to verbal bullying as compared to physical bullying, teachers were 2.06 times more likely to describe the rationale of trying to impact the bully, $B = 0.72$, $SE = .29$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 6.04$, $p = .01$, and more specifically were 2.23 times more likely to describe the rationale of avoiding reinforcing the bully, $B = 0.80$, $SE = .33$, $Wald\ \chi^2(1) = 5.94$, $p = .02$.

Discussion

By adopting a mixed method approach, the current study was able to explore teachers' perspectives on effective responses to overt bullying via multiple avenues. Teachers considered confident and ignoring victim responses to be more effective than sad and angry responses viewed within hypothetical videotaped scenarios. Supplementing this quantitative investigation, the qualitative data uncovered the range of responses teachers recommend that victims employ either during or after bullying episodes. The majority of teachers reported that their victim response advice would not vary depending on the students' gender. Several variations in victim response recommendations and rationales depending on the type of bullying were however evident.

Victim Response Evaluations

As hypothesised, teachers considered confident and ignoring victims to have handled bullying situations better than sad and angry victims. This pattern is broadly consistent with student data (Paper 1), trainee teachers' advice to victims (Nicolaides et al, 2002; Spears et al., 2015) and the recommendations given to victims within

individual-level programs (e.g., Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b). This result also supports past literature suggesting that victims' displays of negative emotions, such as sadness and anger, represent ineffective responding as they are typically the bully's desired reaction (Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Perry et al., 1990; Tenenbaum et al., 2011). With regard to the risk of future victimisation, there appeared to be differences depending on the specific negative emotion expressed and the victim's behavioural reaction. Teachers considered sad victims to be at greatest risk of future victimisation, while confident victims were thought to be at the lowest risk. This result suggests that like students (Paper 1), teachers recognise that visible distress and passivity are likely to reinforce bullies and increase the likelihood of victims being bullied again (Perry et al., 1990; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). While the assertive yet non-provocative approach of confident victims was thought to put them at an advantage, it should be noted that teachers' average evaluated risk of future victimisation fell above the "somewhat" anchor for all victims. This finding underscores teachers' views that even supposedly effective victim responses may be limited in their ability to prevent future bullying, suggesting the need for additional systemic interventions. Interestingly, although ignoring victims were thought to handle bullying situations better than angry victims, there were no differences in teachers' evaluations of ignoring versus angry victims' risk of future victimisation. While teachers consider the ignoring victim response as a skilful strategy for coping with bullying, they appear to be less certain of the potential for this passive response to reduce the risk of future bullying.

Victim Response Recommendations

Teachers' open-ended responses indicating how they would advise victims to respond to bullying revealed a wide variety of victim response recommendations. Consistent with past research (Nicolaides et al., 2002; Spears et al., 2015), teachers were

most likely to advise victims to report the bullying to school staff. The majority of teachers (88%) stated more than one recommendation and over a third of teachers indicated that their victim response advice would vary depending on the situation. In the words of one teacher: “depending on the situation and circumstances, they may need a variety of techniques”. In this way, teachers acknowledged the complexity associated with selecting an effective response to bullying. Some teachers referred to victims “trying” particular victim responses, particularly when faced with physical bullying. These comments imply that teachers believe that victims might find it challenging to implement certain approaches such as staying calm and ignoring the bully. The varying abilities of different students were also referenced with one teacher stating: “I recognise that not all children are able to do this well and require support.” For this reason, it may be appropriate to adopt the approach described by one teacher who said: “I try to tailor my advice to a student's personal skill level as well as the possible future behaviour from the person who hurt them.”

Several teachers recognised that potentially beneficial responses are “not always (effective). It is hard to know when.” Referring specifically to ignoring, one teacher commented that the bully “may keep going until they get a reaction” whereas another teacher said “if they ignore, it will hopefully eventually stop”. These comments, taken together with video set variations in teachers’ evaluations of victim responses, suggest that the effectiveness of victim responses such as ignoring may be dependent on characteristics of the specific bullying situation and when in the bullying cycle they are implemented. Several contradictory approaches were also recommended by teachers. For example, some teachers suggested that victims “try not to look affected”, whereas others advised victims to “tell the offending person how it made them feel” or “make it clear you don’t like it”. These conflicting messages might confuse students, who may benefit from guidance as to when each approach may be helpful. In other situations,

teachers' recommendations (e.g., "stand up for yourself") were quite vague and may not be sufficient to guide effective victim responding.

The reported provision of victim response advice was found to depend on the type of bullying. Teachers were more likely to suggest behaviourally disengaged strategies, including ignoring and walking away, when giving advice on managing verbal as compared to physical bullying. This result is in line with past evidence that teachers often advise students to ignore being teased (Shapiro et al., 1991) and is consistent with differences in students' reported use of ignoring in response to different types of bullying (Paper 1). By contrast, teachers were more likely to advise that victims adopt behaviourally engaged strategies when responding to physical as compared to verbal bullying. Taken together, these findings suggest that teachers consider active responses more appropriate when addressing physical bullying and passive responses more appropriate when addressing verbal bullying.

Although some student gender variations in teachers' patterns of advice-giving have been identified in past research utilising quantitative methodologies (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008; Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015), in the current study, the vast majority of teachers reported that their victim response recommendations would not vary depending on students' gender. Furthermore, no significant between-group student gender variations were detected in the binary logistic regressions examining the victim response recommendations initially described by teachers. These findings suggest that the majority of teachers think they should be recommending the same victim responses to both genders. However, this pattern of responding may be problematic in light of evidence that some victim responses may be differentially effective for girls versus boys (Chung & Asher, 1996; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996; Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015).

Victim Response Rationales

Teachers reported a diverse range of rationales underlying their victim response recommendations, including efforts to impact the bully, victim, and the bullying itself. Many teachers also referred to the role of teachers in understanding, documenting, intervening in, and managing bullying problems or made reference to beliefs and morals underlying certain victim responses. Seventy-six percent of teachers offered more than one rationale. The broad array of rationales underlying teachers' recommended responses to bullying demonstrates the complexity associated with victim response selection and the different processes that need to be considered. Interestingly, advice which aimed to impact the victim was recommended most frequently, despite the fact that victims' responses are often judged by how effective they are at reducing future bullying (e.g., Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). This distinction may be important given that altering victims' responses is unlikely to be a sufficient method for tackling the pervasive problem of school bullying. Teachers' focus on victim empowerment, learning, and support may however positively impact victims' well-being regardless of the outcome of the bullying.

With regard to influencing bullies, teachers recommended responses designed to either avoid reinforcing the bully or demonstrate a point to the bully. At times these aims require opposing victim responses, especially when considering the extent to which distress is expressed and communicated to the bully. The frequency with which teachers reported rationales focussed on impacting the bully also varied by bullying type. In particular, teachers reporting on verbal (versus physical) bullying situations were more likely to describe the rationale of avoiding reinforcing bullies. These results suggest variations in how teachers understand the processes underlying verbal versus physical bullying. Future research is however needed to explore whether reinforcement

plays a more prominent role in explaining persistent verbal bullying compared with physical bullying.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although a diverse set of videotaped scenarios varying in content, location, and individuals were used to assist with ecological validity, future research is needed to assess whether teachers' evaluations of victim responses observed within hypothetical situations extend to real-world settings. This investigation may also assist in determining whether the identified video set and order effects are artefacts of the experimental manipulation or whether they reflect real-life variations in victim response evaluations depending on characteristics of specific bullying scenarios and previously witnessed incidents. While the quantitative data exploring teachers' evaluations of victim responses were limited to four victim responses, the qualitative analysis enabled teachers to describe in their own words the diverse range of responses they recommend to victims and the rationales underlying these recommendations. However given the open-ended nature of the qualitative measures, it was not possible to directly link particular victim responses and teachers' reasons for advising them. Future studies may benefit from utilising semi-structured interviews or guided prompts which would enable specific advice-rationale links to be identified and may also assist in minimising missing data. It should be noted that the current sample comprised of teachers who self-selected into the study. These teachers may be more interested and concerned about bullying and thus future research should test whether results generalise to more representative samples of teachers.

In the current study, teachers viewed bullying scenarios involving students of the same gender and the open-ended questions did not distinguish between victims' responses to same-sex versus cross-sex interactions. Future research is needed to explore any variations in how teachers would advise victims to respond to same-sex

versus cross-sex bullying. It may also be beneficial to examine whether the victim responses teachers recommend vary depending on other factors such as students' history of bullying and victimisation, given evidence that some coping strategies are differentially effective for victimised as compared to non-victimised youth (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002). Furthermore, future studies should investigate teachers' perspectives on effective responses to relational bullying and cyberbullying, which may present unique challenges for victims.

Conclusions

Teachers have a critical responsibility to assist in the prevention and management of school bullying (Boulton, 1997). Some teachers have reflected that it is easier to develop strategies to deal with bullies than it is to guide victims in how to escape peer harassment (Pepler et al., 1994). Teachers may therefore require additional training in how best to support and advise victims of bullying. In order to guide the development of teacher education programs designed for this purpose, the present study examined teachers' perspectives on effective responses to overt bullying using a mixed method approach. Teachers' evaluations of observed victim responses were consistent with the recommendations offered to victims within individual-level programs (e.g., Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b). Qualitative data further revealed the broad range of victim response recommendations teachers typically offer victims and the rationales underlying this advice. Further research is needed to explore the impact of victim response recommendations offered by teachers on bullying outcomes (e.g., Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015) and under different circumstances so that professional development programs can guide teachers in the provision of evidence-based victim response advice. In particular, teachers may require further information about the effects of student gender and bullying type so that they can tailor their advice to match individual students' needs. Although effective victim responding is unlikely to be a

sufficient method for tackling the systemic problem of bullying, teachers can play an important role in empowering victims to adopt responses that minimise their risk of future victimisation and its negative psychological consequences.

PAPER 3

The Effect of Victims' Responses to Overt Bullying on Same-Sex Peer Bystander Reactions

Authors:

Nicole Sokol, Kay Bussey, & Ronald M. Rapee

Centre for Emotional Health

Department of Psychology

Macquarie University

Publication Reference:

Sokol, N., Bussey, K., & Rapee, R. M. (2015). The effect of victims' responses to overt bullying on same-sex peer bystander reactions. *Journal of School Psychology, 53*, 375-391. doi:10.1016/j.jsp.2015.07.002

Abstract

This study investigated the impact of victims' responses to overt bullying on peer bystanders' attitudes and reactions. Fifth- and seventh-grade students (N = 206; M_{age} = 11.13 and 13.18 years, respectively) completed online questionnaires about gender-consistent videotaped hypothetical bullying scenarios in which the victims' responses (angry, sad, confident, ignoring) were experimentally manipulated. Victims' responses significantly influenced bystanders' attitudes towards the victim, perceptions of the victimisation, emotional reactions, and behavioural intentions. In general, angry victims elicited more negative reactions, sad victims elicited greater intentions to act, while incidents involving confident victims were perceived as less serious. Several variations depending on the bullying type and students' grade, gender, and personal experiences with bullying were evident. Implications for individual-level and peer-level anti-bullying interventions are discussed.

Keywords: bullying; victimisation; victim response; bystander; peer witness

The Effect of Victims' Responses to Overt Bullying on Same-Sex Peer Bystander Reactions

Bullying is a pervasive problem that is typically defined as repeated and intentional aggressive behaviour occurring within an asymmetrical power relationship between the bully and the victim (Olweus, 1994). School bullying has been recognised as a group phenomenon (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al., 1996), which affects and is affected by bullies, victims, and bystanders alike. Research has indicated that peer onlookers are present in approximately 85% of school bullying episodes (Craig & Pepler, 1997) and various participant roles adopted by bystanders have been identified (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al., 1996). Depending on their behavioural reactions, bystanders have the potential to either contribute to the problem of bullying (e.g., by joining in, reinforcing the bully, or passively withdrawing) or form part of the solution (e.g., by defending the victim or telling a teacher). Bystanders' decisions to intervene have been found to depend on their social and moral attitudes towards victims, perceptions of bullying situations, and emotional reactions (Thornberg et al., 2012). Therefore, in addition to assessing bystander's reported actions, it is important to examine the cognitions and emotions that are associated with bystanders' behaviours. This approach may highlight key bystander outcomes amenable to intervention while furthering current understandings of bystander roles in bullying.

Determinants of Peer Bystander Outcomes

Consistent with social cognitive theory which highlights the complex interplay between behavioural, personal, and environmental factors (Bandura, 1986), peer attitudes and bystanders' reactions to bullying situations have been found to depend on a range of individual (e.g., gender, age, bullying experiences) and situational factors (e.g., bullying type, degree of harm) (Baldry, 2004; Gini, 2008; Gini, Pozzoli, Borghi, & Franzoni, 2008; Oh & Hazler, 2009). For example, characteristics of the person such

as female gender and younger age have been associated with higher rates of defending victims of bullying (Oh & Hazler, 2009). Characteristics of particular bullying situations have also been found to impact bystander reactions, with peers showing less support for bullies who engaged in direct physical or direct verbal aggression compared to those who engaged in relational or indirect verbal bullying (Tapper & Boulton, 2005). Further examination of factors that influence peer bystanders' attitudes and reactions may assist in the development of anti-bullying interventions targeting the peer group, which seek to educate students about bullying, reduce bystander complacency, and promote positive peer relationships. One situational factor whose effect on bystanders has not been adequately investigated is the victim's response to being bullied. This salient feature of bullying incidents may hold important implications for a range of bystander outcomes.

Victims' Responses to Bullying

The way victims respond to bullying has been identified as a significant determinant of both future victimisation and victim maladjustment (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996; Spence et al., 2009). Researchers have distinguished between two subgroups of victims: aggressive and passive victims (Schwartz et al., 2001). Aggressive victims (also known as provocative victims) tend to display anger, respond with reactive aggression, and engage in unregulated and often unsuccessful counterattacks. In contrast, passive victims, who tend to be the majority, display sadness and anxiety and engage in withdrawn and submissive behaviours. Angry, aggressive, and externalising coping strategies including fighting back as well as internalising coping strategies implying sadness or helplessness have been found to perpetuate the cycle of victimisation by provoking further aggression or reinforcing the bully (Perry et al., 1990; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996). Hence, anti-bullying interventions typically recommend that victims respond calmly and confidently using

neutral, non-provocative comments which aim to confuse the bully and diffuse the situation (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b). Victims are also commonly advised by teachers or researchers to calmly ignore the bully and continue their activities while displaying a nonchalant expression (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996; Shapiro et al., 1991).

Past research has typically evaluated the effectiveness of victims' responses to being bullied in terms of each strategy's ability to diminish or stop the bullying (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005). While this is obviously an important goal, it is also crucial to consider the effect of victims' emotional displays and behavioural responses during bullying episodes on the broader peer group. In particular, it is important to consider the effect of victims' responses to bullying on peer bystanders who are present during bullying episodes and who have the power to influence the situation through their own reactions. Individual-level interventions should take into account the peer processes at play when advising victims in how to respond to peer harassment. Peer-level interventions (e.g., Salmivalli, Kaukainen, & Voeten, 2005) can also draw upon this knowledge when tackling a culture of bullying within the peer group. Improvements to both individual-level and peer-level anti-bullying interventions employed within the context of whole school programs (e.g., Kärnä et al., 2011**)** may offer an important stepping stone towards increasing the efficacy of anti-bullying programs (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

Effect of Victims' Responses on Peer Bystander Outcomes

Research has yet to directly examine the potential effect of victims' responses to bullying on the attitudes and reactions of bystanders. However, some evidence suggests that victims' responses may influence other people's perceptions of bullying incidents. Bauman and Del Rio (2006) found anecdotal evidence that pre-service teachers and school bullying experts considered victims' reactions, including how well they defended

themselves, when determining the seriousness of bullying episodes described in written vignettes. Cross-sectional (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002) and longitudinal research (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2003) has also demonstrated connections between victims' coping responses and peer preference, providing preliminary evidence that victims' responses may influence peer attitudes. Related literature has revealed that peer rejection mediates the relation between aggressive or withdrawal behaviours and victimisation (Hanish & Guerra, 2000), suggesting the influence of victims' behaviour on peer preference and future victimisation in turn.

Victims' responses to peer aggression were found to impact children's perceptions of the aggressor and the victim within an experimental study which adopted a story paradigm (Courtney et al., 2003). Children liked the aggressor more in situations where the victim responded assertively rather than passively. In addition, nonassertive victims were liked less than assertive victims, particularly in situations where the aggressor behaved aggressively towards multiple children. Other studies, which have experimentally manipulated victims' responses to teasing using video scenarios, found that hostile victims were rated as less friendly compared to victims who adopted empathy-inducing, humorous, or ignoring responses (Lightner et al., 2000; Scambler et al., 1998). While these studies have highlighted the potential influence of victims' responses to bullying on other people's attitudes towards victims (e.g., peer liking) and perceptions of the victimisation (e.g., perceived seriousness), more research with a specific focus on peer bystanders is needed, as these students observe victims' immediate responses to bullying incidents. Exploring a wide range of bystander outcomes spanning cognitive, emotional, and behavioural domains will also offer further insights into the peer dynamics involved in bullying.

Aims and Hypotheses

The current study aimed to extend past research by investigating the impact of the victim's response to school bullying on peer bystanders' attitudes and reactions. Viewing gender-consistent hypothetical videotaped scenarios, participants assumed the role of bystanders within this experimental study (defined as peer onlookers with the potential to take on various bystander roles). The videos varied in the different victim responses ("angry," "sad," "confident," "ignoring") portrayed in response to either physical or verbal bullying. This research focussed exclusively on overt forms of bullying during which victims are physically present and their emotional display and behavioural reactions are visible to bystanders. The potential effects of grade, gender, bullying type, and participants' personal experiences with bullying were also investigated, as the effectiveness of different victim responses has been found to vary depending on these factors (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996). A sample of students in late primary school and early secondary school were selected due to the high prevalence of physical and verbal bullying within this age range (approximately equivalent to middle school in the USA) and to assess any differences in bystander responses to bullying across the transition from primary to secondary school in Australia (Cross et al., 2009). Younger students were predicted to like victims more (Gini, 2008; Gini et al., 2008), to indicate greater intentions to defend victims, and to be more inclined to report bullying to teachers compared to older students (Trach et al., 2010).

The present research examined the effects of same-sex victims' responses to bullying on a range of bystander outcomes spanning cognitive, emotional, and behavioural domains in order to further understand the bystander role in bullying and to identify possible avenues for intervention. It was hypothesised that the way in which victims responded to bullying would affect same-sex students' attitudes towards the

victim, perceptions of the victimisation, emotional reactions, and behavioural intentions. As there has been no prior research investigating these specific effects, several exploratory hypotheses were proposed:

1. Bystanders' attitudes towards the victim: Angry victims were expected to receive the lowest ratings of liking and highest ratings of blame, in light of evidence that angry, retaliatory responses are predictive of peer rejection (Hanish & Guerra, 2000; Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2003; Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996; Schwartz et al., 2001) and implicate the victim as a perpetrator of aggression.
2. Bystanders' perceptions of the victimisation: It was hypothesised that incidents involving confident victims would be perceived as less serious and less distressing for victims, given that confident victims are most able to defend themselves (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006).
3. Bystanders' emotional reactions: Episodes involving confident victims were predicted to evoke less anger, sadness, and empathy in bystanders, given confident victims' calm and assertive response (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006).
4. Bystanders' behavioural intentions: Participants were expected to report intentions to engage in more defender behaviours, fewer outsider behaviours, and to more often tell teachers about incidents involving sad victims, in light of sad victims' visible emotional distress and passive response.

Method

Participants

Students were recruited from two private schools, one boys' and one girls' school, in middle- to upper-class areas of a large Australian city. After principals consented to the school's participation, parental consent was requested online or paper forms were sent home with a 54% return rate, of which 95% agreed to participate.

Twenty-one consenting participants were absent on the testing day and a further four participants were excluded because more than 20% of items were missing. The final sample comprised 206 students: 90 Grade 5 students (M_{age} = 11.13 years, *SD* = 0.33, age range = 10.33-11.67 years, 47 males) and 116 Grade 7 students (M_{age} = 13.18 years, *SD* = 0.33, age range = 12.33–14.25 years, 60 males). The majority of participants (91%) were born in Australia or New Zealand and the following ethnic backgrounds were represented: 86% Caucasian, 10% Asian, and 4% Other. Participants came from 18 classes and the number of participants per class ranged from four to 23 students. Descriptive statistics reporting participants' personal experiences with bullying, victimisation, witnessing bullying, and defending victims are presented in Table 1.

Design

Each participant watched either four physical or four verbal bullying scenarios (depending on the survey URL they received at random) involving same-sex students and viewed a different victim response each time. In this way, a 2 (participant gender: male, female) × 2 (grade: 5, 7) × 2 (bullying type: physical, verbal) × 4 (victim response: angry, sad, confident, ignoring) mixed experimental design was adopted, with the first three factors between-subjects and the last one within-subjects. The order in which the four videos were presented was counterbalanced using four fixed orders which were randomly generated with the restriction that each victim response appeared in each position across the four orders. For each bullying type and gender, there were also four fixed sets of videos which were counterbalanced across participants. Across these four sets, each actor dyad portrayed a scenario involving each of the four victim responses. In total, there were 64 different versions of the survey which varied in terms of the gender of the child actors, the type of bullying, the order of the videos, and the video set.

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics Outlining Students' Personal Experiences with Bullying, Victimisation, Witnessing Bullying, and Defending Victims.

	Bullied Others in the Past Term (%)				Victimised by Others in the Past Term (%)				Witnessed Bullying in the Past Term (%)				Defended Victims from Bullying (%)			
Gender	Not at All	1 or 2 Times	Several Times	≥ Once a Week	Not at All	1 or 2 Times	Several Times	≥ Once a Week	Not at All	1 or 2 Times	Several Times	≥ Once a Week	Not at All	1 or 2 Times	Several Times	≥ Once a Week
Males	29	22	33	16	21	11	33	35	11	7	32	50	11	20	30	39
Females	41	37	16	6	30	15	27	28	19	12	31	38	25	9	34	32

Note. "Once a week" refers to once a week on average in the past term.

Materials

Video stimuli. The experimental manipulation was achieved using short hypothetical videotaped scenarios created by the first author following a review of the literature (see Appendix A[3]). To assist with comprehension, brief written captions were provided below the videos. All bullies spoke in a rude, mocking tone and non-verbal communication such as smirking and laughing at the victim's expense was used to establish the intentionally hurtful nature of the bullies' behaviour. Physical and verbal bullying incidents were each filmed four times with alternative endings that depicted different victim responses. Each of the four victim responses represented a combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction: angry victim response (displayed frustration and attempted retaliation in an unregulated way akin to aggressive victims described in the literature), sad victim response (displayed signs of emotional distress and engaged in withdrawn or submissive behaviours similar to passive victims described in the literature), confident victim response (displayed a confident expression and calmly and assertively used a neutral, non-provocative comment designed to diffuse the situation) and ignoring victim response (displayed a nonchalant expression and calmly ignored the bully and continued what he or she was doing).

The videos were created using eight male and eight female Caucasian actors recruited from two secondary schools in different areas of the city to the schools used for participant recruitment. Filming took place at these school campuses and as students typically wear uniforms at Australian schools, actors wore clothing suggestive of school uniforms but without any emblems visible. For each actor dyad, eight video scenarios were filmed in one of four distinct school settings (on a bench in the playground, near the school gate, in a hallway, or at the drinking fountain) and scripts were designed to

[3] In the published paper, the included Appendix provided one verbal bullying scenario (which took place at the bench) and one physical bullying scenario (which took place near the school gate) as examples, with the four different victim responses being described each time.

be appropriate for both genders. The gender of the bully and victim were matched, given evidence that bullying more often occurs within same-sex dyads (Pellegrini & Long, 2002). The gender of the actors was then matched to the participant's gender in line with past research (Bellmore et al., 2012) and because participants attended single-sex schools and therefore exclusively witness same-sex bullying in their school environment. To avoid labels that might influence participants' perceptions, the bully and victim were consistently referred to as "Student 1" and "Student 2", respectively. In order to portray the characters as same-grade peers and to establish the repetitive nature and power imbalance characteristic of bullying, the following voiceover instructions preceded each video: "Please think about what it would be like to watch this happen at school between two students in your class, Student 1 and Student 2. You know that this is not the first time that something like this has happened and that it is hard for Student 2 to make it stop."

Validating the video stimuli. Sixteen postgraduate psychology students (M_{age} = 34.88 years, *SD* = 9.51, 5 males) with experience in developmental and clinical psychology validated the victim responses displayed in the videos. These participants were blind to the study's design and hypotheses. Following random allocation, each participant watched eight videos, so that the four victim responses were viewed in physical bullying scenarios involving females and in verbal bullying scenarios involving males or vice versa. For each video, fifteen ratings describing the victim's response (e.g., 'angry') were completed on a 5-point rating scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*). A series of mixed model analyses, using a Bonferroni adjustment for the six victim response pairwise comparisons, confirmed that the victims portrayed the emotional and behavioural response clusters (angry, sad, confident, ignoring) that the researchers intended in both the physical and verbal bullying scenarios (R^2 ranged from .40 to .60). Victims showing strong displays of negative emotion (i.e., angry and sad)

were rated as more "upset," less "calm," and less "nonchalant" than victims without these emotional displays (i.e., confident and ignoring) (*p*s < .008). "Passive" responses (i.e., sad and ignoring) were also distinguishable from more "assertive" responses (i.e., angry and confident) (*p*s < .008). Using the same scale, the videos were rated as both realistic (M = 4.07, SD = 0.96) and believable (M = 4.06, SD = 0.95), with means falling above the "Quite a Bit" anchor. The videos and questionnaires were also pilot tested with a convenience sample of three children (M_{age} = 10.67 years, SD = 0.84, 1 male) to ensure that the videos were realistic and that the questionnaires were comprehensible for this age group.

Questionnaires. All questionnaires and videos were presented online beginning with questions assessing demographic characteristics (e.g., gender, age, and grade). On a 5-point scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*), participants then gave baseline ratings of how much they liked the students from a series of photos showing same-sex child actors who later portrayed victims in the videos. Following each video, participants completed a questionnaire utilising the same rating scale which included manipulation check items assessing the victim's observable response (angry, sad, confident, ignoring) followed by a range of dependent variables described below by category. Items were grouped into composite variables where necessary based on the conceptual similarity of the measures.

Bystanders' attitudes towards the victim. Four items were adapted from Gini (2008), with two items measuring liking the victim ("I like Student 2" and "I dislike Student 2" reversed, α = .58) and two items measuring blaming the victim ("I blame Student 2 for what happened to them" and "I think Student 2 deserved what happened to them," α = .86). Although reliability of the liking variable was low, results were reported using this composite variable given the medium to large correlation (Table 2)

between these theoretically-related items and given that findings were consistent across the like and dislike items.

Bystanders' perceptions of the victimisation. Three items were included, with two assessing the perceived seriousness of the victimisation ("I think this situation was serious" and "I think what Student 1 did to Student 2 was bullying", adapted from Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000, $\alpha = .75$) and one item assessing estimated victim distress ("On the inside, I think Student 2 was feeling upset").

Bystanders' emotional reactions. There were two single-item ratings of feelings of anger and feelings of sadness ("Watching the video made me feel angry/sad"), which were designed to correspond to the specific negative emotions displayed by angry and sad victims. The empathy for the victim variable ($\alpha = .88$) averaged responses on four items adapted from the Empathic Concern (e.g., "It upset me when I saw what happened to Student 2" and "I felt sorry for Student 2") and Perspective-Taking (e.g., "I tried to think about what things were like for Student 2" and "I tried to think about how Student 2 was feeling") subscales of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index modified for children (Litvak-Miller & McDougall, 1997).

Bystanders' behavioural intentions. Six items based on the Participant Role Questionnaire (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz et al., 1996) assessed: defender behaviours (average of three items, e.g., "Tell Student 1 to stop," $\alpha = .86$), outsider behaviours (average of two items, e.g., "Stand by and mind my own business," $\alpha = .89$), and telling the teacher (single-item, "go tell a teacher").

Personal experiences with bullying. After reading a brief definition of bullying (based on Olweus, 1994), participants indicated how often since the beginning of the school term (7-8 weeks) they had "bullied" other students, "been bullied" by other students, "seen a student being bullied," and "stood up for a student who was being bullied." A specific time period was chosen to gain a time-calibrated measure of actual

behaviour rather than generalised ideas about perceived levels of particular behaviours. In each case, three items assessed physical bullying (e.g., "shoved or pushed") and three items assessed verbal bullying (e.g., "called mean or hurtful names") on a 6-point rating scale (1 = *not at all in the past term* to 6 = *many times a week in the past term*). A principal components analysis with oblimin rotation revealed a four-factor solution explaining 69% of variance: bullying experiences (α = .86, eigenvalue = 2.16), victimisation experiences (α = .91, eigenvalue = 9.31), witnessing experiences (α = .91, eigenvalue = 2.03), and defending experiences (α = .92, eigenvalue = 3.02).

Procedure

Online questionnaires were administered in class groups during school hours in Term 4 (the final term of the Australian school year). In addition to parental consent, verbal assent was obtained from students prior to their participation. Students without parental consent accessed a website about bullying (www.bullyingnoway.com.au) and completed an associated worksheet while their peers participated in the survey. The experimenter distributed printouts of different URLs in order to randomly allocate participating students to different versions of the survey (which varied in terms of the type of bullying, order, and video set for each gender as described in the Design section).

The study was introduced as research "to find out what children think about different things that happen at school." Students were told they would be completing an online survey which involved viewing four videos of actors portraying real situations that have happened at schools like theirs. Students wore headphones during the testing session so they could hear the videos while causing minimal disruption to their peers. The voiceover before each video encouraged participants to assume the role of a bystander in each bullying scenario. After reviewing a practice item, participants completed the online questionnaire of approximately 30 minutes duration at their own

pace. Following the demographic and baseline liking questions, participants watched each video and completed the associated questionnaire one at a time. Participants were able to re-watch each video before completing the manipulation check items and dependent variables. After reading a brief definition of bullying, participants then completed the measures assessing their own experiences with school bullying. When they had completed the task, participants were asked not to discuss the questions or their answers with other students. Participants were also invited to discuss any concerns related to bullying with their teacher or school counsellor. The procedures were approved by the University Human Research Ethics Committee.

Results

Data Analytic Strategy

Using SPSS 21, a series of 2 (gender) × 2 (grade) × 2 (bullying type) × 4 (victim response) doubly multivariate repeated measures MANOVAs and MANCOVAs were conducted on the manipulation check items and on each group of dependent variables respectively. Doubly multivariate analyses were appropriate given the presence of a repeated measures independent variable (i.e., victim response) as well as multiple quantitative dependent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The significance of the multivariate statistic Wilks Lambda (λ) was tested at an alpha level of .05 and multivariate effect sizes were calculated (η_w^2). Multivariate effect sizes can be interpreted in the same way as partial eta squared such that 0.02 represents a small effect, 0.13 represents a medium effect, and 0.26 represents a large effect (Watson, 2014). Follow-up univariate repeated measures ANCOVAs were then conducted on each dependent variable using a Bonferroni correction to account for the number of dependent variables within the group. In order to control the Type I error rate, effects found within each variable were only considered if they had reached significance within the relevant doubly multivariate analysis. Bonferroni adjustments were also made when

testing victim response pairwise comparisons and follow-up simple effects for each level of the interacting factor (e.g., separately for each gender). To control for baseline levels of liking of the actors who portrayed victims in the videos, a within-subjects baseline liking covariate was included in the analyses. Ranges of Pearson correlations between the baseline liking variables and the dependent variables are displayed in Table 2. For all dependent variables, correlations with the baseline liking variables were significant for at least one victim response. Therefore, subsequent analyses were adjusted to take account of this within-subjects variation.

Although counterbalancing of order and video set was incorporated into the study design, the doubly multivariate analyses and follow-up ANCOVAs were repeated to include order and video set one at a time to explore whether results varied depending on these methodological variables. While there was evidence for some minor variations between the video sets for several dependent variables (e.g., perceived seriousness and defender behaviours), no systematic departures from the general pattern were evident. For five dependent variables (estimated victim distress, feelings of sadness, empathy for the victim, defender behaviours, and telling the teacher), order was found to significantly interact with the victim response factor. The influence of order on the pattern of results was consistent across these five variables and will be described below for each dependent variable.

Follow-up moderation analyses utilising a similar MANCOVA procedure were also conducted in order to explore whether the findings varied depending on participants' bullying, victimisation, witnessing, and defending experiences. Given this purpose, moderation effects were only reported in cases where a moderator interacted with a previously reported significant effect. The directions of these interactions were explored by graphically displaying the effects at the 25^{th}, 50^{th}, and 75^{th} percentiles of the

relevant numeric individual-level variable which had been centred at the mean, in line with the pick-a-point method (Hayes & Matthes, 2009).

Skewness analyses on all variables revealed that blaming the victim was highly skewed (skewness > 2.5 for all victim responses). However, log transforming this variable produced equivalent results so the original variable was retained. Missing data among the final sample were negligible with less than 3% of participants missing data and less than 1% missing data pertaining to the videos. Only participants with complete data on relevant variables were included in any given analysis. Preliminary analyses were conducted in order to assess the possible effects of lack of independence of responses by participants in the same class. The intraclass correlations (ICC) were found to be low (< .06), with seven out of the 10 dependent variables having an ICC of < .00001. Variability due to class was also partly accounted for by gender and grade and therefore class was not included in the subsequent analyses. Further checks using the dependent variables with intraclass correlations above .01 indicated that, even in those cases, taking class into account made very little difference to the obtained *p*-values and did not alter the reported conclusions.

Victim Response Manipulation Check

Table 3 displays descriptive statistics for the victim response manipulation check variables. The doubly multivariate analysis revealed significant main effects for victim response (Table 4) and gender, $\lambda = .85$, $F\ (4, 193) = 8.24$, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .15$. Univariate ANOVAs using a nominal alpha of .013 to account for the four variables in the group revealed significant victim response main effects for all variables (see Table 4). In order to test the effectiveness of the victim response manipulation, ratings for each variable were used to compare the relevant victim response to each of the other victim responses. These post-hoc analyses (using a nominal alpha of .002) revealed that angry victims were rated as more angry than sad, $F\ (1, 196) = 250.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 =$

.56, confident, F (1, 196) = 312.88, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .61$, and ignoring victims, F (1, 196) = 365.82, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .65$. Sad victims appeared more sad than angry, F (1, 197) = 217.90, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .53$; confident, F (1, 197) = 270.97, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .58$; and ignoring victims, F (1, 197) =97.33, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .13$. Confident victims were rated as more confident than sad, F (1, 196) = 498.08, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .72$; and ignoring victims, F (1, 196) = 149.50, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .43$; but not when compared to angry victims, F (1, 196) = 2.51, $p = .12$, $\eta_p^2 = .01$. Finally, ignoring victims were rated as calmly ignoring the bully more than angry, F (1, 196) = 991.91, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .84$; sad, F (1, 196) = 101.76, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .34$; and confident victims, F (1, 196) = 381.83, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .66$. This pattern was consistent across all orders and video sets. Overall, these findings indicate that participants interpreted the victim responses as intended; however, elevated ratings of confidence for angry victims imply that the victim response labels may not necessarily be mutually exclusive. Univariate analyses also revealed that overall, females (M = 2.88, SD = 1.61) considered female victims to be more confident than males considered male victims, (M = 2.42, SD = 1.37), F (1, 196) = 27.12, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$.

Overview of Main Analyses

Descriptive statistics for all dependent variables organised by victim response are displayed in Table 3. In cases where the victim response factor interacted with a between-subjects factor, descriptive statistics for each level of the between-subjects factor were also reported. Table 2 displays the Pearson correlations between the variables. Results are presented by group, beginning with doubly multivariate analyses and then univariate repeated measures ANCOVAs and relevant follow-up analyses for each dependent variable. Table 4 displays inferential statistics for all victim response main effects within the doubly multivariate MANCOVA and univariate ANCOVA

analyses. Inferential statistics for all post-hoc victim response pairwise comparisons are presented in Table 5.

Baseline liking within-subjects covariate. A univariate ANOVA on the baseline liking variables revealed a significant grade main effect, F (1, 198) = 5.67, p = .02, η_p^2 = .03. Fifth graders (M = 2.82, SD = 1.03) liked the children who later portrayed victims more than did seventh graders (M = 2.52, SD = 1.06). No other effects involving these variables were significant (ps > .05).

Bystanders' Attitudes Towards the Victim

The doubly multivariate MANCOVA revealed a significant victim response effect. This main effect was qualified by a significant Gender × Victim Response interaction, λ = .96, F (6, 1184) = 4.41, p < .001, η_w^2 = .02. In the following set of analyses, the nominal alpha value when examining each dependent variable was .025.

Liking the victim. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant victim response effect, which was qualified by a significant Gender × Victim Response interaction, F (3, 593) = 8.16, p < .001, η_p^2 = .04. Follow-up simple effects analyses separated by gender indicated that females liked female angry victims significantly less than female sad, confident, and ignoring victims. No other simple effects were significant (ps > .002).

Participants' own victimisation experiences were found to interact with the victim response factor within the moderation analyses, λ = .95, F (3, 185) = 3.28, p = .02, η_p^2 = .05. This effect was qualified by the three-way interaction involving gender, victim response, and participants' victimisation experiences, λ = .95, F (3, 185) = 3.37, p = .02, η_p^2 = .05. The pattern showed that the more participants were victimised, the less females liked female angry victims (compared to the other female victims) and the less males liked male angry and sad victims (compared to male confident and ignoring victims).

Blaming the victim. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant victim response main effect. Post-hoc analyses revealed that angry victims were blamed significantly more than sad, confident, and ignoring victims. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (*p*s > .004).

Participants' own victimisation experiences were found to interact with the victim response factor within the moderation analyses, λ = .95, F (3, 185) = 3.23, p = .02, η_p^2 = .05. The pattern showed that the more participants were victimised, the more they blamed angry victims compared to the other three victims.

Bystanders' Perceptions of the Victimisation

The doubly multivariate MANCOVA revealed significant main effects for victim response and gender, λ = .96, F (2,196) = 4.20, p = .02, η_w^2 = .04. In the following set of analyses, the nominal alpha value when examining each dependent variable was .025.

Perceived seriousness. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant gender main effect, F (1, 197) = 8.38, p = .004, η_p^2 = .04. Females (M = 3.82, SD = 1.08) perceived the incidents involving female victims as more serious than males considered incidents involving male victims (M = 3.48, SD = 1.12). A significant victim response main effect was obtained. Post-hoc analyses revealed that participants considered incidents involving confident victims to be less serious than incidents involving angry, sad, and ignoring victims. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (*p*s > .004).

Participants' bullying experiences interacted with the victim response factor within the moderation analyses, λ = .94, F (3, 185) = 4.03, p = .008, η_p^2 = .06. The pattern showed that the more participants bullied others, the less serious they perceived episodes involving confident victims (relative to other victims).

Table 2

Ranges of Pearson Correlations between the Within-Subjects Covariate and Dependent Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
1. Baseline Liking											
Lowest	–										
Highest	–										
2. Liking the Victim											
Lowest	.21*	–									
Highest	.29*	–									
3. Blaming the Victim											
Lowest	-.05	-.26*	–								
Highest	.17*	-.51*	–								
4. Perceived Seriousness											
Lowest	-.05	.14*	-.07	–							
Highest	.16*	.41*	-.25*	–							
5. Estimated Victim Distress											
Lowest	.003	.08	.05	.30*	–						
Highest	.19*	.21*	-.13	.48*	–						

6. Feelings of Anger											
Lowest	.09	.09	.02	.31*	.22*	–					
Highest	.16*	.25*	.06	.41*	.47*	–					
7. Feelings of Sadness											
Lowest	.13	.18*	-.01	.38*	.39*	.49*	–				
Highest	.25*	.36*	-19*	.52*	.56*	.67*	–				
8. Empathy for the Victim											
Lowest	.17*	.29*	-.08	.49*	.37*	.46*	.58*	–			
Highest	.24*	.45*	-.26*	.62*	.51*	.57*	.65*	–			
9. Defender Behaviours											
Lowest	.09	.34*	-.05	.36*	.33*	.33*	.35*	.51*	–		
Highest	.27*	.51*	-.28*	.48*	.44*	.43*	.59*	.63*	–		
10. Outsider Behaviours											
Lowest	-.05	-.17*	.20*	-.13	-.05	-.04	-.05	-.12	-.42*	–	
Highest	-.16*	.30*	.27*	-.23*	-.17*	-.12	-.19*	-.22*	-.47*	–	
11. Telling the Teacher											
Lowest	.07	.14*	.02	.35*	.16*	.29*	.30*	.42*	.42*	-.28*	–
Highest	.17*	.32*	-.19*	.49*	.30*	.37*	.39*	.52*	.57*	-.37*	–

Note. Correlations between the variables varied by victim response and therefore correlation ranges (i.e., correlations that were lowest and highest in magnitude) were reported; * indicates $p < .05$.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for all Manipulation Check and Dependent Variables Organised by Victim Response.

	Angry Victim		Sad Victim		Confident Victim		Ignoring Victim	
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Manipulation Checks:								
Seemed Angry [a]	3.88	1.14	2.15	1.15	2.02	1.15	1.86	1.04
Seemed Sad [b]	2.18	1.06	3.68	1.30	1.82	1.03	2.59	1.43
Seemed Confident [a]	3.46	1.19	1.35	0.81	3.65	1.28	2.10	1.33
Seemed Calmly Ignoring [a]	1.32	0.81	3.26	1.46	1.98	1.25	4.41	1.07
Attitudes Towards the Victim:								
Liking the Victim	3.42	0.98	3.79	0.79	3.87	0.83	3.89	0.78
Males	3.56	0.88	3.61	0.80	3.80	0.83	3.77	0.79
Females	3.28	1.07	3.97	0.74	3.94	0.84	4.03	0.76
Blaming the Victim	1.37	0.77	1.10	0.45	1.18	0.57	1.09	0.42

Perceptions of the Victimisation:								
Perceived Seriousness	3.62	1.11	3.80	1.05	3.40	1.14	3.75	1.11
Estimated Victim Distress	3.30	1.27	4.17	1.07	2.83	1.26	3.68	1.18
Emotional Reactions:								
Feelings of Anger	2.84	1.33	3.04	1.32	2.46	1.28	2.78	1.25
Feelings of Sadness	2.56	1.29	3.35	1.30	2.67	1.36	3.11	1.28
Empathy for the Victim	3.07	1.03	3.47	1.02	3.08	1.09	3.38	1.01
Physical Bullying	3.19	0.98	3.41	1.06	2.97	1.05	3.34	0.98
Verbal Bullying	2.96	1.06	3.53	0.98	3.17	1.11	3.41	1.05
Behavioural Intentions:								
Defender Behaviours	3.33	1.16	3.84	1.08	3.45	1.17	3.82	1.03
Grade 5	3.61	1.09	3.93	1.05	3.83	1.01	3.87	1.11
Grade 7	3.11	1.17	3.76	1.10	3.14	1.20	3.78	0.97
Outsider Behaviours	2.08	1.14	1.79	1.08	2.05	1.12	1.86	1.00
Telling the Teacher [b]	3.18	1.49	3.30	1.45	2.98	1.44	3.20	1.43

Note. $N = 206$; [a] $N = 204$; [b] $N = 205$.

Table 4

Inferential Statistics for Victim Response Main Effects for Each Manipulation Check and Dependent Variable

Variable	Victim Response Effect				
	λ	F	df	p	η_p^2
Manipulation Checks:	.12	118.38	12, 185	< .001*	.88
Seemed Angry	.31	143.48	3, 194	< .001*	.69
Seemed Sad	.40	99.53	3, 195	< .001*	.60
Seemed Confident	.23	214.23	3, 194	< .001*	.77
Seemed Calmly Ignoring	.16	340.93	3, 194	< .001*	.84
Attitudes Towards the Victim:	.88	12.98	6, 1184	< .001*	.06
Liking the Victim		20.66	3, 593	< .001*	.09
Blaming the Victim		12.99	3, 593	< .001*	.06
Perceptions of the Victimisation:	.76	28.37	6, 1184	< .001*	.13
Perceived Seriousness		11.47	3, 593	< .001*	.05
Estimated Victim Distress		57.15	3, 593	< .001*	.22
Emotional Reactions:	.78	16.95	9, 1438	< .001*	.08
Feelings of Anger		13.57	3, 593	< .001*	.06
Feelings of Sadness		30.18	3, 593	< .001*	.13
Empathy for the Victim		24.19	3, 593	< .001*	.11
Behavioural Intentions:	.88	8.66	9, 1431	< .001*	.04
Defender Behaviours		20.07	3, 593	< .001*	.09
Outsider Behaviours		7.97	3, 593	< .001*	.04
Telling the Teacher		5.50	3, 590	.001*	.03

Note. * indicates significance using the Bonferroni corrected alpha value.

Estimated victim distress. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant victim response main effect. Post-hoc analyses revealed significant differences between all four victim responses, with sad victims considered the most distressed followed by the ignoring, angry, and confident victims in turn. It should be noted that a significant Order × Victim Response interaction was also obtained with the pattern indicating that ratings of angry and confident victims were elevated for participants who viewed that particular victim response first (as compared to the other orders). This pattern may reflect the fact that these participants did not have a reference point from which to calibrate their responses.

Bystanders' Emotional Reactions

The doubly multivariate MANCOVA revealed a significant gender main effect, $\lambda = .87$, F (3,195) = 9.97, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .13$. There was also a significant victim response effect. This main effect was qualified by a significant Bullying Type × Victim Response interaction, $\lambda = .95$, F (9, 1438) = 3.15, $p = .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .02$. In the following set of analyses, the nominal alpha value when examining each dependent variable was .017.

Feelings of anger. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant gender main effect, F (1, 197) = 12.34, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .06$. When viewing the gender-consistent scenarios, females (M = 3.00, SD = 1.31) reported higher levels of anger than did males (M = 2.58, SD = 1.27). A significant victim response main effect was obtained. Post-hoc analyses revealed that participants experienced less anger after viewing confident victims compared to angry, sad, and ignoring victims. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (ps > .002).

Participants' defending experiences interacted with the victim response factor within the moderation analyses, $\lambda = .93$, F (3, 182) = 4.94, $p = .003$, $\eta_p^2 = .08$. The pattern showed that the more participants defended victims against bullying, the more

anger they experienced when watching angry and sad victims compared to the other victims.

Feelings of sadness. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant gender main effect, F (1, 197) = 28.72, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .13$. When viewing the gender-consistent scenarios, females (M = 3.24, SD = 1.29) reported higher levels of sadness than did males (M = 2.62, SD = 1.32). A significant victim response main effect was obtained. Post-hoc analyses revealed that participants experienced less sadness after viewing confident victims compared to sad and ignoring victims. Participants also experienced less sadness after viewing angry victims compared to sad and ignoring victims. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (ps > .002). It should be noted that a significant Order × Victim Response interaction was also obtained with the pattern indicating that ratings of angry and confident victims were elevated for participants who viewed that particular victim response first (as compared to the other orders). This pattern may reflect the fact that these participants did not have a reference point from which to calibrate their responses.

Empathy for the victim. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant gender main effect, F (1, 197) = 20.70, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .10$. Females (M = 3.50, SD = 1.02) indicated higher levels of empathy for female victims than did males for male victims (M = 3.01, SD = 1.02). There was also a significant victim response effect, which was qualified by a significant Bullying Type × Victim Response interaction, F (3, 593) = 4.52, $p = .004$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Follow-up simple effects analyses separated by bullying type indicated that in verbal bullying situations, confident victims evoked less empathy than did sad victims. Angry victims also evoked less empathy than both sad and ignoring victims. In physical bullying situations, confident victims evoked less empathy than sad and ignoring victims. No other simple effects were significant (ps > .001). It should be noted that a significant Order × Victim Response interaction was also

obtained with the pattern indicating that ratings of angry and confident victims were elevated for participants who viewed that particular victim response first (as compared to the other orders). This pattern may reflect the fact that these participants did not have a reference point from which to calibrate their responses.

Bystanders' Behavioural Intentions

The doubly multivariate MANCOVA revealed four significant main effects involving grade, $\lambda = .87$, F (3, 194) = 9.26, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .13$; gender, $\lambda = .86$, F (3,194) = 10.38, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .14$; bullying type, $\lambda = .96$, F (3,194) = 2.91, $p = .04$, $\eta_w^2 = .04$; and victim response. These main effects were qualified by three significant interactions including: a Grade × Gender interaction, $\lambda = .95$, F (3, 194) = 3.67, $p = .01$, $\eta_w^2 = .05$; a Gender × Bullying Type interaction, $\lambda = .96$, F (3, 194) = 2.87, $p = .04$, $\eta_w^2 = .04$; and a Grade × Victim Response interaction, $\lambda = .95$, F (9, 1431) = 3.14, $p = .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .02$. In the following set of analyses, the nominal alpha value when examining each dependent variable was .017.

Defender behaviours. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant victim response main effect, which was qualified by a significant Grade × Victim Response interaction, F (3, 593) = 6.54, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .03$. Follow-up simple effects analyses separated by grade indicated that Grade 7 students were more inclined to defend sad victims compared to angry and confident victims. Grade 7 students were also more inclined to defend ignoring victims compared to angry and confident victims. No other simple effects were significant (ps > .001). It should be noted that a significant Order × Victim Response interaction was also obtained with the pattern indicating that ratings of angry and confident victims were elevated for participants who viewed that particular victim response first (as compared to the other orders). This pattern may reflect the fact that these participants did not have a reference point from which to calibrate their responses.

Table 5

Inferential Statistics for Post-hoc Victim Response Pairwise Comparisons for All Dependent Variables and Simple Effects for Dependent Variables where Significant Interactions were Obtained

Pairwise Comparison:	Angry vs. Sad Victim			Angry vs. Confident Victim			Angry vs. Ignoring Victim		
Dependent Variable	$F(1, 197)$	p	η_p^2	$F(1, 197)$	p	η_p^2	$F(1, 197)$	p	η_p^2
Attitudes Towards the Victim:									
Liking the Victim	23.97	<.001*	.11	38.77	<.001*	.16	34.94	<.001*	.15
Males (α = .002)	.19	.66	<.001	6.38	.01	.03	3.24	.07	.02
Females (α = .002)	42.24	<.001*	.18	39.32	<.001*	.17	42.94	<.001*	.18
Blaming the Victim (α = .004)	20.55	<.001*	.09	13.43	<.001*	.06	20.29	<.001*	.09
Perceptions of the Victimisation:									
Perceived Seriousness (α = .004)	5.53	.02	.03	10.10	.002*	.05	2.77	.10	.01
Estimated Victim Distress (α = .004)	66.12	<.001*	.25	15.93	<.001*	.07	15.35	<.001*	.07
Emotional Reactions:									
Feelings of Anger (α = .003)	3.47	.06	.02	18.36	<.001*	.09	0.90	.34	.005
Feelings of Sadness (α = .003)	65.99	<.001*	.25	2.20	.14	.01	36.88	<.001*	.16
Empathy for the Victim	44.87	<.001*	.19	.09	.78	< .001	23.87	<.001*	.11
Physical Bullying (α = .001)	4.05	.009	.03	4.61	.03	.02	2.91	.09	.01
Verbal Bullying (α = .001)	49.06	<.001*	.20	7.50	.007	.04	28.49	<.001*	.13
Behavioural Intentions:									
Defender Behaviours	35.45	<.001*	.15	2.42	.12	.01	29.67	<.001*	.13
Grade 5 (α = .001)	6.26	.01	.03	2.96	.09	.01	4.83	.03	.02
Grade 7 (α = .001)	38.76	<.001*	.16	.15	.70	.001	33.06	<.001*	.14
Outsider Behaviours (α = .003)	16.77	<.001*	.08	0.77	.38	.004	8.82	.003	.04
Telling the Teacher [a] (α = .003)	2.02	.16	.01	9.04	.003	.04	0.01	.92	<.001

Pairwise Comparison:	Sad vs. Confident Victim			Sad vs. Ignoring Victim			Confident vs. Ignoring Victim		
Dependent Variable	$F(1, 197)$	p	η_p^2	$F(1, 197)$	p	η_p^2	$F(1, 197)$	p	η_p^2
Attitudes Towards the Victim:									
Liking the Victim	2.21	.14	.01	2.74	.10	.01	0.04	.84	<.001
Males (α = .002)	6.16	.01	.03	3.31	.07	.02	.35	.56	.002
Females (α = .002)	.14	.71	.001	.28	.60	.001	.78	.38	.004
Blaming the Victim (α = .004)	3.73	.06	.02	< 0.01	.99	<.001	2.85	.09	.01
Perceptions of the Victimisation: (α = .004)									
Perceived Seriousness (α = .004)	34.00	<.001*	.15	0.68	.41	.003	17.08	<.001*	.08
Estimated Victim Distress (α = .004)	160.16	<.001*	.45	23.28	<.001*	.11	61.14	<.001*	.24
Emotional Reactions:									
Feelings of Anger (α = .003)	42.08	<.001*	.18	8.45	.004	.04	10.42	.001*	.05
Feelings of Sadness (α = .003)	52.31	<.001*	.21	7.63	.006	.04	16.21	<.001*	.08
Empathy for the Victim	59.19	<.001*	.23	3.05	.08	.02	19.89	<.001*	.09
Physical Bullying (α = .001)	31.44	<.001*	.14	.89	.35	.005	12.44	.001	.06
Verbal Bullying (α = .001)	28.15	<.001*	.13	2.40	.12	.01	7.65	.006	.04
Behavioural Intentions:									
Defender Behaviours	29.38	<.001*	.13	0.07	.006	<.001	17.08	<.001*	.08
Grade 5 (α = .001)	1.10	.30	.006	.04	.85	< .001	.19	.66	.001
Grade 7 (α = .001)	50.63	<.001*	.20	.03	.86	< .001	33.61	<.001*	.15
Outsider Behaviours (α = .003)	16.37	<.001*	.08	1.17	.28	.006	5.09	.03	.03
Telling the Teacher[a] (α = .003)	21.20	<.001*	.10	1.70	.19	.009	5.34	.02	.03

Note. N = 206. Bonferroni corrected alpha values are provided for each dependent variable.* indicates significance using the appropriate alpha value. [a] Within-subjects df was 196.

Outsider behaviours. Descriptive statistics, organised by gender, grade, and bullying type, are displayed in Table 6. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant bullying type effect, F (1, 197) = 6.49, p = .01, η_p^2 = .03. This main effect was qualified by a significant Gender × Bullying Type interaction, F (1, 197) = 7.51, p = .007, η_p^2 = .04. Simple effects analyses revealed that there was a significant bullying type effect among females, F (1, 201) = 15.78, p < .001, η_p^2 = .07. For females viewing bullying among females, verbal bullying situations produced more reported outsider behaviours than physical bullying situations. For males viewing bullying among males, outsider behaviours did not significantly vary depending on the type of bullying observed, F (1, 201) = 0.01, p = .92. There was also a significant grade effect, F (1, 197) = 6.25, p = .01, η_p^2 = .03. This main effect was qualified by a significant Gender × Grade interaction, F (1, 197) = 8.73, p = .004, η_p^2 = .04. Simple effects analyses revealed that there was a significant grade effect among males, F (1, 201) = 16.86, p < .001, η_p^2 = .08. Grade 7 males viewing bullying among males reported being more inclined to engage in outsider behaviours compared with Grade 5 males. For females viewing bullying among females, outsider behaviours did not significantly vary by grade, F (1, 201) = 0.02, p = .89, η_p^2 < .001. A significant victim response main effect was also obtained. Post-hoc analyses revealed that participants were less inclined to engage in outsider behaviours after viewing sad victims compared to either angry or confident victims. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (ps > .002).

Main effects for participants' experiences witnessing bullying interactions, F (1, 186) = 15.40, p < .001, η_p^2 = .08, revealed that the more participants witnessed bullying, the more inclined they were to engage in outsider behaviours, B = 0.26, t = 3.93, SE = 0.07, p < .001.

Table 6

Descriptive Statistics for Outsider Behaviours Organised by Gender, Grade, and Bullying Type

	Male			Female		
Group	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Grade						
Grade 5	1.56	0.75	47	1.96	1.06	43
Grade 7	2.26	1.20	60	1.92	1.13	56
Bullying Type						
Physical	2.06	1.15	52	1.58	0.86	47
Verbal	1.86	1.01	55	2.25	1.19	52

Telling the teacher. The univariate ANCOVA revealed a significant gender main effect, F (1, 196) = 28.54, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .13$. When viewing bullying among same-sex peers, females (M = 3.60, SD = 1.34) were more inclined to tell the teacher than were males (M = 2.76, SD = 1.44). There was also a significant grade main effect, F (1, 196) = 26.00, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .12$. Grade 5 students (M = 3.67, SD = 1.24) were more inclined to tell the teacher than Grade 7 students (M = 2.77, SD = 1.48). A significant victim response main effect was obtained. Post-hoc analyses revealed that participants were more inclined to tell the teacher after viewing incidents involving sad victims compared to confident victims. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (ps > .002). It should be noted that a significant Order × Victim Response interaction was also obtained with the pattern indicating that ratings of angry and confident victims were elevated for participants who viewed that particular victim response first (as compared to the other orders). This pattern may reflect the fact that these participants did not have a reference point from which to calibrate their responses.

Main effects for participants' own bullying experiences, F (1, 187) = 8.98, p = .003, $\eta_p^2 = .05$; and victimisation experiences, F (1, 187) = 8.44, p = .004, $\eta_p^2 = .04$,

revealed that participants who bullied others or were victimised more often, were less inclined to tell the teacher, B = -0.58, t = -3.00, SE = 0.19, p = .003 and B = -0.28, t = -2.91, SE = 0.09, p = .004, respectively.

Discussion

Victims' responses to bullying significantly influenced the attitudes and reactions of same-sex peer bystanders. Using gender-consistent video scenarios, this study compared the relative effects of four different victim responses (angry, sad, confident, ignoring) on bystanders' attitudes towards the victim, perceptions of the victimisation, emotional reactions, and behavioural intentions. In line with predictions, angry victims were perceived more negatively by their peers. Situations involving confident victims were perceived as less serious and distressing to victims and evoked less emotion. Bystanders also reported greater intentions to take positive action when witnessing incidents involving sad victims. These findings add a new dimension to bullying research by showing that bystander reactions vary depending on the victim's response and they offer important implications for anti-bullying interventions aimed at victims and the broader peer group. Identified variations depending on bullying type, students' gender, grade, and personal experiences with bullying also highlight the need to adapt intervention programs to the relevant audience.

Bystanders' Attitudes Towards the Victim

Overall, bystanders' attitudes were found to be most negative towards victims who adopted an angry response characteristic of aggressive victims (Schwartz et al., 2001). Interestingly, this effect was stronger when bystanders had experienced more victimisation themselves. Rather than understanding and excusing victims' emotional displays in response to bullying, bystanders who had been victimised more often tended to exhibit lower liking for angry victims (and sad victims in the case of male participants) and placed more blame on angry victims. This pattern may indicate that

victims of bullying are generally uncomfortable around and disapproving of displays of aggression, whether pro-active or reactive (Olweus, 1994). Future research should consider asking students to explain and justify their evaluations of different victims in order to uncover the driving mechanisms behind these effects.

There were gender differences in students' reported liking of same-sex victims. While female bystanders liked angry victims less than the other victims, there were no significant victim response effects for male participants. Similar gender differences have been noted in response to teasing situations where females, but not males, rated victims who displayed angry, aggressive behaviours as significantly less friendly than victims who responded passively (Scambler et al., 1998). Given that this gender pattern in peer attitudes prevailed in Scambler et al.'s study (1998) even when the gender of the victim was counterbalanced across participants' gender, the current finding may be best explained in terms of females' general disapproval of angry, overtly aggressive behaviours, regardless of who enacts them. Gender stereotypes may further contribute to this result given that expressions of anger and overt aggression are generally less acceptable among females than males (Underwood, Galenand, & Paquette, 2001).

Participants' baseline ratings completed before watching the bullying scenarios indicated how much participants liked the children who later portrayed victims in the videos. While these ratings varied by age, no age differences were detected in the victim liking variable once these baseline ratings were statistically controlled. This finding contradicts the hypothesis and past research indicating that younger children typically like victims more than older children (Gini, 2008; Gini et al., 2008). Rather, the results of the current study suggest that fifth graders like children in general more than seventh graders and this finding highlights the need for research to adjust for this age difference when examining peer attitudes in bullying situations.

As predicted, bystanders blamed angry victims more than the other victims, even though the victim's aggression was exclusively in response to the bully's provocation. This finding offers an important motivation for victims to avoid using aggressive strategies, which appear to increase the risk that bystanders will believe the victim deserved maltreatment. Victim blame is also a key mechanism underlying moral disengagement which may in turn reduce the likelihood of bystander intervention (Obermann, 2011). These results emphasise the potential for using individual-level interventions which alter victims' responses to bullying as a means of facilitating peer acceptance and reducing victim blame. Developing peer-level interventions that emphasise that victims should not be blamed for their victimisation and that responding effectively to bullying is often challenging may also foster peers' understanding of the victim's position. Taken together, these programs may help improve victims' status in the peer group and increase their friendship opportunities which in turn can protect victims against future victimisation and its negative psychological consequences (Hodges et al., 1999).

Bystanders' Perceptions of the Victimisation

Bystanders considered incidents involving confident victims to be less serious and less distressing for victims. This pattern is consistent with anecdotal evidence suggesting that people take into account how well victims defend themselves when rating the seriousness of bullying interactions (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). These results may stem from the fact that a victim exuding confidence appears to counter common definitions of bullying which describe the power differential between the bully and victim in terms of the victim having difficulty defending himself or herself (Olweus, 1993). This definition does not take into account power imbalances that are less visible such as subtle differences in social power or subjective differences perceived by victims. While consistent use of the confident victim response could conceivably shift

the balance of power over time, the current results warn that in the meantime, bystanders may not recognise the seriousness of bullying incidents characterised by more subtle power disparities. Perceptions of seriousness of gender-consistent bullying scenarios also varied for different subgroups of bystanders. Males considered the bullying episodes to be less serious than females, and the more students bullied others, the less serious they perceived incidents involving confident victims. This latter finding implies that students with a history of bullying may be particularly vulnerable to minimising the seriousness of bullying behaviours when victims appear confident and may instead view these interactions as playful teasing.

Of all the outcomes assessed, bystanders' perceptions of victims' internal distress were found to vary the most depending on victims' visible reaction to being bullied. Sad victims were thought to be the most upset, followed by the ignoring, angry, and confident victims in turn. Interestingly, ignoring victims who responded passively with a calm facial expression were thought to be more upset than angry victims who clearly displayed negative emotion in the form of anger. It appears that peer bystanders may place greater importance on victims' behavioural reaction, compared to their emotional display, when inferring victims' distress. Alternatively, this pattern may reflect a tendency to underestimate the feelings of hurt that may drive victims' angry and aggressive responses to bullying. Importantly, bystanders' average rating of confident victims fell below the "somewhat" upset anchor, suggesting that when victims are able to conceal their expression of negative emotion, observers may fail to realise that they may still be experiencing significant distress.

Bystanders' Emotional Reactions

Witnessing bullying has the potential to elicit strong emotions; however these reactions were more intense when incidents involved sad or passive victims. Bystanders experienced less anger when viewing confident victims. Students who more often

defended victims of bullying were also more likely to experience anger after witnessing incidents involving angry and sad victims, consistent with previous findings (Rocke Henderson & Hymel, 2011). Given the nature of the defending measure in the current study, it is not clear whether students adopted aggressive or non-aggressive strategies when standing up for victims. Future research should clarify the effect of bystander anger on specific methods of defending, in order to understand how bystanders' emotional reactions motivate particular behaviours and potentially affect the perpetuation of aggression within the peer group.

Passive victims (i.e., sad and ignoring) evoked more sadness and more empathy in verbal bullying situations compared to more assertive victims (i.e., angry and confident), perhaps reflecting an empathic sense of helplessness for victims who were unable to defend themselves. In physical bullying situations, passive victims once again evoked more empathy than confident victims, however bystander empathy for angry victims was relatively elevated. This pattern may imply that bystanders understand the victim's choice to use a more aggressive strategy in response to physical violence. Compared to males, females reported experiencing more anger, sadness, and empathy in response to witnessing same-sex bullying, in line with past research (Hektner & Swenson, 2011; Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005). Understanding bystanders' emotional reactions and the ways in which they vary depending on the context (e.g., bullying type) may ultimately assist in predicting bystander actions in response to bullying situations (Barhight et al., 2013; Rocke Henderson & Hymel, 2011).

Bystanders' Behavioural Intentions

Bystanders were most likely to report intentions to assist sad victims implying that students recognise the need to intervene or inform the teacher, rather than standing by and doing nothing, when a victim of bullying appears helpless and distressed. Grade 7 students reported greater intentions to defend passive victims (i.e., sad and ignoring)

compared to more assertive victims (i.e., angry and confident); however victim response effects were not significant among fifth graders. Although the predicted grade main effect was not significant, the current results suggest that higher rates of defending among younger children found in past research (Trach et al., 2010) might be driven by older children's reduced rates of defending in situations where victims exhibit a more active victim response (i.e., angry or confident).

Intentions to exhibit outsider behaviours were found to vary depending on students' gender, grade, and the type of bullying. Overall, bystanders reported fewer intentions to adopt outsider behaviours after viewing incidents involving sad victims compared to angry or confident victims. Interestingly, victims of bullying most commonly appear sad and respond passively (Schwartz et al., 2001) and yet outsider behaviours still predominate in school settings (Trach et al., 2010). The current findings offer a potential explanation for this apparent discrepancy. Outsider behaviours were found to be more prevalent among students who witnessed bullying more often, perhaps suggesting a vicious cycle where the prevalence of bullying increases bystander complacency, which in turn enables further bullying to occur (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004).

Bystanders indicated a greater tendency to report bullying incidents involving sad victims compared to confident victims. This result contributes to a growing literature examining the "reporter" participant role in bullying, which refers to bystanders who report incidents to the teacher although they tend to do nothing during the actual bullying episode (Sim & Tan, 2013). Females and younger students were more inclined to tell the teacher about the bullying they observed, in line with past research (Rigby & Johnson, 2005). By contrast, bystanders who themselves were more often involved in bullying, as either bullies or victims, were less likely to indicate intentions to report bullying to the teacher. Past research indicating that students who

bullied others or were victimised more often tended to make more negative appraisals of teachers' capacity to resolve conflicts (Rigby & Bagshaw, 2003) may help explain reduced reporting rates among these students. In the case of bullies, this pattern may also reflect beliefs about the acceptability of aggressive behaviour or the desire to avoid punishment when they themselves behave aggressively towards their peers. For victims, this effect may indicate an acceptance of the inevitability of bullying in the school environment or a sense of doubt over whether reporting bullying to teachers will produce positive outcomes for them. These findings emphasise the need to train teachers in how to manage school bullying, build trust within teacher-student relationships, and establish a supportive school climate which actively works to prevent bullying.

Implications for Anti-bullying Interventions

Examining the impact of the victim's response to bullying on a range of bystander outcomes has revealed important insights that can inform the development of evidence-based individual-level and peer-level interventions which can be employed within the context of whole school anti-bullying programs. The present findings clearly highlight the disadvantages of victims adopting angry and aggressive responses to bullying. The angry victim was thought to be less distressed than victims who responded passively and incidents involving angry victims evoked less bystander sadness and less empathy in verbal bullying situations. The angry victim response was also found to result in higher levels of blame and lower levels of peer acceptance, extending previous research indicating the effect of aggression on peer rejection and subsequent victimisation (Hanish & Guerra, 2000). In addition, seventh graders exhibited fewer intentions to defend angry victims. While past research has demonstrated the ineffectiveness of angry and aggressive responses to bullying in light of their tendency to provoke further aggression (Schwartz et al., 2001; Spence et al.,

2009), the current findings go a step further to highlight the broader social consequences of adopting this victim response. Taken together, these results support the implementation of school policies which discourage aggressive responses to bullying and suggest the potential benefits of providing victims with emotion regulation skills training (Mahady Wilton et al., 2000). Skills-training interventions which seek to modify victims' responses to bullying are not intended to place blame on the victim, but instead aim to empower victims to play an active role in effectively managing the bullying problem and preventing future victimisation.

Sad, passive victims were found to be most likely to elicit bystander support in the current study, indicating that peer bystanders were generally sensitive to the victim's distress and need for external assistance. However, past research indicates that this victim response may increase the likelihood of future victimisation as expressions of distress may reinforce the bully and passive responses may indicate that the victim is an easy target (Perry et al., 1990). Taken together, these findings suggest the need to consider the impact of the victim's response on both bullies and bystanders, as these effects may not be in the same direction. It is also possible that the consequences of adopting the sad victim response change over time. While the current findings suggest that sad, passive responses during a single bullying episode increase bystanders' intentions to help, future research should evaluate the long-term social implications of these behaviours given evidence that children displaying symptoms of depression and anxiety may experience lower peer liking (Luchetti & Rapee, 2014).

Current findings suggest the possible benefits of adopting victim responses involving neutral, non-provocative comments expressed calmly and confidently or ignoring the bully with a nonchalant expression. Both of these responses produced some advantages in terms of bystanders' attitudes towards the victim relative to angry expressions, however less so when compared to sad expressions. Nevertheless, it is

plausible that victims who continually respond to bullying in socially appropriate ways may be viewed more favourably by their peers over time. This idea is supported by evidence of increased peer acceptance among socially marginalised children who had completed a social skills intervention one year earlier, although these effects were not evident immediately following treatment (DeRosier & Marcus, 2005). Referring to these findings within individual-level interventions may help motivate victims to invest time and effort into practising more effective responses to bullying.

The present research also exposed several potential negative consequences associated with adopting the confident victim response recommended within anti-bullying interventions (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b). Incidents involving confident victims were less likely to be reported to teachers, perceived as serious, considered distressing, and to evoke bystander empathy or other emotional reactions. While in some circumstances these reactions may be appropriate, these results suggest that students who successfully execute the confident victim response may not be recognised as victims of bullying, minimising the likelihood of bystander support. In line with this view, several teachers within qualitative research were surprised when particular students in their class self-identified as victims because the students appeared well-adjusted, assertive, and could stand up for themselves (Mishna et al., 2005). The present finding may also help explain situations where bullying continues following victims' use of social shielding, a protective strategy whereby victims try to appear emotionally unaffected and hide their internal distress in front of bullies and bystanders in order to reduce the "fun" associated with bullying them (Thornberg et al., 2013). These findings affirm the need to encourage all victims, including those who display appropriate assertiveness and social skills, to speak to an adult or safe person about their bullying experiences to ensure they do not go unnoticed.

In addition to informing the development of individual-level interventions designed to guide victims' responses to bullying, this research highlights the need for educational campaigns and peer-level interventions that address definitions and perceptions of bullying to ensure that students understand that victims of bullying may respond in a multitude of ways. It should be emphasised that although some students may not outwardly express distress following victimisation, these experiences are still hurtful and may cause significant harm (Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996). By educating and building empathy in this way, peer bystanders may be more likely to use their influence over bullying situations in more positive and constructive ways.

Limitations and Future Directions

The current study assessed children's self-reported responses to hypothetical scenarios, which may limit the generalisability of these findings. However, use of diverse video scenarios varying in content, location, and individuals, assisted with ecological validity. While a within-subjects design may be vulnerable to demand effects, the use of an experimental paradigm also provided an important advantage over correlational designs, given the potential to infer causal relations (Gini et al., 2008). Some order effects and minor video set effects were identified in the current study. For five dependent variables (estimated victim distress, feelings of sadness, empathy for the victim, defender behaviours, and telling the teacher), the general victim response pattern was for ratings of angry and confident victims to be lower than ratings for sad and ignoring victims; however ratings of confident and angry victims were elevated for participants who viewed that particular video first (as compared to the other orders). This pattern may reflect the fact that these participants did not have a reference point from which to calibrate their responses. More research is needed to explore whether these variations are an artefact of the experimental paradigm or whether they reflect

real-life calibration processes whereby students consider bullying episodes they observe in the context of other witnessed incidents.

To extend the current research, the effect of victims' responses to bullying on bystander reactions should be investigated within real-life contexts, across time, and extending to additional bystander outcomes (e.g., perceptions of the bully). Examination of a broader range of victim responses (e.g., telling the bully to stop) is also indicated and in particular it may be important to separate out the relative impact of the victim's emotional display compared to their behavioural reaction. For example, it would be helpful to differentiate angry expressions from displays of assertive versus aggressive behaviour, as victims' displays of controlled versus reactive anger may differentially affect the reactions of both bullies and bystanders. This distinction is important in light of common recommendations that victims should "stand up for themselves" (Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015), although the exact nature of this response and the specific consequences on the broader peer group require further clarification.

In the current study, bystanders' behavioural intentions to defend the victim or tell the teacher were found to be moderately to highly correlated with their perceptions of seriousness, estimated victim distress, liking of the victim, empathy for the victim, and negative emotional reactions of anger and sadness. There was also a small to medium correlation between blaming the victim and the reported use of outsider behaviours. However, from the present study it was not possible to infer causal pathways between bystander outcomes. Understanding how specific attitudes, perceptions, and emotional reactions operate together to predict bystanders' behaviours may be an important avenue for further research. Future studies may also extend this research to relational bullying episodes and may examine other potential contributing factors including the frequency with which particular victim responses are employed, the relationships between the students involved, and the presence of particular

classroom and school norms. The use of analytic strategies that allow for individual students to be clustered within classes may assist in the examination of variations within and between classes.

Given the use of a relatively homogenous sample of students from two private schools, it is necessary for future research to establish if these results generalise to more ethnically and economically diverse samples. While the rates of bullying, victimisation, witnessing, and defending among the current sample were broadly consistent with Australian and international data, prevalence rates have been found to vary considerably depending on how bullying is defined and measured (Hemphill, Heerde, et al., 2014). Future research is therefore needed to clarify how students' adoption of different participant roles affects their perceptions and reactions to bullying incidents. The present investigation focussed exclusively on same-sex interactions. It was therefore not possible to distinguish whether the identified gender effects were due to the bystanders' gender, the gender of the bully and victim, or broader school-level factors. It is also not clear how bystanders would react to bullying situations involving a male bully and female victim or vice versa. Investigating bystander processes within cross-sex bullying interactions (Baldry, 2004; Gini et al., 2008) may inform anti-bullying programs within co-educational schools.

Despite these limitations, the current findings illustrated the significant interplay between different students' reactions to incidents of bullying. In addition to affecting bullies' decisions to strike again (Salmivalli, Karhunen et al., 1996), victims' responses to being bullied were found to significantly impact the attitudes and reactions peer bystanders reported as a group. While these patterns may not always reflect the behaviours of individual bystanders, these broader social consequences should be considered when advising victims in how to respond to bullying within individual-level interventions. Understanding the role of bystanders also offers a vital avenue towards

incorporating programs that tackle bullying at the peer-group level within whole school anti-bullying interventions.

PAPER 4

The Impact of Victims' Responses on Teacher Reactions to Bullying

Authors:

Nicole Sokol, Kay Bussey, & Ronald M. Rapee

Centre for Emotional Health

Department of Psychology

Macquarie University

Publication Reference:

Sokol, N., Bussey, K., & Rapee, R. M. (2016). The impact of victims' responses on teacher reactions to bullying. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 55,* 78-87. doi:10.1016/j.tate.2015.11.002

Abstract

This study examined how victims' responses to bullying affect teachers' attitudes and reactions. Australian teachers (N = 289) completed online questionnaires about hypothetical videotaped bullying scenarios portraying four different victim responses (angry, sad, confident, ignoring). Teachers attributed the most blame to angry victims, while bullies of angry and confident victims attracted less blame. Episodes involving confident and angry victims (compared to sad and ignoring victims) were perceived less negatively and evoked less teacher emotion. Furthermore, teachers reported fewer intentions to intervene in incidents involving confident victims. Implications for professional development programs for teachers and programs aimed at victims are discussed.

Keywords: *bullying; victimisation; victims; victim response; teacher attitudes; teacher behaviour*

The Impact of Victims' Responses on Teacher Reactions to Bullying

Bullying is characterised by repeated and intentionally aggressive behaviour towards a less powerful individual (Olweus, 1994) and is a major cause for concern among school communities worldwide. Appropriate teacher intervention offers an important means of overcoming the power imbalance inherent within bullying relationships and represents a key avenue for reducing the systemic problem of bullying (Pepler et al., 1994). While teachers may recognise their critical responsibility to prevent and manage bullying within the school environment (Boulton, 1997), observational research and student reports suggest that teachers rarely intervene in bullying incidents (Craig, Pepler, et al., 2000; Pepler et al., 1994). These findings are concerning given that teachers' actual and perceived responses to bullying influence the behaviours of bullies, victims, and peer bystanders (Yoon, 2004; Yoon & Barton, 2008; Yoon & Bauman, 2014; Yoon & Kerber, 2003). For example, low rates of teacher intervention tend to reinforce students' bullying behaviours (Craig, Pepler, et al., 2000) and inhibit help-seeking behaviours among victims (Oliver & Candappa, 2007), whereas victimisation tends to decline with increased teacher intervention (Hektner & Swenson, 2012). By modelling appropriate responses to bullying, teachers can also encourage positive peer bystander interventions and can help establish a school climate that opposes bullying (Pepler et al., 1994; Yoon & Barton, 2008).

In order to train teachers in effective bullying prevention and management methods, teacher education programs have been implemented either as standalone interventions (e.g., Bully Busters; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004; The GREAT Teacher Program; Orpinas & Horne, 2004) or within whole school anti-bullying programs (e.g., Cross et al., 2011). Whole school interventions have also emphasised the importance of establishing anti-bullying policies, which include school rules against bullying and clear procedures outlining how school staff should address bullying

incidents. In addition to these systemic approaches, whole school programs often incorporate individual-level interventions which seek to train victims in more effective ways of responding to bullying. The current study sought to inform the development of these different intervention components by examining the effect of victims' responses to bullying on teachers' attitudes and reactions. This line of research may offer insights into the role teachers can play in preventing and managing bullying while also elucidating barriers to effective teacher intervention.

Past research has indicated that teachers' attitudes and behaviours in bullying situations depend on a range of individual and situational factors (Yoon et al., 2014). In general, pro-victim attitudes and intervention behaviours were more prevalent among teachers who were female (Boulton, 1997; Yoon, Bauman, Choi, & Hutchinson, 2011), who were more empathic (Craig, Henderson et al., 2000), and who had higher self-efficacy for handling bullying (Bradshaw et al., 2007). In addition to exploring these characteristics, the current study examined moral disengagement (Obermann, 2011) and the frequency with which bullying is witnessed (Paper 3). These individual factors have been found to affect peer responses to bullying, but have yet to be studied in teacher samples.

Situational factors can also affect how teachers perceive and respond to school bullying. Research exploring the role of broad school factors has found that school level (e.g., primary or secondary; Bradshaw et al., 2007) and the presence of anti-bullying policies and procedures (Bauman et al., 2008) may influence some teacher outcomes, although these factors do not always have a significant effect (Bauman et al., 2008; Boulton, 1997; Yoon et al., 2011). Other studies highlight the influence of more proximal situational factors pertaining to specific bullying episodes. For example, bullying type has been found to play a role, with physical bullying being viewed as more serious and warranting of intervention compared to verbal bullying (Craig,

Henderson, et al., 2000). There is also preliminary evidence suggesting that teachers' perceptions and reactions to bullying may vary depending on the gender of the students involved (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008; Yoon et al., 2014), with teachers rating physically aggressive acts committed by female students as more serious and warranting of punishment compared to acts perpetrated by male students (Rogowicz et al., 2014).

The victim's response to being bullied is a salient situational feature of bullying episodes. Despite speculation about its potential influence (Rogowicz et al., 2014), the impact of victims' responses on teacher reactions to bullying has yet to be adequately investigated. Preliminary evidence suggests that victims' responses may affect a range of teacher outcomes. One study investigating contextual attributes of indirect bullying situations found that victim distress had the greatest effect on teachers' decisions to intervene (Blain-Arcaro et al., 2012). Similarly, teachers have reported relying on victims' reactions to determine whether intervention is necessary in teasing interactions (Smith et al., 2010). Anecdotal evidence has also suggested that some teachers-in-training and school bullying experts considered how well victims defended themselves and the physical and psychological harm experienced by victims when determining the seriousness of bullying episodes (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Furthermore, qualitative research has revealed that teachers may struggle to identify victims who respond confidently to bullying, due to assumptions that victims of bullying are socially inept, unassertive, and unable to stand up for themselves (Mishna et al., 2006; Mishna et al., 2005). Although experimental evidence has not yet been gathered with teachers, one study has shown that victims' responses to bullying differentially influenced the attitudes and reactions of peer bystanders (Paper 3). In this study, angry victims were assigned the most blame and bystanders reported the greatest intention to intervene when witnessing sad victim reactions. Incidents in which victims responded confidently were perceived to be the least serious and evoked the fewest intentions to intervene.

Taken together, these findings suggest that victims' emotional displays and behavioural reactions may affect how teachers interpret and respond to bullying interactions.

The current study aimed to investigate the impact of victims' responses to bullying on teachers' attitudes and reactions and tested whether victim response effects found among peer bystanders extend to teacher bystanders. The potential effects of teacher gender, student gender, bullying type, and a range of individual and school factors were also investigated in order to clarify their role in determining teachers' reactions to bullying. The videotaped scenarios used to portray the four different victim responses (labelled as angry, sad, confident, ignoring) offered improved ecological validity compared to written vignettes (e.g., Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Yoon & Kerber, 2003) and allowed teachers to view victims' immediate emotional displays and behavioural reactions to negative peer interactions (Yoon et al., 2014). Based on findings from previous research examining the influence of victims' responses on peer bystanders (Paper 3), it was predicted that the most blame would be attributed to angry victims, while their bullies would attract less blame. Teachers were also hypothesised to attribute less blame to bullies of confident victims, given that calm and assertive responses may interfere with students being identified as victims of bullying (Mishna et al., 2006; Mishna et al., 2005). It was further predicted that episodes involving confident victims would be perceived as less serious and less distressing for victims and watching these incidents was expected to evoke less negative emotion and empathy (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Furthermore, it was hypothesised that teachers would report fewer intentions to intervene in bullying incidents involving confident victims. Averaging across the different victim responses, teachers were predicted to rate physical bullying as more serious and likely to motivate intervention compared to verbal bullying (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000).

Method

Participants and Procedure

The final sample comprised 289 teachers (M_{age} = 41.22 years, *SD* = 11.81, age range = 21-67 years), 20% of whom were male (*n* = 59). Similar gender ratios have been reported in past research (Stockdale, Hangaduambo, Duys, Larson, & Sarvela, 2002) and this proportion is broadly consistent with Australian norms for the teaching profession (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015b). On average, teachers had 15.84 years of teaching experience (*SD* = 11.76, range = 1-46 years) and 81% of teachers worked full-time. The sample was predominantly Caucasian (90%) and 84% of teachers were born in Australia or New Zealand. The vast majority of participants completed their teacher training in Australia or New Zealand (96%) and 75% of teachers had received at least some anti-bullying training either during their teacher training or while working as a teacher. Sixty-three percent of the sample predominantly taught primary school (years K–6), while 37% predominantly taught secondary school (years 7–12). Ninety-two percent of teachers reported having experience teaching students in grades five through to eight which represented the target population in the current study. This student population was selected given the high prevalence of overt bullying within this age range (approximately equivalent to middle school in the USA; Bradshaw et al., 2007; Cross et al., 2009). Seventy-one percent of teachers taught at government schools, which is broadly representative of the Australian school system (Australian Bureau of Statistics, 2015b). Most teachers worked at coeducational schools (95%). Teachers' ratings of the typical family socioeconomic status of students at their school indicated that 42% were lower or lower middle class, 31% were middle class, and 26% were upper or upper middle class.

Teachers were invited to voluntarily participate in the study via several recruitment methods. The first author contacted 135 schools selected arbitrarily from a

list of state schools and 95 schools selected arbitrarily from a list of Australian private schools. The survey link was then distributed to teachers by the school liaison, at the principal's discretion. Other participants (23%) were informed about the study through personal contacts or teacher associations. Six participants were excluded because they experienced technical difficulties which prevented them from viewing one or more of the experimental videos. The study was introduced as research investigating bullying and peer relationships from the perspective of teachers. After providing consent online, the survey program randomly assigned participants to a particular survey version and participants completed the questionnaires of approximately 30 minutes duration at their own convenience. Some schools chose to provide their staff with an opportunity to participate during staff meeting time. The procedures were approved by the University Human Research Ethics Committee and the state's education department.

Design

A 2 (teacher gender: male, female) × 2 (student gender: boy, girl) × 2 (bullying type: physical, verbal) × 4 (victim response: angry, sad, confident, ignoring) mixed experimental design was adopted, with the first three factors between-subjects and the last one within-subjects. The order of video presentation was counterbalanced using four fixed orders which were randomly generated ensuring that each victim response appeared in each position across the four orders. For each bullying type and student gender, there were four fixed sets of videos which were counterbalanced across participants. Across these four sets, each actor dyad portrayed a scenario involving each of the four victim responses. Overall, there were 64 versions of the survey, which varied in terms of the student gender, bullying type, video order, and video set. Random allocation was achieved using the online survey program.

Materials

Video stimuli. The experimental manipulation was established using short

hypothetical videotaped scenarios created by the first author (see Appendix A). Each physical and verbal bullying incident was filmed with four alternative endings that depicted different victim responses which consisted of the combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction: *angry victim response* (displayed frustration and attempted retaliation in an unregulated way akin to the aggressive victim subgroup described in the literature; Schwartz et al., 2001), *sad victim response* (displayed signs of emotional distress and engaged in withdrawn or submissive behaviours as is typical for the passive victim subgroup; Schwartz et al., 2001), *confident victim response* (displayed a confident expression and calmly and assertively used a neutral, non-provocative comment designed to diffuse the situation as recommended in anti-bullying interventions; Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003b) and the *ignoring victim response* (displayed a nonchalant expression and calmly ignored the bully and continued what he or she was doing as is commonly recommended by researchers, teachers, and in anti-bullying interventions; Berry & Hunt, 2009; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al, 1996; Shapiro et al., 1991). Expert ratings provided by 16 postgraduate psychology students (M_{age} = 34.88 years, *SD* = 9.51, 5 males) with experience in developmental and clinical psychology confirmed the intended victim response pattern (see Appendix B).

The video scenarios portrayed bullying between same-sex actors (Gini, 2008), given that victimisation often occurs among students of the same gender (Craig et al., 2007). The scenarios were filmed in four distinct school settings (on a bench in the playground, near the school gate, in a hallway, or at the drinking fountain), using four pairs of actors for each gender. Students in the videos were described as same-grade peers in late primary school or early high school and "Student 1" and "Student 2" served as neutral labels for the bully and victim, respectively. In order to establish the repetitive nature and power imbalance characteristic of bullying, teachers read the

following statement prior to watching each video: “Please think about what it would be like to watch this happen between two students at your school, Student 1 and Student 2. Student 1’s behaviours are clearly intentional and you know that this is not the first time that something like this has happened and that it is hard for Student 2 to make it stop.”

Questionnaires. Videos were embedded within online questionnaires which began by assessing demographic information (e.g., gender), teaching history (e.g., teacher training), and school characteristics (e.g., school type). Participants viewed photos and provided baseline liking ratings on a 5-point rating scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*) reflecting their first impressions of the children they later viewed in the videos. Following each video and using the same rating scale, participants responded to manipulation check items assessing the victim’s observable response (angry, sad, confident, ignoring) and a range of dependent variables described below, most of which were adapted from Paper 3.

Attributions of blame. Four items were included (adapted from Gini, 2008; Nesdale & Pickering, 2006), with two items measuring *blaming the victim* (“I blame Student 2 for what happened” and “I think Student 2 deserved what happened to them”, $\alpha = .71$) and two items measuring *blaming the bully* (“I blame Student 1 for what happened” and “I think Student 1 should be punished for what happened”, $\alpha = .75$).

Perceptions of the victimisation. Three items were included, with two items assessing the *perceived seriousness* of the victimisation (“I think this situation was serious” and “I think what Student 1 did to Student 2 was ‘bullying’”, adapted from Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000, $\alpha = .75$) and one item assessing *estimated victim distress* (“On the inside, I think Student 2 was feeling upset”).

Emotional reactions. Three items assessed *negative emotions* (“Watching the video made me feel angry/sad/upset”, $\alpha = .93$). The *empathy for the victim* variable ($\alpha = .93$) averaged responses on four items adapted from the Empathic Concern (e.g., “It

upset me when I saw what happened to Student 2", "I felt sorry for Student 2") and Perspective-Taking (e.g., "I tried to think about what things were like for Student 2", "I tried to think about how Student 2 was feeling") subscales of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (Davis, 1980).

Behavioural intentions to intervene. Eleven items were included, eight of which were adapted from the Handling Bullying Questionnaire (Bauman et al., 2008) and three of which were added as a result of pilot testing using a convenience sample of three female teachers (M_{age} = 27.67 years, *SD* = 2.52). Six types of teacher responses were assessed: disciplining the bully (e.g., "insist Student 1 'cut it out'" and "make sure Student 1 was suitably punished"), working with the bully (e.g., "discuss with Student 1 ways he or she can improve the situation" and "encourage Student 1 to think about how it would feel if he or she were in Student 2's position"), working with the victim (e.g., "ask Student 2 if he or she is okay and suggest telling the teacher if this happens again" and "encourage Student 2 to behave in a way that shows he or she cannot be intimidated"), working with both the bully and victim (e.g., "talk with both students separately/together to find out more about the history or context of their interaction"), enlisting other adults (e.g., "refer the matter to other school personnel" and "contact Student 1 and/or Student 2's parents to discuss the situation"), and ignoring the incident (e.g., "let the students sort it out themselves", reversed scored). A *behavioural intentions to intervene* variable was created by averaging these 11 items (α = .80).

After the videos and their related questionnaires, participants completed a series of additional questionnaires assessing a range of individual and school factors as follows:

Current exposure to bullying. After reading a brief definition of bullying (based on Olweus, 1994), teachers indicated how often they had "personally witnessed students bullying other students" and had bullying "reported to them by students" using a 6-point

rating scale (1 = *not at all in the past term* to 6 = *many times a week in the past term*). In each case, two items assessed physical bullying (e.g., "shoved or pushed") and two items assessed verbal bullying (e.g., "called mean or hurtful names"). All eight items were then summed to create an overall measure of teachers' exposure to overt bullying (α = .94).

Self-efficacy for dealing with bullying. Using a 5-point rating scale (1 = *not well at all* to 5 = *extremely well*), efficacy for dealing with school bullying (α = .90) was assessed by summing 10 items corresponding to those used to assess teachers' behavioural intentions (leaving out the "let the students sort it out themselves" item), many of which were based on the Handling Bullying Questionnaire (Bauman et al., 2008).

Moral disengagement. The first author created a 12-item questionnaire which used one or two items to assess each of the eight mechanisms of moral disengagement (Bandura et al., 1996; Hymel, Rocke-Henderson, & Bonanno, 2005) within a bullying context (e.g., "For kids, bullying is just a normal part of growing up") using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*). Scores were summed to produce an overall measure of moral disengagement (α = .89).

Empathy. Using a 5-point Likert scale (1 = *strongly disagree* to 5 = *strongly agree*) the 20-item Basic Empathy Scale (Joliffe & Farrington, 2006) assessed both cognitive empathy (e.g., "It is hard for me to understand when my friends are sad") and affective empathy (e.g., "I get caught up in other people's feelings easily") (α = .89).

School anti-bullying activities. A 13-item questionnaire assessing whether or not the school had implemented different anti-bullying policies, procedures, and activities (e.g., "school policies and rules related to bullying") was created by the first author (adapted from Anti Bullying Alliance, 2013; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Scores were summed to create an anti-bullying activities score (α = .85).

Results

Data Analytic Strategy

The descriptive statistics reported are the estimated marginal means calculated in the analyses. Ranges of Pearson correlations between the dependent variables were calculated. A series of 2 (teacher gender) × 2 (student gender) × 2 (bullying type) × (4) (victim response) doubly multivariate repeated measures MANOVAs were conducted on the manipulation check items and on each group of dependent variables respectively using SPSS 21. Doubly multivariate analyses were appropriate given the presence of a repeated measures independent variable (i.e., victim response) as well as multiple quantitative dependent variables (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). The significance of the multivariate statistic Wilks Lambda (λ) was tested at an alpha level of .05 and multivariate effect sizes were calculated (η_w^2). Follow-up univariate repeated measures ANOVAs were then conducted with Bonferroni corrections accounting for the number of dependent variables in the group. To control the Type I error rate, effects were only considered if they had reached significance within the relevant doubly multivariate analysis. Further Bonferroni adjustments were made when testing victim response pairwise comparisons and follow-up simple effects for each level of the interacting factor. Preliminary analyses on the variables measuring teachers' baseline levels of liking of the children who later acted in the videos did not reveal any significant effects ($ps > .05$) and therefore these variables were not included as covariates in the abovementioned analyses.

Although counterbalancing of order and video set was incorporated into the study design, the analyses were repeated with order and video set included one at a time to explore whether results varied depending on these methodological variables. Significant order and video set effects for the *seemed confident* manipulation check variable and order effects for the *blaming the bully* variable are described below. For five dependent variables (*blaming the bully, perceived seriousness, negative emotions,*

empathy for the victim, and *behavioural intentions to intervene*), there were some variations in the victim response pattern depending on the video set, particularly for videos portraying physical bullying. These video set variations suggest that teachers took into account other contextual variables, in addition to the victim's response, when making ratings about the videotaped bullying interactions. For the most part however, victim response patterns were broadly consistent across the different video sets.

To explore whether the findings varied depending on a range of teacher and school characteristics, follow-up analyses were conducted utilising a similar MANOVA procedure, entering each variable one at a time. None of the variables moderated any of the previously reported results, however several main effects were identified. In order to examine main effects found for continuous variables which had been centred at their means, ANOVAS were conducted on the relevant dependent variables, averaging across the four victim responses.

Skewness analyses on all variables revealed that *blaming the victim* was highly skewed (skewness > 1.9 for all victim responses). However, log transforming this variable produced a similar victim response pattern so the original variable was retained. Missing data among the final sample were negligible with approximately 1% of participants missing data and less than 0.7% missing data pertaining to the videos. Only participants with complete data on relevant variables were included in any given analysis.

Victim Response Manipulation Check

Descriptive statistics for the victim response manipulation check variables are displayed in Table 1. The doubly multivariate analysis revealed several significant effects[4], including a significant victim response main effect, $\lambda = .22$, F (12, 270) =

[4] In addition to the significant victim response main effect, the doubly multivariate analysis revealed a significant bullying type main effect, $\lambda = .96$, F (4, 278) = 2.74, $p = .03$, $\eta_w^2 = .04$. The Bullying Type × Victim Response interaction, $\lambda = .92$, F (12, 270) = 2.07, $p = .02$, $\eta_w^2 = .08$, and the Bullying Type × Teacher Gender × Victim Response three-way interaction, $\lambda = .93$, F (12, 270) = 1.81, $p = .05$, $\eta_w^2 = .07$,

79.28, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .78$. Univariate ANOVAs only revealed significant victim response main effects for all manipulation check variables: Seemed Angry $\lambda = .31$, F (3, 279) = 205.68, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .69$, Seemed Sad $\lambda = .52$, F (3, 279) = 85.18, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .48$, Seemed Confident $\lambda = .43$, F (3, 279) = 125.80, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .58$, Seemed Calmly Ignoring $\lambda = .36$, F (3, 279) = 165.22, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .64$.

In order to test the effectiveness of the victim response manipulation, ratings for each variable were used to compare the relevant victim response to each of the other victim responses. These post-hoc analyses revealed that angry victims were rated as more angry than the sad, *MD* = 1.84, *SE* = 0.10, $p < .001$, confident, *MD* = 2.10, *SE* = 0.10, $p < .001$, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 2.13, *SE* = 0.10, $p < .001$. Sad victims appeared more sad than the angry, *MD* = 1.26, *SE* = 0.12, $p < .001$, confident, *MD* = 1.81, *SE* = 0.11, $p < .001$, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 1.32, *SE* = 0.13, $p < .001$. Confident victims were rated as more confident than the angry, *MD* = 0.33, *SE* = 0.11, $p = .002$, sad, *MD* = 2.02, *SE* = 0.11, $p < .001$, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 1.10, *SE* = 0.13, $p < .001$. Finally, ignoring victims were rated as calmly ignoring the bully more than the angry, *MD* = 2.72, *SE* = 0.12, $p < .001$, sad, *MD* = 1.14, *SE* = 0.13, $p < .001$, and confident victims, *MD* = 1.93, *SE* = 0.13, $p < .001$. Follow-up analyses revealed that this pattern was generally consistent across all orders and video sets; however, there were some small variations for the variable assessing victim confidence[5]. Overall, the manipulation check results were consistent with students' ratings of the same videos (Paper 3) and indicate that teachers interpreted the victim responses as intended.

---

also reached significance. These additional effects were not however significant within the Univariate ANOVAs conducted for each manipulation check variable.

[5] For orders where the confident or angry victims were viewed first, ratings of confidence for that particular victim were relatively lower producing a significant Order × Victim Response interaction, $\lambda = .91$, F (9, 623) = 2.79, $p = .003$, $\eta_w^2 = .03$. This pattern may reflect the fact that these participants did not have a reference point from which to calibrate their responses. While ratings of confidence were generally consistent across video sets, the ignoring victim at the water fountain was noticeably elevated producing a significant Video Set × Victim Response interaction, $\lambda = .88$, F (9, 621) = 3.66, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .04$.

Overview of Main Analyses

Table 1 displays the descriptive statistics for all dependent variables organised by victim response. The correlations between the variables are shown in Table 2. Results are presented by group, beginning with doubly multivariate analyses and then univariate repeated measures ANOVAs and relevant follow-up analyses for each dependent variable.

Attributions of Blame

The doubly multivariate MANOVA revealed significant main effects for victim response, $\lambda = .86$, F (6, 274) = 7.21, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .14$, student gender, $\lambda = .96$, F (2, 278) = 5.07, $p = .007$, $\eta_w^2 = .04$, and teacher gender, $\lambda = .97$, F (2, 278) = 3.82, $p = .02$, $\eta_w^2 = .03$. No other effects were significant (ps > .05).

Blaming the victim. The univariate ANOVA only revealed a significant victim response main effect, $\lambda = .92$, F (3, 277) = 8.62, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .09$. Post-hoc analyses indicated that angry victims were blamed significantly more than sad, MD = 0.24, SE = 0.05, $p < .001$, confident, MD = 0.19, SE = 0.05, $p < .001$, and ignoring victims, MD = 0.22, SE = 0.06, $p < .001$. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (ps > .004).

Blaming the bully. The univariate ANOVA revealed a significant teacher gender main effect, F (1, 279) = 6.69, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Female teachers (M = 3.86, SD = 0.79) blamed bullies more than did male teachers (M = 3.55, SD = 0.81), MD = 0.30, SE = 0.12, $p = .01$. A significant victim response main effect was also obtained, $\lambda = .93$, F (3, 277) = 6.94, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .07$. Post-hoc analyses revealed that teachers blamed bullies of sad, MD = 0.26, SE = 0.08, $p = .001$, and ignoring victims, MD = 0.25, SE = 0.08, $p = .001$, more than bullies of confident victims. Teachers also blamed bullies of sad, MD = 0.28, SE = 0.08, $p = .001$, and ignoring victims, MD = 0.26, SE = 0.08, $p < .001$, more than bullies of angry victims. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (ps > .004). For this variable, a significant Order × Victim Response

interaction was obtained, λ = .86, F (9, 618) = 4.27, p < .001, η_w^2= .05. The pattern revealed that teachers attributed relatively less blame to the bully when that particular incident was viewed first compared to the other orders, suggesting that blame for the bully generally increased as multiple bullying incidents were viewed in close succession.

Perceptions of the Victimisation

The doubly multivariate MANOVA revealed a significant victim response main effect, λ = .64, F (6, 274) = 25.93, p < .001, η_w^2= .36, student gender main effect, λ = .95, F (2, 278) = 7.45, p = .001, η_w^2 = .05, and Student Gender × Bullying Type interaction, λ = .97, F (2, 278) = 4.08, p = .02, η_w^2 = .03. No other effects were significant (ps > .05).

Perceived seriousness. The univariate ANOVA revealed a significant student gender effect, F (1, 279) = 8.45, p = .004, η_p^2 = .03. This main effect was qualified by a significant Student Gender × Bullying Type interaction, F (1, 279) = 6.37, p = .01, η_p^2 = .02. In the case of physical bullying, incidents involving girls (M = 4.01, SD = 0.87) were perceived as more serious than those involving boys (M = 3.39, SD = 1.06), MD = 0.62, SE = 0.16, p < .001. Perceived seriousness did not however differ significantly for verbal bullying situations involving girls (M = 3.82, SD = 0.91) compared to boys (M = 3.78, SD = 1.01), MD = 0.04, SE = 0.16, p > .01. A significant victim response main effect was obtained, λ = .87, F (3, 277) = 13.94, p < .001, η_p^2 = .13. Post-hoc analyses revealed that teachers considered incidents involving confident victims to be less serious than incidents involving sad, MD = 0.52, SE = 0.08, p < .001, and ignoring victims, MD = 0.43, SE = 0.09, p < .001. Incidents involving angry victims were also considered less serious than incidents involving sad victims, MD = 0.32, SE = 0.08, p < .001. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (ps > .004).

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for all Dependent Variables Organised by Victim Response

	Angry Victim		Sad Victim		Confident Victim		Ignoring Victim	
Dependent Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Manipulation Checks:								
Seemed Angry	3.75	1.26	1.91	1.30	1.65	1.14	1.61	1.25
Seemed Sad	2.20	1.40	3.46	1.63	1.65	1.15	2.14	1.55
Seemed Confident	3.39	1.31	1.70	1.26	3.72	1.47	2.62	1.71
Seemed Calmly Ignoring	1.45	1.18	3.03	1.69	2.24	1.57	4.17	1.51
Attributions of Blame:								
Blaming the Victim	1.36	0.75	1.12	0.53	1.16	0.53	1.13	0.63
Blaming the Bully	3.57	1.29	3.84	1.24	3.58	1.32	3.83	1.29
Perceptions of the Victimisation:								
Perceived Seriousness	3.67	1.29	3.98	1.15	3.46	1.39	3.89	1.24
Estimated Victim Distress	3.75	1.34	4.10	1.28	2.86	1.45	3.47	1.41
Emotional Reactions:								
Negative Emotions	3.03	1.39	3.27	1.39	2.64	1.41	3.17	1.45
Empathy for the Victim	3.35	1.30	3.60	1.25	3.27	1.39	3.65	1.32
Male Teachers	3.13	1.05	3.24	1.01	3.08	1.12	3.45	1.07
Female Teachers	3.58	1.03	3.97	0.98	3.45	1.07	3.84	1.03
Behavioural Intentions to Intervene	3.84	0.81	3.88	0.81	3.58	0.97	3.84	0.85

Note. N = 289 for all except attributions of blame and perceptions of the victimisation for which N = 287. Estimated marginal means have been reported.

Table 2

Ranges of Pearson Correlations between the Dependent Variables

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. Blaming the Victim							
Lowest	–						
Highest	–						
2. Blaming the Bully							
Lowest	-.12*	–					
Highest	-.27*	–					
3. Perceived Seriousness							
Lowest	-.07	.40*	–				
Highest	-.13*	.46*	–				
4. Estimated Victim Distress							
Lowest	.04	.21*	.34*	–			
Highest	-.12*	.26*	.46*	–			
5. Negative Emotions							
Lowest	.01	.32*	.54*	.45*	–		
Highest	-.12*	.38*	.61*	.58*	–		
6. Empathy for the Victim							
Lowest	-.06	.30*	.54*	.37*	.65*	–	
Highest	-15*	.36*	.62*	.50*	.75*	–	
7. Behavioural Intentions to Intervene							
Lowest	.00	.43*	.57*	.34*	.49*	.49*	–
Highest	-.08	.50*	.64*	.43*	.59*	.59*	–

Note. Correlations between the dependent variables varied by victim response. For this reason, correlation ranges (i.e., correlations that were lowest and highest in magnitude) were reported; * indicates $p < .05$.

Estimated victim distress. The univariate ANOVA revealed a significant student gender effect, F (1, 281) = 13.81, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. This main effect was qualified by a significant Student Gender × Bullying Type interaction, F (1, 281) = 5.40, $p = .02$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. For physical bullying, female victims ($M = 3.82$, $SD = 0.78$) were perceived as more distressed than male victims ($M = 3.21$, $SD = 0.95$), $MD = 0.61$, $SE = 0.14$, $p < .001$. Estimated victim distress did not however differ for verbal bullying situations involving girls ($M = 3.64$, $SD = 0.81$) compared to boys ($M = 3.50$, $SD =$

0.87), *MD* = 0.14, *SE* = 0.14, $p > .01$. A significant victim response main effect was obtained, $\lambda = .64$, F (3, 279) = 52.79, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .36$. Post-hoc analyses revealed that teachers considered confident victims to be less distressed than angry, *MD* = .90, *SE* = 0.10, $p < .001$, sad, *MD* = 1.24, *SE* = 0.11, $p < .001$, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 0.62, *SE* = 0.11, $p < .001$. Angry, *MD* = 0.34, *SE* = 0.10, $p = .001$, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 0.63, *SE* = 0.10, $p < .001$, were also considered less distressed than sad victims. There was no significant difference in estimated victim distress between angry and ignoring victims (*MD* = 0.28, *SE* = 0.10, $p > .004$).

Emotional Reactions

The doubly multivariate MANOVA revealed a significant student gender main effect, $\lambda = .96$, F (2, 278) = 6.11, $p = .003$, $\eta_w^2 = .04$, teacher gender main effect, $\lambda = .94$, F (2, 278) = 8.62, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .06$, victim response main effect, $\lambda = .79$, F (6, 274) = 12.24, $p < .001$, $\eta_w^2 = .21$, and Teacher Gender × Victim Response interaction, $\lambda = .94$, F (6, 274) = 3.07, $p = .006$, $\eta_w^2 = .06$. No other effects were significant (ps > .05).

Negative emotions. The univariate ANOVA revealed a significant student gender main effect, F (1, 281) = 11.62, $p = .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .04$ and teacher gender main effect, F (1, 281) = 15.56, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .05$. Incidents involving girls (*M* = 3.26, *SD* = 1.08) evoked more negative emotion compared to incidents involving boys (*M* = 2.80, *SD* = 1.23), *MD* = 0.47, *SE* = 0.14, $p = .001$. Furthermore, female teachers (*M* = 3.30, *SD* = 0.93) reported more negative emotions compared to male teachers (*M* = 2.76, *SD* = 0.94), *MD* = 0.54, *SE* = 0.14, $p < .001$. A significant victim response main effect was obtained, $\lambda = .81$, F (3, 279) = 21.71, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .19$. Post-hoc analyses revealed that teachers experienced less negative emotion after viewing incidents involving confident victims, compared to incidents involving angry, *MD* = 0.39, *SE* = 0.08, $p < .001$, sad, *MD* = 0.63, *SE* = 0.08, $p < .001$, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 0.53, *SE* = 0.09, $p < .001$. Teachers also experienced less negative emotion after viewing incidents involving

angry victims compared to sad victims, *MD* = 0.24, *SE* = 0.07, *p* = .001. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (*p*s > .004).

Empathy for the victim. The univariate ANOVA revealed a significant student gender main effect, *F* (1, 279) = 7.16, *p* = .008, η_p^2 = .03. Incidents involving girls (*M* = 3.64, *SD* = 1.00) evoked more empathy for the victim compared to incidents involving boys (*M* = 3.29, *SD* = 1.16), *MD* = 0.34, *SE* = 0.13, *p* = .008. A significant teacher gender effect, *F* (1, 279) = 14.05, *p* < .001, η_p^2 = .05, and victim response effect were also obtained, λ = .90, *F* (3, 277) = 10.10, *p* < .001, η_p^2 = .10. These main effects were qualified by a significant Teacher Gender × Victim Response interaction, λ = .96, *F* (3, 277) = 3.44, *p* = .02, η_p^2 = .04. Follow-up simple effects analyses indicated that female teachers felt less empathy for confident victims compared to sad, *MD* = 0.52, *SE* = 0.07, *p* < .001, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 0.39, *SE* = 0.07, *p* < .001. Female teachers also reported less empathy for angry victims compared to sad, *MD* = 0.39, *SE* = 0.06, *p* < .001, and ignoring victims, *MD* = 0.26, *SE* = 0.06, *p* < .001. No other simple effects were significant for females and although the pattern was similar, no simple effects reached significance among males teachers (*p*s > .002). Simple effects analyses exploring the Teacher Gender × Victim Response interaction separated by victim response revealed significant teacher gender effects for angry and sad victims only, *MD* = 0.45, *SE* = .15, *p* = .003, and, *MD* = 0.73, *SE* = .15, *p* < .001, respectively. Compared to male teachers, female teachers reported more empathy for angry and sad victims.

Behavioural Intentions to Intervene

The univariate ANOVA revealed significant main effects for teacher gender, *F* (1, 280) = 4.36, *p* = .04, η_p^2 = .02, and student gender, *F* (1, 280) = 8.26, *p* = .004, η_p^2 = .03. These effects were qualified by a significant Student Gender × Bullying Type interaction, *F* (1, 280) = 3.94, *p* = .05, η_p^2 = .01 and Student Gender × Bullying Type × Teacher Gender interaction, *F* (1, 280) = 6.35, *p* = .01, η_p^2 = .02 (see descriptive

statistics in Table 3). Female teachers reported greater intentions to intervene in verbal bullying incidents involving girls (M = 4.01, SD = 0.55) compared to verbal bullying incidents involving boys (M = 3.71, SD = 0.55), MD = 0.31, SE = 0.11, p = .004, whereas male teachers reported greater intentions to intervene in physical bullying incidents involving girls (M = 3.99, SD = 0.55) compared to physical bullying incidents involving boys (M = 3.40, SD = 0.55), MD = 0.59, SE = 0.21, p = .005. A significant victim response main effect was also obtained, λ = .88, F (3, 278) = 12.91, p < .001, η_p^2 = .12. Post-hoc analyses revealed that teachers reported being less likely to intervene in incidents involving confident victims, compared to those involving angry, MD = 0.26, SE = 0.05, p < .001, sad, MD = 0.29, SE = 0.05, p < .001, and ignoring victims, MD = 0.25, SE = 0.06, p < .001. No other pairwise comparisons were significant (p > .008).

Main Effects Involving Individual and School Factors

Averaging over the four victim responses, various individual and school factors were found to influence specific teacher outcomes. Teachers from schools with more anti-bullying activities were less inclined to blame the victim, F (1, 263) = 6.06, p = .01, η_p^2 = .02. Teachers with higher levels of moral disengagement considered the bullying incidents to be less serious, F (1, 265) = 5.23, p = .02, η_p^2 = .02, while teachers who reported being exposed to more bullying in the past term tended to rate incidents as more serious, F (1, 266) = 6.79, p = .01, η_p^2 = .03. Teachers who were generally more empathic were more likely to feel empathy for the victim, F (1, 260) = 10.78, p = .001, η_p^2 = .04. Teachers with higher self-efficacy for dealing with bullying, F (1, 266) = 31.74, p < .001, η_p^2 = .11, and teachers from schools with more anti-bullying activities indicated greater intentions to intervene, F (1, 263) = 10.98, p = .001, η_p^2 = .04. Primary school teachers (M = 3.91, SD = 1.12) were also more likely to report intentions to intervene compared to secondary school teachers (M = 3.63, SD = 0.60), MD = 0.28, SE = 0.10, p = .006.

Table 3

Descriptive Statistics for Behavioural Intentions to Intervene Organised by Teacher Gender, Bullying Type, and Student Gender

		Male Teachers			Female Teachers		
Bullying Type	Student Gender	*M*	*SD*	*n*	*M*	*SD*	*n*
Physical Bullying	Boys	3.40	0.55	11	3.78	0.55	62
	Girls	3.99	0.55	19	3.99	0.55	56
Verbal Bullying	Boys	3.78	0.55	11	3.71	0.55	53
	Girls	3.62	0.55	17	4.01	0.55	59

Discussion

Teachers' attitudes and reactions to bullying were found to vary depending on the victim's emotional display and behavioural response to the bullying episode. As hypothesised, angry victims were attributed the most blame, while bullies of active victims (angry and confident) were attributed less blame. Compared to passive victims (sad and ignoring), teachers considered incidents involving confident victims to be less serious and less distressing for victims and these episodes tended to evoke fewer negative emotions and less empathy for the victim. Incidents involving angry victims also tended to be perceived as less serious and evoked less emotion than episodes involving sad victims. Furthermore and in line with predictions, teachers reported fewer intentions to intervene in bullying incidents involving confident victims. These findings identify the victim's response as a key situational factor influencing teachers' reactions to bullying. The effects of a range of individual, school, and situational factors were also explored. These results contribute to understanding the role of teachers in bullying situations and offer important insights relevant to the improvement of various components of whole school anti-bullying interventions including professional development programs for teachers and programs aimed at victims.

Attributions of Blame

Teachers attributed the most blame to angry victims, in line with hypotheses and consistent with the pattern observed among peer bystanders (Paper 3). This result suggests that victims' aggressive strategies attract blame even when adopted exclusively in response to the bully's provocation. Perhaps teachers make assumptions that angry victims also engage in provocative behaviours which 'cause' them to be victimised in the first place. These beliefs may interfere with teachers' intentions to intervene via a process of moral disengagement, for which victim blame is a key driving mechanism (Bandura et al., 1996). Teachers who view the angry victim response as an offence

rather than as emotional and behavioural dysregulation may also be less likely to offer the support these victims need to learn more effective responses to bullying.

Victims' responses to being bullied also influenced the extent to which bullies were blamed for their actions. Bullies of passive victims (sad and ignoring) attracted more blame than bullies of active victims (angry and confident), although the bully's behaviour was objectively the same in each case. While blame may be shifted from bullies to angry victims due to their display of aggression, reduced blame for bullies of confident victims supports the suggestion that calm and assertive responses interfere with students being identified as victims of bullying (Mishna et al., 2006; Mishna et al., 2005). If victims who utilise more active victim responses detect that teachers are not holding students who bully them responsible for their inappropriate actions, they may be less inclined to seek teacher support, perhaps due to perceptions of unfairness or more negative perceptions of the school climate. It should be noted that the blaming the bully measure adopted in the current study included an item stating that bullies should be punished for what happened. Although indicating that the bully is deserving of punishment implies a certain level of responsibility over the incident, other factors (e.g., attitudes towards punitive methods) may affect the extent to which teachers endorse this item. Future research should explore the relative influence of teachers' attributions of blame and beliefs about punishment in determining teachers' responses to bullying incidents.

Perceptions of the Victimisation

Incidents involving confident victims were perceived as less serious than those involving passive victims (sad and ignoring), however the significant difference between confident and angry victims demonstrated among peer bystanders (Paper 3) did not reach significance in the current sample. Incidents involving angry victims were also considered less serious than those involving sad victims. These results are in line

with past research which has found that some teachers-in-training and school bullying experts considered how well victims defended themselves when rating the seriousness of bullying interactions (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Victims exuding confidence may appear to counter the definition of bullying if the power differential between the bully and victim is operationalised in terms of the victim's difficulty defending himself or herself (Olweus, 1994). However, some self-identified victims of bullying are able to respond assertively and stand up for themselves (Mishna et al., 2006; Mishna et al., 2005). This evidence suggests that the power imbalance in bully-victim relationships may be more accurately described in terms of the difficulty victims have putting an end to bullying and the feelings of helplessness that result, rather than necessitating particular victim reactions. Therefore, while adults recommend confident responses in the hope that they will shift the balance of power over time, teachers should be encouraged to consider subtle power disparities that may not be immediately visible when determining the seriousness of bullying interactions.

Teachers considered sad victims to be the most distressed, while confident victims were considered the least distressed. Although this may not be surprising given differences in their display of negative emotion, teacher ratings of confident victims fell below the "somewhat" upset anchor as was found for peer bystanders (Paper 3). While victims who adopt the confident victim response may in some cases be experiencing less internal distress than other victims, some confident victims may experience considerable hurt and may feel powerless to stop the bullying (Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). Given that students are often actively encouraged to conceal their true hurt to avoid reinforcing the bully (Fox & Boulton, 2003b), teacher and student observers should consider the potential distress experienced by confident victims who are able to avoid expressing any negative emotion.

While teachers were predicted to rate physical bullying as more serious than

verbal bullying in line with past research utilising gender neutral vignettes (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000), results instead revealed significant Student Gender × Bullying Type interactions for both the perceived seriousness and estimated victim distress variables. Student gender differences were observed in physical bullying situations only, such that physical bullying incidents involving females were considered more serious (Rogowicz et al., 2014) and female victims were thought to be more distressed than male victims (Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). Minimising the seriousness of physical bullying incidents among boys may stem from gender stereotypes, expectations of rough-and-tumble play, and beliefs that physical aggression is normative among boys (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008; Troop-Gordon & Ladd, 2015). Students' detection of these teacher attitudes may facilitate male bullies' more frequent engagement in physical bullying behaviours and may inhibit help-seeking among male victims. These results also highlight the need to consider the effect of contextual variables such as bullying type and student gender when exploring teachers' perceptions of bullying.

Emotional Reactions

Bullying incidents involving confident victims evoked less negative emotion in teachers compared to incidents involving passive victims (sad and ignoring), as predicted and as observed among peer bystanders (Paper 3). Incidents involving angry victims also evoked less negative emotion than those involving sad victims. Furthermore, active victims (angry and confident) evoked significantly less empathy in female teachers compared to passive victims (sad and ignoring). Further inspection of these teacher gender variations revealed higher rates of empathy for angry and sad victims among females compared to males, whereas empathy for confident and ignoring victims did not differ by teacher gender. Past research has reported that females experience more empathy for the victim compared to males (Duy, 2013), however the

current study has revealed that this gender difference may depend on the victim's response to being bullied. While one might expect teachers' emotional reactions and empathy to be heightened when victims display more negative emotion, as was found for sad victims, the distress of angry victims did not appear to elicit this effect. This result suggests that teachers, and perhaps in particular male teachers, may not be sensitive to angry victims' expressions of distress. Incidents involving girls also evoked more negative emotion and more empathy in teachers compared to incidents involving boys, suggesting that teachers may be less sensitive to the distress experienced by male victims of bullying. Taken together, these findings are concerning given evidence that teachers' empathy for the victim predicts their likelihood of intervention (Yoon, 2004).

Behavioural Intentions to Intervene

As hypothesised, teachers reported the lowest intentions to intervene when incidents involved confident victims. Taken together with peer bystander research (Paper 3), it appears that victims who exhibit confident and assertive responses to bullying may not receive as much bystander support or intervention. Teachers should be encouraged to check in with all victims of bullying to assess their level of distress and the nature of the interaction, in order to determine what type of teacher intervention may be required. Students who are able to employ the confident victim response should also be encouraged to alert teachers to their bullying problems to avoid their bullying going unnoticed. Although physical bullying was predicted to motivate greater intentions to intervene compared to verbal bullying (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000), the current study instead revealed a significant Student Gender × Bullying Type × Teacher Gender interaction. Female teachers reported greater intentions to intervene in verbal bullying incidents involving girls compared to boys, whereas male teachers reported greater intentions to intervene in physical bullying incidents involving girls compared to boys. This result highlights the complex relationships between different individual and

situational factors that predict teachers' responses to bullying.

The Role of Individual and School Factors

In addition to the teacher gender effects described above, several other individual and school factors influenced teacher outcomes. Perceived seriousness ratings were lower among teachers with higher levels of moral disengagement, while teachers exposed to more bullying in the past term rated bullying incidents as more serious. Empathy for the victim was also higher among teachers who were generally more empathic. Given the influence of perceived seriousness and empathy for the victim on teachers' likelihood of intervention (Yoon, 2004), it may be important to address beliefs associated with moral disengagement and promote empathy for the victim within teacher programs. Consistent with past research (Bradshaw et al., 2007), teachers with higher self-efficacy for dealing with bullying reported greater intentions to intervene. This finding suggests that professional development programs should extend beyond educating teachers about bullying, to focus on training teachers in specific skills necessary for effectively managing bullying (e.g., Orpinas et al., 2004). In particular, these programs should incorporate skills practice in order to build teachers' sense of efficacy.

Characteristics of the school also influenced teachers' attitudes and responses. Primary school teachers reported greater intentions to intervene compared to secondary school teachers. While it is possible that primary school students may need or want more teacher intervention, at least in some circumstances, this finding warns that secondary school victims of bullying may not receive as much spontaneous support from teachers. These victims should be encouraged to seek help from teachers when necessary, while at the same time secondary school teachers should be reminded of the need to support all victims regardless of their school level, even if the type of teacher intervention varies depending on the students' age. The presence of anti-bullying

activities at the school also affected teachers' responses to bullying. Teachers from schools with more anti-bullying activities were less inclined to blame the victim and reported greater intentions to intervene. These findings reinforce the importance of establishing a whole-school anti-bullying program that can encourage pro-victim attitudes and effective bullying intervention among teachers.

Limitations and Future Directions

Although the utility of video vignette methodologies has been established, questionnaire responses may not always reflect what teachers would do in practice. In order to improve ecological validity, the current study utilised a diverse set of videotaped scenarios varying in content, location, and individuals. This approach also allowed for the systematic manipulation of situational variables enabling causal inferences to be drawn. Further research is however needed to test whether teachers' self-reported responses to hypothetical scenarios generalise to real-world settings. Some order and video set effects were also identified, although more research is needed to decipher whether these effects are an artefact of the experimental paradigm or whether they reflect actual contextual variations in teachers' real-life responses. The videotaped scenarios were limited to same-sex bullying interactions in this investigation, given that bullying often occurs among students of the same gender (Craig et al., 2007). There is however evidence that patterns of aggression differ in same-sex versus cross-sex interactions (Russell & Owens, 1999), highlighting the importance of studying how teachers in co-educational schools perceive and respond to cross-sex bullying.

While the current study assessed behavioural intentions to intervene using a composite measure, future research should examine individual, school, and situational predictors of specific types of teacher intervention (Yoon et al., 2014). Research exploring variations in teachers' intervention behaviours depending on victims' responses to bullying, coupled with information about victims' preferences with regard

to teacher assistance, may inform both teacher education courses and programs aimed at victims. Future research may also benefit from exploring the influence of other factors, such as whether teachers directly witness bullying interactions or have incidents reported to them. Literature examining this issue has produced inconsistent results (Bradshaw et al., 2007; Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000; Novick & Isaacs, 2010). However, a consideration of victims' emotional displays and behavioural responses during bullying episodes and while reporting incidents to teachers may help explain these divergent findings. Finally, future research should explore teachers' reactions to a broader range of victim responses including telling the bully to stop. While the effectiveness of this approach has been questioned (Smith et al., 1999), saying "stop" might overtly convey victims' displeasure, thereby encouraging teacher intervention. Furthermore, it would be beneficial to explore the relative impact of victims' emotional display (e.g., appear frustrated) and behavioural reaction (e.g., attempt retaliation) on teachers' perceptions and reactions to bullying.

Conclusion

The current study highlighted the influence of individual, school, and situational factors on teachers' attitudes and reactions to bullying. In particular, the victim's response to being bullied was identified as a key situational factor impacting teacher outcomes. Given teachers' broad range of responsibilities and the extensive demands on their time and attention, it makes sense that teachers might use victims' visible distress or passivity during bullying episodes as a heuristic to determine whether teacher intervention is necessary. Teachers may also need to decide whether and how to intervene in particular bullying incidents before specific assessment of victims' internal distress is possible. Professional development programs should acknowledge these challenges when reminding teachers that victims' subjective distress may not always be visible to bystanders. Rather than relying solely on victims' observable response to

distinguish playful teasing from bullying (Smith, et al., 2010), teachers should be encouraged to more thoroughly assess the students' relationship, the frequency of incidents, and the subjective experience of victims whenever possible. This additional information will assist teachers in making more informed decisions about how best to interpret and respond to the complex problem of school bullying. Helping teachers understand their attitudes and behavioural tendencies and training them in practical bullying prevention and intervention strategies will ensure that teachers are better utilised within school-based anti-bullying efforts (Yoon & Bauman, 2014).

THESIS DISCUSSION

Thesis Discussion

This thesis investigated victims' responses to overt bullying and their differential effects on the attitudes and reactions of peer bystanders and teachers. Using hypothetical videotaped scenarios, the research reported in this thesis compared four victim responses (labelled as angry, sad, confident, ignoring) consisting of the combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction displayed during the bullying episode. The use of role-played videos maximised ecological validity and extended past survey research investigating victims' broad coping responses (e.g., Kristensen & Smith, 2003; Smith & Shu, 2000). By examining the views of both students and teachers, this thesis aimed to further understandings of victims' responses to bullying and sought to determine their impact on peer bystanders and teachers within the social ecology of bullying. The key findings from the four empirical papers are reviewed with specific reference to the similarities and differences between results obtained from student and teachers samples. The implications of this body of research for the design of individual-level, peer-level, and teacher-level components of whole school anti-bullying interventions are outlined. Limitations and future research directions are discussed, before an overall conclusion to the thesis is presented.

Review of Thesis Papers

Papers 1 and 2 explored victims' responses to overt bullying from student and teacher perspectives, respectively. By comparing students' victim response evaluations and practices within the same study, Paper 1 revealed a gap between the responses students "know" to be effective (i.e., confident and ignoring responses) and what they report they would actually "do" if faced with bullying themselves (i.e., sad and angry responses). This gap may imply that students do not possess the skills and resources necessary to implement the victim responses they consider effective. Alternatively, the knowing-doing gap may reflect the fact that other motivations interfere with students'

implementation of the responses they rate as effective. The qualitative data outlining the range of motivations driving students' responses to bullying supported the idea that victims may select different responses depending on their priorities and personal agendas in a given situation.

Notwithstanding some minor gender and grade variations in students' ratings, teachers' victim response evaluations outlined in Paper 2 were broadly consistent with the student data presented in Paper 1. Confident and ignoring victim responses were considered more effective than sad and angry responses, in line with recommendations given to victims within individual-level programs (e.g., Berry & Hunt, 2009; Fox & Boulton, 2003a, 2003b). These findings suggest that both students and teachers tend to be aware that victims' displays of negative emotions, such as sadness and anger, combined with passive and aggressive behaviours respectively, represent ineffective responses as they reinforce the bully (Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Perry et al., 1990; Tenenbaum et al., 2011). Overall, both students and teachers considered sad victims to be at greatest risk of future victimisation. However in the majority of cases, the average evaluated risk of future victimisation fell above the "somewhat" anchor even for more active victim responses. These findings highlight that while victims' responses to bullying can influence the trajectory of bullying, victims, by themselves, are ultimately limited in their ability to control bullying. For this reason, students and teachers may consider other goals (e.g., victims' feelings and self-perceptions) when selecting or advising particular responses to bullying.

Within the qualitative data, students and teachers described a broad range of victim responses as well as a variety of motivations and rationales underlying these approaches. Both samples referred to victims' emotional displays and behaviours during bullying episodes as well as approaches employed afterwards, such as reporting the bullying to others. Students and teachers also both recognised that in addition to trying

to avoid conflict and future bullying, particular victim responses could be used to impact the bully (e.g., avoid reinforcing them) or the victim (e.g., strengthen the victim's position). Some of these motivations and rationales were even mentioned more often than goals to end the bullying. Interestingly, the percentage of teachers who recommended reporting the bullying to others was more than twice that of students who indicated that they would use this strategy (75% versus 33%, respectively). These results are in line with past studies noting low rates of help-seeking among victims of bullying (Oliver & Candappa, 2007), although teachers are most likely to recommend this strategy (Nicolaides et al., 2002; Rigby, 2011; Spears et al., 2015). Different views of help-seeking among student versus teacher samples were also reflected in the data examining the motivations and rationales underlying different victim responses. While only a small minority of students discussed the role of others, about 50% of teachers described the need for systemic approaches when addressing bullying.

Taken together, Papers 1 and 2 highlighted the complexity associated with selecting and implementing effective responses to bullying. Furthermore, even responses that were considered relatively effective were recognised as being insufficient to attenuate the systemic problem of school bullying. Interestingly, the qualitative data exploring victim response motivations and rationales revealed that neither students nor teachers reported considering the impact of different victim responses on bystanders who witness the bullying interaction. However, there is some preliminary evidence suggesting that bystanders may consider the victim's response to being bullied when interpreting and deciding whether to intervene in bullying incidents (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Blain-Arcaro et al., 2012; Mishna et al., 2006; Smith et al., 2010; Thornberg et al., 2012). Building on this research, Papers 3 and 4 aimed to directly investigate victim response effects on the attitudes and reactions of peer bystanders and teachers. These studies sought to contribute to understanding the roles of peers and teachers in

the social ecology of bullying in order to provide the foundation for interventions which encourage bystanders to respond in more positive and constructive ways.

In Papers 3 and 4, the victim's emotional display and behavioural response during the bullying episode was identified as a salient situational factor influencing peer bystanders' and teachers' cognitions, emotions, and behaviours. Results revealed that female students and students who had experienced more victimisation in the past term tended to like angry victims less than the other victims. Both peer bystanders and teachers also attributed the most blame to angry victims, although ratings of victim blame were generally low, in line with past research (Baldry, 2004). Teachers' attributions of blame towards bullies varied by victim response, with bullies of sad and ignoring victims attracting more blame than bullies of angry and confident victims. Some minor differences were found between students' and teachers' perceptions of the victimisation. While peer bystanders considered incidents involving confident victims to be the least serious, teachers considered episodes involving confident victims to be less serious than those involving sad and ignoring victims, but not necessarily angry victims. When estimating victims' distress, peer bystanders considered sad victims to be the most upset, followed by the ignoring, angry, and confident victims in turn. While a similar pattern was observed among teachers, no significant difference was found between teachers' estimations of the internal distress of ignoring versus angry victims.

Victims' responses to bullying were found to impact the emotional reactions of both peer bystanders and teachers, including feelings of anger and sadness and empathy towards the victim. Notwithstanding some variations by gender and bullying type, incidents involving confident victims and at times angry victims, evoked fewer negative emotions and less empathy, when compared to incidents involving sad and ignoring victims. Peer bystanders' and teachers' behavioural reactions to bullying also varied by victim response and in some cases by gender, grade, and bullying type. Peers were most

likely to report intentions to assist sad victims, whereas for incidents involving more active victims (and in particular confident victims) both peers and teachers were less likely to intervene. Taken together, these results highlight the importance of considering the broader systemic consequences associated with particular victim responses, rather than exclusively evaluating victims' responses to bullying in terms of their effect on bullies.

In addition to these victim response main effects, peer bystanders' and teachers' attitudes and reactions were at times found to vary depending on other individual (e.g., gender, grade, experiences with bullying, empathy, moral disengagement, self-efficacy), situational (e.g., bullying type, student gender), and school (e.g., school level, anti-bullying activities) factors. These findings contribute to a growing body of literature investigating personal and environmental variables impacting peer and teacher responses to bullying (Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000; Oh & Hazler, 2009; Yoon et al., 2014). Understanding the role of these different factors in predicting bystanders' cognitive, emotional, and behavioural reactions to bullying will help to fine-tune programs designed to promote bystander support and intervention in bullying situations.

Implications for Anti-Bullying Interventions

The findings from the four empirical papers presented in this thesis offer several insights for improving individual-level, peer-level, and teacher-level components of whole school anti-bullying interventions. While meta-analyses suggest that whole school programs tend to be effective in reducing overall rates of bullying and victimisation, efforts to improve individual-level and peer-level interventions are warranted (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Better utilisation of teachers within anti-bullying activities and programs also offers a crucial avenue to more effectively prevent and manage school bullying (Richard et al., 2012).

Individual-level interventions have often focussed on teaching victims social skills (DeRosier, 2004; Hunt, 2015; Smith et al., 2001), however more recently researchers have emphasised the need to target victims' cognitions and emotions in addition to their behaviours (Rosen, Milich, & Harris, 2007). For example, several researchers have highlighted the potential benefits of providing victims with emotion regulation skills-training to help them monitor and control their own feelings and emotional displays (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Mahady Wilton et al., 2000). The results of the research presented in this thesis support the need for victims to be trained in emotion regulation skills in order to assist them in implementing victim responses that avoid displays of negative emotion (i.e., confident and ignoring responses) as an alternative to the more common sad and angry responses which tend to reinforce bullies (Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Perry et al., 1990; Tenenbaum et al., 2011). Paper 1 demonstrated that students typically know which responses are more effective, suggesting that educational programs may be insufficient for helping victims. Instead, skills-training interventions which enable victims to practice preferred responses and build self-efficacy for implementing them are necessary in order to promote behavioural change. Role plays can be used to assist victims in practising responses to specific bullying incidents and it may be helpful to use a staged approach to gradually teach victims more complex responses (Scambler et al., 1998). For example, students might practice remaining calm and implementing the ignoring response first, prior to learning how to adopt the confident response which requires the additional challenge of generating an immediate verbal response.

Even if victims learn the necessary skills to implement different victim responses, the current body of research highlighted the complexity associated with selecting an effective response in a particular bullying situation. Different approaches may vary in their effectiveness depending on a range of individual (e.g., gender, grade)

and contextual (e.g., bullying type) factors. The effectiveness of a particular response may also depend on the victim's motivations in that particular situation. Adults should therefore clarify and take into account why victims adopt particular responses as well as the relevant personal and environmental factors when advising students about how to respond to bullying.

The research presented in this thesis highlights the need to consider the impact of different victim responses on both bullies and bystanders. The sad victim response sometimes had opposing effects on bullies versus bystanders, which may create confusion for victims. The current findings suggest that while bullies might find sad victims' visible distress and passivity reinforcing thereby increasing their risk of future victimisation, this response may also highlight to peer bystanders and teachers that their assistance is needed. However, these results were obtained when bystanders observed single bullying episodes. More research is needed to test whether using the sad victim response over time leads to negative social consequences, in line with evidence of lower peer liking for children displaying symptoms of depression and anxiety (Luchetti & Rapee, 2014). There appeared to be notable disadvantages associated with adopting the angry victim response when considering its effect both on future bullying and bystanders' attitudes and reactions. Emphasising the drawbacks of angry responses within individual-level interventions may assist adults in motivating students to exert the effort needed to learn anger management strategies and to practice alternate responses to bullying. Furthermore, helping victims to avoid the commonly utilised sad and angry responses to bullying may offer an important means of breaking the vicious cycles that perpetuate bullying, whereby children with internalising or externalising problems get bullied which leads to further problems that in turn increase their vulnerability to future bullying (Hunt, 2015; Nishina et al., 2005).

Although the confident victim response tended to be rated as effective, the results outlined in Papers 3 and 4 suggest that victims should be made aware of the limitations of this response. Bystanders perceived incidents involving confident victims as less serious and less distressing for victims and were less likely to intervene in these situations. Victims who are able to adopt this strategy should therefore be encouraged to seek help from friends or adults if they are distressed by what has occurred to ensure that their bullying does not go unnoticed. While ignoring responses were generally considered to offer less protection from future victimisation compared to confident responses, the passive nature of ignoring responses did evoke more bystander support by comparison. In this way, ignoring responses go some way to avoid reinforcing the bully but do not allow victims to stand up for themselves as actively as confident responses do.

By discussing the relative advantages and disadvantages of different victim responses in particular bullying situations, individual-level interventions can provide victims with information to assist their victim response selections. This knowledge could then be applied in the context of social problem solving, which offers victims a framework for selecting responses to different bullying situations in a systematic and considered way. For example, individual-level programs could teach victims techniques in generating and evaluating possible emotional displays and behavioural responses, practising and implementing the selected response, and then reflecting on how effective that particular response was in the given situation. This approach will enable students to think through the pros and cons of particular victim responses, consider their primary motivations, practice response implementation, and develop skills in self-reflection. Through the process of skills development, these interventions have the potential to empower victims to play an active role in effectively managing the bullying problem and preventing future victimisation. This approach will also likely assist in

strengthening victims' self-esteem and their self-efficacy for managing bullying interactions. It should be noted that while the term 'victim' has been used throughout this thesis for consistency with past bullying literature, in school contexts and within anti-bullying programs, the term 'target' should instead be used in order to avoid the negative and disempowering connotations of the word 'victim'.

Although there is some preliminary support for the potential benefits of interventions that target victims of bullying (Hunt, 2015), this approach is limited in its ability to sufficiently mitigate the systemic problem of school bullying. Some recommendations to victims within individual-level programs directly rely on other people within the social ecology of bullying. For example, some programs advise victims to "get an audience" and to ensure other people are around when they come into contact with the bully (Berry & Hunt, 2009; Rapee et al., 2006). However, this approach will only be effective if bystanders are supportive of the victim. The presence of peers who side with the bully or teachers who ignore bullying interactions will likely increase the victim's distress, humiliation, and sense of helplessness. While victims are encouraged to report bullying to teachers, the effectiveness of this approach has been found to be variable (Rigby, 2011). Student reports have indicated that this strategy only improved their situation in up to approximately 50% of cases and at times things got worse as a result of telling teachers (Fekkes, Pijpers,& Verloove-Vanhorick, 2005; Rigby & Barnes, 2002; Smith & Shu, 2000). The strategy of asking friends for help is also dependent on others and will only be effective for victims who have friends that are willing and capable of assisting them (Smith et al., 2001). Furthermore, victims may be advised to try to make new friends (Berry & Hunt, 2009), in light of evidence that having more or different friends may protect students from future victimisation (Smith, Talamelli, et al., 2004). While training in friendship and social skills can assist victims in establishing new connections with their peers, peer status and students' reputations

tend to be resistant to change especially in the short-term (DeRosier, 2004; DeRosier & Marcus, 2005). For these reasons, systemic approaches are needed in addition to individual-level programs with victims.

Given the potential for peers and teachers to shift the balance of power inherent in bullying interactions, peer-level and teacher-level anti-bullying programs have been developed with the aim of galvanising bystander support and establishing a positive school climate that is opposed to bullying (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012). Research suggests that peers and teachers influence the bullying dynamic via their attitudes and behaviours (Saarento, Garandeau, & Salmivalli, 2014). Bullying tends to be more common in classrooms where students hold fewer anti-bullying attitudes (Saarento, Kärnä, Hodges, & Salmivalli, 2013) and peer bystanders' behaviours in bullying situations influence classroom rates of bullying (Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011) and moderate the effects of individual and interpersonal risk factors for victimisation (Kärnä, Voeten, Poskiparta, & Salmivalli, 2010). Furthermore, while low rates of teacher intervention reinforce bullying behaviours (Craig, Pepler, et al., 2000), student perceptions of teachers' disapproval of bullying (Saarento et al., 2013, 2014), teachers' high efficacy for addressing bullying (Veenstra et al., 2014), and positive teacher-student relationships (Murray-Harvey & Slee, 2010) are all associated with lower rates of bullying. Taken together, this research highlights the need for interventions to encourage peers and teachers to be socially responsible 'upstanders' rather than passive bystanders in bullying situations (Cohen, 2014).

Peer-level programs have been designed to promote anti-bullying attitudes, build empathy for victims, and teach strategies for effective bystander intervention (Friendly Schools Program, Cross et al., 2011; Steps to Respect Program, Frey et al., 2005; KiVa program, Salmivalli, 1999). The KiVa program (Kärnä et al., 2011; Saarento et al., 2015) for example is a whole school anti-bullying intervention that was developed in

Finland based on the Participant Role approach to bullying (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al., 1996). This program incorporates a range of components including a curriculum program delivered to students in their classrooms. The findings presented in Paper 3 suggest that these peer-level programs should address definitions and perceptions of bullying to ensure that students understand that victims of bullying may respond in many different ways. While some victims may not outwardly express distress during the bullying episode, students should be made aware that these experiences are still hurtful and may cause significant harm (Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996). This approach may assist in building empathy for victims and urges peers to oppose all bullying in the school environment, regardless of how individual victims respond to incidences of bullying.

Teacher programs have been implemented either as standalone interventions (e.g., Bully Busters; Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004; The GREAT Teacher Program; Orpinas & Horne, 2004) or within whole school anti-bullying programs (e.g., Cross et al., 2011) with the aim of enhancing teachers' knowledge and skills in how to prevent and manage bullying. The findings presented in Paper 4 highlight the need to remind teachers to assess the students' relationships, the frequency of incidents, and the subjective experience of victims whenever possible, rather than relying on victims' observable responses as indications of the seriousness of bullying incidents and the need for intervention. Building teachers' awareness of their attitudes and behavioural tendencies in different bullying situations may also allow teachers to adjust for any personal biases. Supporting past research (Bradshaw et al., 2007), results revealed that teachers' self-efficacy for managing bullying influenced their likelihood of intervention. This finding suggests that professional development programs should not only educate teachers about bullying, they should also incorporate skills practice to build self-efficacy and train teachers in specific skills for managing bullying. Furthermore, these

programs should provide a platform for teachers to discuss potential recommendations to give to victims about how to respond to bullying. These discussions should be guided by research, such as that presented in Papers 1 and 2, which revealed the range of rationales underlying teachers' advice to victims and offered preliminary comparisons with students' opinions regarding effective responses to bullying.

Thesis Strengths

Extending on past teasing literature (Landau et al., 2001; Lightner et al., 2000; Scambler et al., 1998), this research was the first to compare victims' responses to overt bullying using videotaped bullying scenarios portraying victims' observable emotional displays and behavioural responses during bullying episodes. Given the presence of visual and auditory cues, this approach offered increased specificity and ecological validity compared to past research utilising written vignettes or broad descriptions of victims' coping responses (e.g., Kristensen & Smith, 2003; Smith & Shu, 2000; Yoon & Kerber, 2003). To reflect the diversity evident in real-life bullying situations, the video scenarios also varied in terms of their content, location, and the individuals involved. Furthermore, four different victim responses were examined to enable responses that are typically recommended by researchers, teachers, and within anti-bullying interventions (i.e., confident and ignoring responses) to be compared with common yet ineffective responses to bullying (e.g., externalising responses portrayed by angry victims and internalising responses portrayed by sad victims; Mahady Wilton et al., 2000; Salmivalli, Karhunen, et al., 1996).

When exploring victims' responses to bullying from student and teacher perspectives in Papers 1 and 2 respectively, mixed methods were adopted in order to assist with generating new insights and to improve the validity of data obtained from either quantitative or qualitative methods alone (Hong & Espelage, 2012a). While the quantitative analysis had the advantage of specificity, the qualitative analysis had the

benefit of flexibility and allowed participants to express their ideas in their own words. Filling a crucial gap in the literature, this research also offered unique insights into the motivations driving students' responses to bullying and the rationales underlying teachers' advice to victims.

The research presented in Papers 3 and 4 was the first to directly examine the impact of victims' responses to bullying on the cognitive, emotional, and behavioural reactions of bystanders. In order to generate insights about the roles of both peers and teachers in the social ecology of bullying, this thesis examined victim response effects on both peer bystanders and teachers using an experimental design. Given the potential to infer causal relations, this method offered an important advantage compared to correlational designs (Gini et al., 2008) and enabled the broader social consequences of victims' responses to bullying to be uncovered. The effects of a range of individual, situational, and school factors were also examined in order to assist in elucidating the complex array of variables impacting bystanders' attitudes and reactions to bullying.

Thesis Limitations and Future Research Directions

Alongside these strengths, several limitations of the present research should be considered. In the current studies, participants viewed hypothetical scenarios which may have produced different reactions to witnessing actual bullying incidents between students they know at their school. For example, while children generally hold anti-bullying attitudes and are supportive of helping hypothetical victims (Rigby & Johnson, 2006; Rigby & Slee, 1991; Whitney & Smith, 1993), they may have more negative attitudes (e.g., greater attributions of blame; Teräsahjo & Salmivalli, 2003) towards the actual victims in their class (Salmivalli, 2010). Future studies are therefore needed to assess student and teacher reactions to bullying incidents witnessed within their school environment, with a particular focus on the influence of bystanders' peer status, relationship with the victim, classroom and school norms, and the reputation or

perceived social role the victim plays in the peer group (Salmivalli, 2010). For ethical reasons, the hypothetical bullying incidents depicted in the videos were also of a relatively mild nature. Further research is needed to assess bystander reactions to bullying incidents involving harsher language and more violent physical behaviours.

While in the current research, participants witnessed single episodes of bullying between a bully and victim with no other bystanders present, future research is needed to examine the effect of adopting different victim responses over time and in the presence of different types of onlookers. Longitudinal studies may assist in assessing temporal changes, whereas experimental designs may be used to compare bullying situations that occur in the presence of different witnesses (e.g., Roos, Salmivalli, & Hodges, 2011). Examining victim response effects over time will assist in assessing the utility of particular victim responses depending on victims' short-term goals (e.g., elicit immediate support from bystanders) versus long-term goals (e.g., gain respect and acceptance from peers). This research may also help determine the extent to which victims must persist in utilising recommended strategies in order to ultimately escape the victim role (Elledge et al., 2010). Furthermore, additional research is needed to determine whether the order and video set variations identified in the current studies were artefacts of the experimental paradigm or whether they reflect real-life calibration processes whereby students consider bullying episodes they observe in the context of other witnessed incidents.

In order to depict the victim responses described in past literature, the videotaped scenarios utilised in this thesis portrayed different victim responses through the combination of a particular emotional display and behavioural reaction. Further research is therefore needed to compare the relative effects of the emotional display component (e.g., visible frustration) and the behavioural component (e.g., reactive aggression and attempted retaliation) of victims' responses. For example, angry

expressions should be differentiated from displays of assertive versus aggressive behaviour, as victims' displays of controlled versus reactive anger may differentially affect the attitudes and reactions of both bullies and bystanders (Murray-Harvey et al., 2012). Although the current research compared the effects of four different victim responses (angry, sad, confident, ignoring), the qualitative data presented in Papers 1 and 2 suggested a broad range of victim responses worthy of further investigation. For example, it would be helpful to examine the strategy of telling the bully to stop, which may overtly convey the victims' displeasure thereby encouraging bystander intervention. However, the effectiveness of this approach has been questioned (Smith et al., 1999) and victims' verbal protests may also be reinforcing to bullies (Tapper & Boulton, 2005). Although past studies have typically examined this strategy using a written description, future research may benefit from studying "telling the bully to stop" combined with either an angry expression or a confident yet calm expression.

When portraying the different victim responses in the current research, a range of scenarios were used and therefore the exact nature of the response varied across the videos. For example, the confident victim responses varied in the extent to which the victim agreed with the bully and in the degree of humour employed. While this diversity is consistent with the variation likely to occur within naturalistic settings, further studies are needed to examine the relative effectiveness of a particular victim response style in different situations. Furthermore, while this research studied victim responses in isolation, coping may be better understood as a multi-response process, as in reality, children may use a range of different responses (Bellmore et al., 2013; Waasdorp & Bradshaw, 2011). Future studies may therefore benefit from measuring multiple responses in order to determine patterns of responding among victims.

The current research relied on self-report data which may be subject to social desirability and demand effects. While this approach enabled an efficient assessment of

individuals' reported attitudes and subjective emotional experiences, the behavioural intentions participants reported in response to vignettes may differ from their actual behaviour in real-life situations (Poulou, 2001). To address these limitations, observational methods could be employed to assess victims' responses to being bullied and bystanders' subsequent reactions. Alternatively, future studies could adopt a multi-informant approach that takes into account student, peer, and teacher reports (e.g., Ladd & Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2002). Several specific measures adopted in this thesis could also be improved in future research. For example, to build on findings from Papers 1 and 2, future studies could use semi-structured interviews or guided prompts to identify specific links between students' victim response selections and motivations as well as teachers' victim response advice and rationales.

The samples utilised in the current research may have limited the generalisability of the findings. In Papers 1 and 3, a relatively homogenous sample of fifth- and seventh-grade students from two private Australian schools responded to same-sex scenarios. Future research is therefore needed to test whether results generalise to more ethnically and economically diverse samples, students of different ages, students with varying bullying and victimisation histories, and cross-sex bullying situations. Papers 2 and 4 relied on teachers voluntarily participating in an online survey and therefore teachers who were more interested or more concerned about bullying may have been more likely to participate (Bauman et al., 2008). For this reason, future studies should attempt to replicate these findings using a random, unbiased, and representative sample of teachers.

Building on the body of research presented in this thesis, there are several additional avenues for future study worthy of mention. While Papers 3 and 4 explored bystanders' cognitive, emotional, and behavioural responses to bullying each in isolation, future research may benefit from exploring specific causal pathways between

these variables. A broader range of bystander variables could also be explored, by including bystanders' attitudes towards the bully for example. While the current research explored victims' responses to being bullied and its effects on bystanders within the context of physical and verbal bullying, future studies should extend this investigation to relational bullying and cyberbullying situations. Victim responses may however need to be conceptualised differently when the bullying does not occur within a face-to-face interaction. Preliminary research suggests that victims' strategies for coping with cybervictimisation influence their mental health and behavioural outcomes (Dooley, Shaw, & Cross, 2012). The role of cyber-bystanders has also begun to be explored (e.g., Machackova, Dedkova, Sevcilkova, & Cerna, 2013; Price et al., 2014). Further research is however needed to uncover the effect of victims' responses on the systemic processes involved in covert and cyberbullying. Direct requests for help from peers and teachers may be particularly important in these situations due to the often invisible nature of the victim's reaction and the lack of observable harm caused by the bullying (Heirman & Walrave, 2008; Maunder et al., 2010).

Thesis Conclusions

Victims, peers, and teachers alike must grapple with difficult decisions regarding how best to respond to the pervasive problem of school bullying. The current thesis studied victims' responses to bullying from both student and teacher perspectives and offered the first direct examination of the impact of victims' responses to bullying on the cognitions, emotions, and behaviours of peer bystanders and teachers. The present findings demonstrated that responding to bullying is a complex and challenging task for victims and highlighted the need to consider the effects of different victim responses on both bullies and bystanders. By addressing this crucial gap in the literature, this body of research deepened our understanding of the roles of peers and teachers within the social ecology of bullying. The current thesis also generated insights

relevant to the improvement of individual-level, peer-level, and teacher-level components of whole school anti-bullying programs which aim to tackle the systemic problem of bullying.

REFERENCES

References

Andershed, H., Kerr, M., & Stattin, H. (2001). Bullying in school and violence on the streets: Are the same people involved? *Journal of Scandinavian Studies in Criminology and Crime Prevention, 2*, 31-49. doi: 10.1080/140438501317205538

Anti-Bullying Alliance. (2013). ABA School Assessment Tool. Retrieved from: http://www.anti-bullyingalliance.org.uk/resources/school-assessment-tools/

Archer, J. (2004). Sex differences in aggression in real-world settings: A meta-analytic review. *Review of General Psychology, 8*, 291-322. doi: 10.1037/1089-2680.8.4.291

Atlas, R. S., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. *The Journal of Educational Research, 92*, 86-99. doi: 10.1080/00220679809597580

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2015a, October 31). 4102.0 – Australia Social Trends, 1997. Retrieved from: http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/2f762f95845417aeca25706c00834efa/80fbc4826c05c115ca2570ec001b193c!OpenDocument

Australian Bureau of Statistics (2015b, March 5). Staff: 4221.0 - Schools, Australia, 2014. Retrieved from: http://www.abs.gov.au/AUSSTATS/abs@.nsf/Latestproducts/4221.0Main%20Features152014?opendocument&tabname=Summary&prodno=4221.0&issue=2014&num=&view=

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

Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory.*

Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A., Barbaranelli, C., Caprara, G. V., & Pastorelli, C. (1996). Mechanisms of moral disengagement in the exercise of moral agency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71*, 364. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.71.2.364

Barchia, K., & Bussey, K. (2011). Predictors of student defenders of peer aggression victims: Empathy and social cognitive factors. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 35*, 289-297. doi: 10.1177/0165025410396746

Barhight, L. R., Hubbard, J. A., & Hyde, C. T. (2013). Children's physiological and emotional reactions to witnessing bullying predict bystander intervention. *Child Development, 84*, 375-390. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01839.x

Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 219-231. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.219

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

Bellmore, A., Chen, W., & Rischall, E. (2013). The reasons behind early adolescents' responses to peer victimization. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 42*, 275-284. doi: 10.1007/s10964-012-9825-0

Bellmore, A., Ma, T., You, J., & Hughes, M. (2012). A two-method investigation of early adolescents' responses upon witnessing peer victimization at school. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*, 1265-1276. doi 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.04.012

Beran, T. (2005). A new perspective on managing school bullying: Pre-service teachers' attitudes. *Journal of Social Sciences, Special Issue No. 8*, 43-49. Retrieved from: http://www.krepublishers.com

Berger, K. S. (2007). Update on bullying at school: Science forgotten? *Developmental*

Review, 27, 90-126. doi: 10.1016/j.dr.2006.08.002

Berry, K., & Hunt, C. J. (2009). Evaluation of an intervention program for anxious adolescent boys who are bullied at school. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 45,* 376-382. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.04.023

Black, S., Weinles, D., & Washington, E. (2010). Victim strategies to stop bullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 8,* 138-147. doi: 10.1177/1541204009349401

Blain-Arcaro, C., Smith, J. D., Cunningham, C. E., Vaillancourt, T., & Rimas, H. (2012). Contextual attributes of indirect bullying situations that influence teachers' decisions to intervene. *Journal of School Violence, 11*, 226-245. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2012.682003

Boulton, M. J. (1997). Teachers' views on bullying: Definitions, attitudes and ability to cope. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 67*, 223-233. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-8279.1997.tb01239.x

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*(*3),* 361-382. Retrieved from: http://web.a.ebscohost.com

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology, 3*, 77-101. doi: 10.1191/1478088706qp063oa

Bronfenbrenner, U. (1977). Toward an experimental ecology of human development. *American Psychologist, 32*, 513-531. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.32.7.513

Camodeca, M., & Goossens, F. A. (2005). Children's opinions on effective strategies to cope with bullying: The importance of bullying role and perspective. *Educational Research, 47,* 93-105. doi: 10.1080/0013188042000337587

Caravita, S., Di Blasio, P., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Unique and interactive effects of

empathy and social status on involvement in bullying. *Social Development, 18*, 140-163. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00465.x

Card, N. A., Stucky, B. D., Sawalani, G. M., & Little, T. D. (2008). Direct and indirect aggression during childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic review of gender differences, intercorrelations, and relations to maladjustment. *Child Development, 79*, 1185-1229. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2008.01184.x

Causey, D. L., & Dubow, E. F. (1992). Development of a self-report coping measure for elementary school children. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 21*, 47-59. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp2101_8

Chung T. & Asher S. R. (1996). Children's goals and strategies in peer conflict situations. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 42*, 125–147. doi: 10.2307/23090523

Cohen, J. (2014). Effective bullying prevention efforts and school climate reform. In M. G. Masiello & D. Schroeder (Eds.), *A public health approach to bullying prevention* (pp. 23 - 56). Washington, DC: American Public Health Association.

Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., Kim, T. E., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly, 25*, 65-83. doi: 10.1037/a0020149

Courtney, M. L., Cohen, R., Deptula, D. P., & Kitzmann, K. M. (2003). An experimental analysis of children's dislike of aggressors and victims. *Social Development, 12*, 46-66. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00221

Cowie, H., & Berdondini, L. (2002). The expression of emotion in response to bullying. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 7*, 207-214. doi: 10.1080/13632750200507018

Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. G. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International, 21*, 5-21. doi: 10.1177/0143034300211001

Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1997). Observations of bullying and victimization in the school yard. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13*, 41-59. doi: 10.1177/082957359801300205

Craig, W. M., Pepler, D., & Atlas, R. (2000). Observations of bullying in the playground and in the classroom. *School Psychology International, 21*, 22-36. doi: 10.1177/0143034300211002

Craig, W., Pepler, D., & Blais, J. (2007). Responding to bullying: What works? *School Psychology International*, *28*, 465-477. doi: 10.1177/0143034307084136

Cross, D., Monks, H., Hall, M., Shaw, T., Pintabona, Y., Erceg, E., . . . Lester, L. (2011). Three-year results of the Friendly Schools whole-of-school intervention on children's bullying behaviour. *British Educational Research Journal, 37*, 105-129. doi: 10.1080/01411920903420024

Cross, D., Shaw, T., Hearn, L., Epstein, M., Monks, H., Lester, L., Thomas, L. (2009). Child Health Promotion Research Centre. *Australian covert bullying prevalence study*. Perth: Edith Cowan University.

Dake, J. A., Price, J. H., & Telljohann, S. K. (2003). The nature and extent of bullying at school. *Journal of School Health, 73*, 173-180. doi: 10.1111/j.1746-1561.2003.tb03599.x

Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*, 377-383. doi: 10.1037/h0025589

Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10*, 85. Retrieved from: researchgate.net

DeRosier, M. E. (2004). Building relationships and combating bullying: Effectiveness of a school-based social skills group intervention. *Journal of Clinical Child &*

Adolescent Psychology, 33, 196-201. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp3301_18

DeRosier, M. E., & Marcus, S. R. (2005). Building friendships and combating bullying: Effectiveness of SS GRIN at one-year follow-up. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 34*, 140-150. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp3401_13

Dooley, J. J., Shaw, T., & Cross, D. (2012). The association between the mental health and behavioural problems of students and their reactions to cyber-victimization. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology, 9*, 275-289. doi: 10.1080/17405629.2011.648425

Due, P., Holstein, B. E., Lynch, J., Diderichsen, F., Gabhain, S. N., Scheidt, P., & Currie, C. (2005). Bullying and symptoms among school-aged children: International comparative cross sectional study in 28 countries. *The European Journal of Public Health, 15*, 128-132. doi: 10.1093/eurpub/cki105

Duy, B. (2013). Teachers' attitudes toward different types of bullying and victimization in Turkey. *Psychology in the Schools, 50*, 987-1002. doi: 10.1002/pits.21729

Elinoff, M. J., Chafouleas, S. M., & Sassu, K. A. (2004). Bullying: Considerations for defining and intervening in school settings. *Psychology in the Schools, 41*, 887-897. doi: 10.1002/pits.20045

Elledge, L. C., Cavell, T. A., Ogle, N. T., Malcolm, K. T., Newgent, R. A., & Faith, M. A. (2010). History of peer victimization and children's response to school bullying. *School Psychology Quarterly, 25*, 129-141. doi: 10.1037/a0020313

Ellis, A. A., & Shute, R. (2007). Teacher responses to bullying in relation to moral orientation and seriousness of bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*, 649-663. doi: 10.1348/000709906X163405

Eslea, M., & Rees, J. (2001). At what age are children most likely to be bullied at school? *Aggressive Behaviour, 27*, 419-429. doi: 10.1002/ab.1027

Espelage, D. L., Hong, J. S., Rao, M. A., & Thornberg, R. (2015). Understanding

ecological factors associated with bullying across the elementary to middle school transition in the United States. *Violence and Victims, 30*, 470-487. doi: 10.1891/0886-6708.VV-D-14-00046

Espelage, D. L., Rao, M. A., & De La Rue, L. (2013). Current research on school-based bullying: A social-ecological perspective. *Journal of Social Distress and the Homeless, 22*, 21-27. doi: 10.1179/1053078913Z.0000000002

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

Fitzpatrick, S., McLellan, L., Fogliati, R., Lyneham, H., Bussey, K., Hunt, C., Hudson, J., & Rapee, R. (2015). *Cool Kids – Taking Control Online Treatment Program*. Centre for Emotional Health, Macquarie University, Sydney.

Flaspohler, P. D., Elfstrom, J. L., Vanderzee, K. L., Sink, H. E., & Birchmeier, Z. (2009). Stand by me: The effects of peer and teacher support in mitigating the impact of bullying on quality of life. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*, 636-649. doi: 10.1002/pits.20404

Fox, C. L., & Boulton, M. J. (2003a). A Social Skills Training (SST) Programme for victims of bullying. *Pastoral Care in Education, 21*, 19-26. doi: 10.1111/1468-0122.00258

Fox, C., & Boulton, M. (2003b). Evaluating the effectiveness of a social skills training (SST) programme for victims of bullying. *Educational Research, 45*, 231-247. doi: 10.1080/0013188032000137238

Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M. K., Snell, J. L., Edstrom, L. V., MacKenzie, E. P., & Broderick, C. J. (2005). Reducing playground bullying and supporting beliefs: An experimental trial of the steps to respect program. *Developmental*

Psychology, 41, 479-490. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.41.3.479

Frisén, A., Hasselblad, T., & Holmqvist, K. (2012). What actually makes bullying stop? Reports from former victims. *Journal of Adolescence, 35*, 981-990. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2012.02.001

Frisén, 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(168)*, 749-761. Retrieved from: web.b.ebscohost.com

Gamliel, T., Hoover, J. H., Daughtry, D. W., & Imbra, C. M. (2003). A qualitative investigation of bullying: The perspectives of fifth, sixth and seventh graders in a USA parochial school. *School Psychology International, 24*, 405-420. doi: 10.1177/01430343030244004

Garandeau, C. F., & Cillessen, A. H. (2006). From indirect aggression to invisible aggression: A conceptual view on bullying and peer group manipulation. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 11*, 612-625. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2005.08.005

Gini, G. (2008). Italian elementary and middle school students' blaming the victim of bullying and perception of school moral atmosphere. *Elementary School Journal, 108*, 335-354. doi: 10.1086/528975

Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoè, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending behaviour? *Aggressive Behaviour, 33*, 467-476. doi: 10.1002/ab.20204.

Gini, G., & Pozzoli, T. (2009). Association between bullying and psychosomatic problems: A meta-analysis. *Pediatrics, 123*, 1059-1065. doi: 10.1542/peds.2008-1215

Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., Borghi, F., & Franzoni, L. (2008). The role of bystanders in students' perception of bullying and sense of safety. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 617-638. doi: 10.1016/j.jshanishp.2008.02.001

Gladstone, G. L., Parker, G. B., & Malhi, G. S. (2006). Do bullied children become anxious and depressed adults?: A cross-sectional investigation of the correlates of bullying and anxious depression. *The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 194,* 201-208. doi: 10.1097/01.nmd.0000202491.99719.c3

Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (1998). Self-blame and peer victimization in middle school: An attributional analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 587-538. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.34.3.587

Graham, S., & Juvonen, J. (2001). An attributional approach to peer victimization. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 49-72). New York: The Guilford Press.

Hanish, L. D., & Guerra, N. G. (2000). Predictors of peer victimization among urban youth. *Social Development, 9,* 521-543. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00141

Harcourt, S., Jasperse, M., & Green, V. (2014). 'We were sad and we were angry': A systematic review of parents' perspectives on bullying. *Child & Youth Care Forum, 43,* 373-391. doi: 10.1007/s10566-014-9243-4

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

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

Hayes, A. F., & Matthes, J. (2009). Computational procedures for probing interactions in OLS and logistic regression: SPSS and SAS implementations. *Behaviour Research Methods, 41*, 924-936. doi: 10.3758/BRM.41.3.924

Hazler, R. J. (1996). Bystanders: An overlooked factor in peer on peer abuse. *The*

Journal for the Professional Counselor, 11(2), 11-21. Retrieved from: eric.ed.gov/?id=ED412429

Heirman, W., & Walrave, M. (2008). Assessing concerns and issues about the mediation of technology in cyberbullying. *Cyberpsychology: Journal of Psychosocial Research on Cyberspace, 2*(2), 1-12. Retrieved from: http://cyberpsychology.eu/view.php?cisloclanku=2008111401&article=1

Hektner, J. M., & Swenson, C. A. (2011). Links from teacher beliefs to peer victimization and bystander intervention: Tests of mediating processes. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 32*, 516-536. doi: 10.1177/0272431611402502

Hemphill, S.A., Heerde, J.A. & Gomo, R. (2014). *A conceptual definition of school-based bullying for the Australian research and academic community*. Canberra: Australian Research Alliance for Children and Youth.

Hemphill, S. A., Tollit, M., & Herrenkohl, T. I. (2014). Protective factors against the impact of school bullying perpetration and victimization on young adult externalizing and internalizing problems. *Journal of School Violence, 13*, 125-145. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2013.844072

Hodges, E. V. E., Boivin, M., Vitaro, F., & Bukowski, W. M. (1999). The power of friendship: Protection against an escalating cycle of peer victimization. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 94-101. doi: 10.1037//0012-1649.35.1.94

Hong, J. S., & Espelage, D. L. (2012a). A review of mixed methods research on bullying and peer victimization in school. *Educational Review, 64*, 115-126. doi: 10.1080/00131911.2011.598917

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

Hunt, C. (2015). Understanding and combating school-based bullying from an

individual-level perspective: A review. *Australian Psychologist, 50,* 182-185. doi:10.1111/ap.12093

Hymel, S. (1986). Interpretations of peer behaviour: Affective bias in childhood and adolescence. *Child Development, 57,* 431-445. doi: 10.2307/1130599

Hymel, S., Rocke-Henderson, N., & Bonanno, R. A. (2005). Moral disengagement: A framework for understanding bullying among adolescents. *Journal of Social Sciences, 8,* 1-11. Retrieved from: krepublishers.com

Isaacs, J., Hodges, E. V., & Salmivalli, C. (2008). Long-term consequences of victimization by peers: A follow-up from adolescence to young adulthood. *European Journal of Developmental Science, 2*(4), 387-397. Retrieved from: www.researchgate.net

Janosz, M., Archambault, I., Pagani, L. S., Pascal, S., Morin, A. J., & Bowen, F. (2008). Are there detrimental effects of witnessing school violence in early adolescence*?* *Journal of Adolescent Health, 43*, 600-608. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2008.04.011

Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Development and validation of the Basic Empathy Scale. *Journal of Adolescence, 29,* 589-611. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2005.08.010

Juvonen, J., & Graham, S. (2014). Bullying in schools: The power of bullies and the plight of victims. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 159-185. doi: 10.1146/annurev-psych-010213-115030

Juvonen, J., Nishina, A., & Graham, S. (2000). Peer harassment, psychological adjustment, and school functioning in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92,* 349-359. doi: 10.1037/0022-0663.92.2.349

Kanetsuna, T., & Smith, P. K. (2002). Pupil insights into bullying, and coping with bullying. *Journal of School Violence, 1,* 5-29. doi: 10.1300/J202v01n03_02

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 Behaviour, 32*, 570-580. doi: 10.1002/ab.20156

Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). Vulnerable children in varying classroom contexts: Bystanders' behaviours moderate the effects of risk factors on victimization. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 56*, 261-282. doi: 10.1353/mpq.0.0052

Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Little, T. D., Poskiparta, E., Kaljonen, A., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). A large-scale evaluation of the KiVa antibullying program: Grades 4–6. *Child Development, 82*, 311-330. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01557.x

Kochenderfer, B. J., & Ladd, G. W. (1997). Victimized children's responses to peers' aggression: Behaviours associated with reduced versus continued victimization. *Development and Psychopathology, 9*(1), 59-73. Retrieved from: http://journals.cambridge.org.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/

Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2003). Identification of aggressive and asocial victims and the stability of their peer victimization. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 49*, 401-425. doi: 10.1353/mpq.2003.0022

Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2004). Peer victimization: The role of emotions in adaptive and maladaptive coping. *Social Development, 13*, 329-349. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2004.00271.x

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

Kochenderfer-Ladd, B., & Skinner, K. (2002). Children's coping strategies: Moderators of the effects of peer victimization? *Developmental Psychology, 38*, 267-278.

doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.38.2.267

Kristensen, S. M., & Smith, P. K. (2003). The use of coping strategies by Danish children classed as bullies, victims, bully/victims, and not involved, in response to different (hypothetical) types of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 44,* 479-488. doi: 10.1046/j.1467-9450.2003.00369.x

Kumpulainen, K., Räsänen, E., & Puura, K. (2001). Psychiatric disorders and the use of mental health services among children involved in bullying. *Aggressive Behaviour, 27,* 102-110. doi: 10.1002/ab.3

Ladd, G. W., & Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2002). Identifying victims of peer aggression from early to middle childhood: Analysis of cross-informant data for concordance, estimation of relational adjustment, prevalence of victimization, and characteristics of identified victims. *Psychological Assessment, 14,* 74-96. doi: 10.1037//1040-3590.14.1.74

Landau, S., Milich, R., Harris, M. J., & Larson, S. E. (2001). "You really don't know how much it hurts": Children's and preservice teachers' reactions to childhood teasing. *School Psychology Review, 30(*3), 329-343. Retrieved from: http://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ667513Lazarus, R. S., & Folkman, S. (1984). Stress, appraisal, and coping. New York: Springer.

Leadbeater, B., & Hoglund, W. (2006). Changing the social contexts of peer victimization. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 15*(1), 21-26. Retrieved from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2277274/

Lereya, S. T., Copeland, W. E., Costello, E. J., & Wolke, D. (2015). Adult mental health consequences of peer bullying and maltreatment in childhood: Two cohorts in two countries. *The Lancet Psychiatry, 2,* 524-531. doi: 10.1016/S2215-0366(15)00165-0

Lightner, R. M., Bollmer, J. M., Harris, M. J., Milich, R., & Scambler, D. J. (2000). What do you say to teasers? Parent and child evaluations of responses to teasing. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 21,* 403-427. doi: 10.1016/S0193-3973(00)00047-2

Litvack-Miller, W., McDougall, D., & Romney, D. M. (1997). The structure of empathy during middle childhood and its relationship to prosocial behaviour. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 123 (3),* 303-324. Retrieved from: http://web.a.ebscohost.com.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/

Lodge, J., & Frydenberg, E. (2005). The role of peer bystanders in school bullying: Positive steps toward promoting peaceful schools. *Theory into Practice, 44,* 329-336. doi: 10.1207/s15430421tip4404_6

Luchetti, S., & Rapee, R.M. (2014). Liking and perceived probability of victimization of peers displaying behaviours characteristic of anxiety and depression. *Journal of Experimental Psychopathology, 5*, 212-223. doi: 10.5127/jep.036913

Machackova, H., Dedkova, L., Sevcikova, A., & Cerna, A. (2013). Bystanders' support of cyberbullied schoolmates. J*ournal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 23,* 25-36. doi: 10.1002/casp.2135

Mahady Wilton, M. M., Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (2000). Emotional regulation and display in classroom victims of bullying: Characteristic expressions of affect, coping styles and relevant contextual factors. *Social Development, 9*, 226-245. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00121

Marshall, M. L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Graybill, E. C., & Skoczylas, R. B. (2009). Teacher responses to bullying: Self-reports from the front line. *Journal of School Violence, 8*, 136-158. doi: 10.1080/15388220802074124

Maunder, R. E., Harrop, A., & Tattersall, A. J. (2010). Pupil and staff perceptions of bullying in secondary schools: Comparing behavioural definitions and their

perceived seriousness. *Educational Research, 52,* 263-282. doi: 10.1080/00131881.2010.504062

Menesini, E., Eslea, M., Smith, P. K., Genta, M. L., Giannetti, E., Fonzi, A., & Costabile, A. (1997). Cross-national comparison of children's attitudes towards bully/victim problems in school. *Aggressive Behaviour, 23,* 245-257. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1098-2337(1997)23:4<245::aid-ab3>3.0.co;2-j

Mishna, F., Pepler, D., & Wiener, J. (2006). Factors associated with perceptions and responses to bullying situations by children, parents, teachers, and principals. *Victims & Offenders, 1*, 255-288. doi: 10.1080/15564880600626163

Mishna, F., Scarcello, I., Pepler, D., & Wiener, J. (2005). Teachers' understanding of bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education,* 28, 718-738. doi: 10.2307/4126452

Modecki, K. L., Minchin, J., Harbaugh, A. G., Guerra, N. G., & Runions, K. C. (2014). Bullying prevalence across contexts: A meta-analysis measuring cyber and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 55*, 602-611. doi: 10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.06.007

Murray-Harvey, R., Skrzypiec, G., & Slee, P. T. (2012). Effective and ineffective coping with bullying strategies as assessed by informed professionals and their use by victimised students. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 22*, 122-138. doi: 10.1017/jgc.2012.5

Murray-Harvey, R., & Slee, P. T. (2010). School and home relationships and their impact on school bullying. *School Psychology International, 31,* 271-295. doi: 10.1177/0143034310366206

Nansel, T. R., Craig, W., Overpeck, M. D., Saluja, G., & Ruan, W. (2004). Cross-national consistency in the relationship between bullying behaviours and psychosocial adjustment. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine, 158,* 730-736. doi: 10.1001/archpedi.158.8.730

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviours among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*, 2094-2100. doi: 10.1001/jama.285.16.2094.

Naylor, P., Cowie, H., & del Rey, R. (2001). Coping strategies of secondary school children in response to being bullied. *Child Psychology & Psychiatry Review, 6*, 114-120. doi: http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S1360641701002647

Nesdale, D., & Pickering, K. (2006). Teachers' reactions to children's aggression. *Social Development, 15,* 109-127. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2006.00332.x

Newman-Carlson, D., & Horne, A. M. (2004). Bully Busters: A psychoeducational intervention for reducing bullying behaviour in middle school students. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82,* 259-267. doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6678.2004.tb00309.x

Newman-Carlson, D., Horne, A. M., & Bartolomucci, C. L. (2000). *Bully busters: A teacher's manual for helping bullies, victims, and bystanders (Grades 6 – 8).* Champaign, Ill: Research Press.

Nicolaides, S., Toda, Y., & Smith, P. K. (2002). Knowledge and attitudes about school bullying in trainee teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 105-118. doi: 10.1348/000709902158793

Nishina, A., & Juvonen, J. (2005). Daily reports of witnessing and experiencing peer harassment in middle school. *Child Development, 76*, 435-450. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2005.00855.x

Nishina, A., Juvonen, J., & Witkow, M. R. (2005). Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will make me feel sick: The psychosocial, somatic, and scholastic consequences of peer harassment. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 34*, 37-48. doi: 10.1207/s15374424jccp3401_4

Novick, R. M., & Isaacs, J. (2010). Telling is compelling: The impact of student reports of bullying on teacher intervention. *Educational Psychology, 30,* 283-296. doi: 10.1080/01443410903573123

O'Connell, P., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: Insights and challenges for intervention. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 437-452. doi: 10.1006/jado.1999.0238

Obermann, M. L. (2011). Moral disengagement among bystanders to school bullying. *Journal of School Violence, 10*, 239-257. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2011.578276

Oh, I., & Hazler, R. J. (2009). Contributions of personal and situational factors to bystanders' reactions to school bullying. *School Psychology International, 30*, 291-310. doi: 10.1177/0143034309106499

Oliver, C., & Candappa, M. (2007). Bullying and the politics of 'telling'. *Oxford Review of Education, 33*, 71-86. doi: 10.1080/03054980601094594

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

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

Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 35*, 1171-1190. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.1994.tb01229.x

Olweus D. (1996). The Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. Mimeo. Bergen, Norway: Research Centre for Health Promotion, University of Bergen.

Olweus, D. (2001). Peer harassment: A critical analysis and some important issues. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 3-20). New York: The Guilford Press.

Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (2004). A teacher-focused approach to prevent and reduce

students' aggressive behaviour: The GREAT Teacher Program. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 26*, 29-38. doi: 10.1016/j.amepre.2003.09.016

Paquette, J. A., & Underwood, M. K. (1999). Gender differences in young adolescents' experiences of peer victimization: social and physical aggression. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 45*(2), 242-266. Retrieved from: http://go.galegroup.com.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/

Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20*, 259-280. doi: 10.1348/026151002166442

Pepler, D. J. (2006). Bullying interventions: A binocular perspective. *Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 15*(1), 16-20. Retrieved from: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2277273/

Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M., Ziegler, S., & Charach, A. (1994). An evaluation of an anti-bullying intervention in Toronto schools. *Canadian Journal of Community Mental Health, 13*, 95-110. doi: 10.7870/cjcmh-1994-0014

Perren, S., Dooley, J., Shaw, T., & Cross, D. (2010). Bullying in school and cyberspace: Associations with depressive symptoms in Swiss and Australian adolescents. *Child and Adolescent Psychiatry and Mental Health, 4*, 1-10, doi: 10.1186/1753-2000-4-28

Perry, D. G., Hodges, E. V., & Egan, S. K. (2001). Determinants of chronic victimization by peers: A review and new model of family influence. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 73-104). New York: The Guilford Press.

Perry, D. G., Kusel, S. J., & Perry, L. C. (1988). Victims of peer aggression. *Developmental Psychology, 24*, 807-814. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.24.6.807

Perry, D. G., Williard, J. C., & Perry, L. C. (1990). Peers' perceptions of the consequences that victimized children provide aggressors. *Child Development, 61*, 1310-1325. doi: 10.2307/1130744

Petersen, L. (1995). Stop Think Do. In H. P. J. G. van Bilsen, P. C. Kendall, & J. H. Slavenburg (Eds.). *Behavioural approaches for children and adolescents* (pp. 103-111). doi: 10.1007/978-1-4757-9406-9_9

Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behaviour. *School Psychology Review, 41*(1), 47-65. Retrieved from: http://web.a.ebscohost.com.simsrad.net.ocs.mq.edu.au/

Pornari, C. D., & Wood, J. (2010). Peer and cyber aggression in secondary school students: The role of moral disengagement, hostile attribution bias, and outcome expectancies. *Aggressive Behaviour, 36*, 81-94. doi: 10.1002/ab.20336

Poulou, M. (2001). The role of vignettes in the research of emotional and behavioural difficulties. *Emotional and Behavioural Difficulties, 6*, 50-62. doi: 10.1080/13632750100507655

Pöyhönen, V., Juvonen, J., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). What does it take to stand up for the victim of bullying? The interplay between personal and social factors. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 56*, 143-163. doi: 10.1353/mpq.0.0046

Pozzoli, T., Gini, G., & Vieno, A. (2012). The role of individual correlates and class norms in defending and passive bystanding behaviour in bullying: A multilevel analysis. *Child Development, 83*, 1917-1931. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01831.x

Price, D., Green, D., Spears, B., Scrimgeour, M., Barnes, A., Geer, R., & Johnson, B. (2014). A qualitative exploration of cyber-bystanders and moral engagement. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling, 24*, 1-17. doi:

10.1017/jgc.2013.18

Rapee, R. M., Lyneham, H. J., Schniering, C. A., Wuthrich, V., Abbott, M. J., Hudson, J. L., & Wignall, A. (2006). *The Cool Kids® Child and Adolescent Anxiety Program Therapist Manual.* Sydney: Centre for Emotional Health, Macquarie University.

Richard, J. F., Schneider, B. H., & Mallet, P. (2012). Revisiting the whole-school approach to bullying: Really looking at the whole school. *School Psychology International, 33*, 263-284. doi: 10.1177/0143034311415906

Rigby, K. (2001). Health consequences of bullying and its prevention in schools. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 310-331). New York: The Guilford Press.

Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspectives on bullying.* London: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.

Rigby, K. (2011). What can schools do about cases of bullying? *Pastoral Care in Education, 29*, 273-285. doi: 10.1080/02643944.2011.626068

Rigby, K., & Bagshaw, D. (2003). Prospects of adolescent students collaborating with teachers in addressing issues of bullying and conflict in schools. *Educational Psychology, 23*, 535-546. doi: 10.1080/0144341032000123787

Rigby, K., & Barnes, A. (2002). To tell or not to tell: The victimised student's dilemma. *Youth Studies Australia, 21*(3), 33-36. Retrieved from: http://search.informit.com.au/

Rigby, K., & Johnson, B. (2005). Student bystanders in Australian schools. *Pastoral Care in Education, 23*, 10-16. doi: 10.1111/j.0264-3944.2005.00326.x

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. doi: 10.1080/01443410500342047

Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1991). Bullying among Australian school children: Reported

behaviour and attitudes toward victims. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 131*, 615-627, doi: 10.1080/00224545.1991.9924646

Rivers, I., & Smith, P. K. (1994). Types of bullying behaviour and their correlates. *Aggressive Behaviour, 20*(5), 359-368. Retrieved from: www.researchgate.net

Rocke Henderson, N. A. (2010). *Social problem-solving and emotion processes among early adolescent bystanders in hypothetical bullying situations.* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of British Columbia, Canada.

Rocke Henderson, N., & Hymel, S. (2011, March). *Peer responses to school bullying: The role of emotions and friendships in early adolescent bystanders' social problem-solving*. Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Montreal, Canada.

Rogowicz, S. T., Del Vecchio, T., Dwyer-Masin, T., & Hughes, E. M. (2014). The influence of aggressors' characteristics on teachers' responses to physical and relational aggression. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 30,* 355-374. doi: 10.1080/15377903.2014.950443

Roos, S., Salmivalli, C., & Hodges, E. V. (2011). Person x context effects on anticipated moral emotions following aggression. *Social Development, 20,* 685-702. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2011.00603.x

Rosen, P. J., Milich, R., & Harris, M. J. (2007). Victims of their own cognitions: Implicit social cognitions, emotional distress, and peer victimization. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 28,* 211-226. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2007.02.001

Roth, S., & Cohen, L. J. (1986). Approach, avoidance, and coping with stress. *American Psychologist, 41*, 813-819. doi: 10.1037/0003-066X.41.7.813

Rudolph, K. D., Abaied, J. L., Flynn, M., Sugimura, N., & Agoston, A. M. (2011). Developing relationships, being cool, and not looking like a loser: Social goal

orientation predicts children's responses to peer aggression. *Child Development, 82*, 1518-1530. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2011.01631.x

Russell, A. L. (1999). Peer estimates of school-aged boys' and girls' aggression to same- and cross-sex targets. *Social Development, 8*, 364-379. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00101

Saarento, S., Boulton, A., & Salmivalli, C. (2015). Reducing bullying and victimization: Student- and classroom-level mechanisms of change. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 43*, 61-76. doi: 10.1007/s10802-013-9841-x

Saarento, S., Garandeau, C. F., & Salmivalli, C. (2014). Classroom- and school-level contributions to bullying and victimization: A review. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology*, 25, 204-218. doi: 10.1002/casp.2207

Saarento, S., Kärnä, A., Hodges, E. V., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Student-, classroom-, and school-level risk factors for victimization. *Journal of School Psychology, 51*, 421-434. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2013.02.002

Sainio, M., Veenstra, R., Huitsing, G., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). Victims and their defenders: A dyadic approach. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 35*, 144-151. doi: 10.1177/0165025410378068

Sairanen, L., & Pfeffer, K. (2011). Self-reported handling of bullying among junior high school teachers in Finland. *School Psychology International, 32*, 330-344. doi: 10.1177/0143034311401795

Salmivalli, C. (1999). Participant role approach to school bullying: Implications for interventions. *Journal of Adolescence, 22*, 453-459. doi:10.1006/jado.1999.0239

Salmivalli, C., Karhunen, J., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1996). How do the victims respond to bullying? *Aggressive Behaviour, 22*, 99-109. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:2<99::AID-AB3>3.0.CO;2-P

Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A., & Voeten, M. (2005). Anti-bullying intervention:

Implementation and outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 75*, 465-487. doi: 10.1348/000709905X26011

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behaviour, 22*, 1-15. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:1<1::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-T

Salmivalli, C., & Poskiparta, E. (2012). Making bullying prevention a priority in Finnish schools: The KiVa antibullying program. *New Directions for Youth Development, 133,* 41-53. doi: 10.1002/yd.20006

Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviour in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioural Development, 28*, 246-258. doi: 10.1080/01650250344000488

Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behaviour in Classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology, 40*, 668-676. doi: 10.1080/15374416.2011.597090

Scambler, D. J., Harris, M. J., & Milich, R. (1998). Sticks and stones: Evaluations of responses to childhood teasing. *Social Development, 7*, 234-249. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00064

Schmidt, M. E., & Bagwell, C. L. (2007). The protective role of friendships in overtly and relationally victimized boys and girls. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly-Journal of Developmental Psychology, 53*, 439-460. doi: 10.1353/mpq.2007.0021

Schwartz, D., Proctor, L. J., & Chien, D. H. (2001). The aggressive victim of bullying. In J. Juvonen, & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 147-174). New York: The Guilford Press.

Shapiro, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Kessler, J. W. (1991). A three-component model of

children's teasing: Aggression, humor, and ambiguity. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 10,* 459-472. doi: 10.1521/jscp.1991.10.4.459

Sim, T. N., & Tan, M. M. (2013). Behavioural norms, moral judgments, and social approval of participant roles in school bullying in a Singapore sample. *Youth & Society, 45,* 184-200. doi: 10.1177/0044118x11410080

Skiba, R. J., & Peterson, R. L. (2000). School discipline at a crossroads: From zero tolerance to early response. *Exceptional Children, 66,* 335-346. doi: 10.1177/001440290006600305

Slonje, R., & Smith, P. K. (2008). Cyberbullying: Another main type of bullying? *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 49,* 147-154. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9450.2007.00611.x

Smith, P. K., & Brain, P. (2000). Bullying in schools: Lessons from two. *Aggressive Behaviour, 26,* 1-9. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(2000)26:1<1::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-7

Smith, P. K., Madsen, K. C., & Moody, J. C. (1999). What causes the age decline in reports of being bullied at school? Towards a developmental analysis of risks of being bullied. *Educational Research, 41,* 267-285. doi: 10.1080/0013188990410303

Smith, J. D., Schneider, B. H., Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2004). The effectiveness of whole-school antibullying programs: A synthesis of evaluation research. *School Psychology Review, 33*(4), 547-560. Retrieved from: http://njbullying.org/documents/smith2004.pdf

Smith, P. K., & Sharp, S. (Eds.). (1994). *School bullying: Insights and perspectives*. London: Routledge.

Smith, P. K., & Shu, S. (2000). What good schools can do about bullying: Findings from a survey in English schools after a decade of research and action.

Childhood, 7, 193-212. doi: 10.1177/0907568200007002005

Smith, P. K., Shu, S., & Madsen, K. (2001). Characteristics of victims of school bullying: Developmental changes in coping strategies and skills. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 332-351). New York: The Guilford Press.

Smith, P. K., Talamelli, L., Cowie, H., Naylor, P., & Chauhan, P. (2004). Profiles of non-victims, escaped victims, continuing victims and new victims of school bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 74*, 565-581. doi: 10.1348/0007099042376427

Smith, H., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Marshall, M. L., Ruffner, C., & Graybill, E. C. (2010). Teachers' perceptions of teasing in schools. *Journal of School Violence, 9*, 2-22. doi: 10.1080/15388220903185522

Solberg, M. E., & Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behaviour, 29*, 239-268. doi: 10.1002/ab.10047

Spears, B. A., Campbell, M., Tangen, D., Slee, P. T., & Cross, D. (2015). Australian pre-service teachers' knowledge and understanding of cyberbullying: Implications for school climate. Special edition on School Climate and Cyberbullying. *Les Dossiers des Sciences de l' Éducation.* Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/8081844/Spears_B.A._Campbell_M._Tangen_D._Sell_P.T._and_Cross_D._in_press_Australian_Pre-service_Teachers_Knowledge_and_Understanding_of_Cyberbullying_Implications_for_School_Climate

Spence, S. H., De Young, A., Toon, C., & Bond, S. (2009). Longitudinal examination of the associations between emotional dysregulation, coping responses to peer provocation, and victimization in children. *Australian Journal of Psychology,*

61, 145-155. doi: 10.1080/00049530802259076

Stockdale, M. S., Hangaduambo, S., Duys, D., Larson, K., & Sarvela, P. D. (2002). Rural elementary students', parents', and teachers' perceptions of bullying. *American Journal of Health Behaviour, 26,* 266-277. doi: 10.5993/AJHB.26.4.3

Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Expanding the social-ecological framework of bullying among youth: Lessons learned from the past and directions for the future. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in North American Schools* (2nd ed.) (pp. 3-10). New York: Routledge.

Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying? *Educational Researcher, 39,* 38-47. doi: 10.3102/0013189X09357622

Swearer, S. M., Peugh, J., Espelage, D. L., Siebecker, A. B., Kingsbury, W. L., & Bevins, K. S. (2006). A social-ecological model for bullying prevention and intervention in early adolescence: An exploratory examination. In S. R. Jimerson, & M. J. Furlong (Eds.), *The Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 257–273). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistic* (6th ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

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

Tattum, D., & Tattum, E. (1992). Bullying: A whole-school response. In N. Jones & E. Baglin-Jones (Eds.), *Learning to Behave* (pp. 67-84). London: Kogan Page.

Tenenbaum, L. S., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., & Parris, L. (2011). Coping strategies and perceived effectiveness in fourth through eighth grade victims of bullying. *School Psychology International, 32,* 263-287. doi: 10.1177/0143034311402309

Teräsahjo, T., & Salmivalli, C. (2003). "She is not actually bullied." The discourse of harassment in student groups. *Aggressive Behaviour, 29,* 134-154. doi: 10.1002/ab.10045

Terranova, A. M. (2009). Factors that influence children's responses to peer victimization. *Child and Youth Care Forum,* 38, 252-271. doi: 10.1007/s10566-009-9082-x

Thornberg, R., Halldin, K., Bolmsjö, N., & Petersson, A. (2013). Victimising of school bullying: A grounded theory. *Research Papers in Education, 28,* 309-329. doi: 10.1080/02671522.2011.641999

Thornberg, R., Tenenbaum, L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Jungert, T., & Vanegas, G. (2012). Bystander motivation in bullying incidents: To intervene or not to intervene? *The Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, 13,* 247-252. doi: 0.5811/westjem.2012.3.11792

Trach, J., Hymel, S., Waterhouse, T., & Neale, K. (2010). Bystander responses to school bullying: A cross-sectional investigation of grade and sex differences. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 25*, 114-130. doi: 10.1177/0829573509357553

Troop-Gordon, W., & Ladd, G. (2015). Teachers' victimization-related beliefs and strategies: Associations with students' aggressive behaviour and peer victimization. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, *43*, 45-60. doi: 10.1007/s10802-013-9840-y

Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology, 7,* 27-56. doi: 10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1

Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., & Lösel, F. (2012). School bullying as a predictor of violence later in life: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective

longitudinal studies. *Aggression and Violent Behaviour, 17,* 405-418. doi:10.1016/j.avb.2012.05.002

Tu, K. M., Erath, S. A., & Flanagan, K. S. (2012). Can socially adept friends protect peer-victimized early adolescents against lower academic competence? *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 33*, 24-30. doi: 10.1016/j.appdev.2011.09.002

Underwood, M. K., Galenand, B. R., & Paquette, J. A. (2001). Top ten challenges for understanding gender and aggression in children: Why can't we all just get along? *Social Development, 10,* 248-266. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00162

Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying Is Power. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*, 157-176. doi: 10.1300/J008v19n02_10

van Goethem, A. A., Scholte, R. H., & Wiers, R. W. (2010). Explicit-and implicit bullying attitudes in relation to bullying behaviour. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 38,* 829-842. doi 10.1007/s10802-010-9405-2

Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Huitsing, G., Sainio, M., & Salmivalli, C. (2014). The role of teachers in bullying: The relation between antibullying attitudes, efficacy, and efforts to reduce bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 106,* 1135-1143. doi: 10.1037/a0036110

Vessey, J. A., DiFazio, R. L., & Strout, T. D. (2013). Youth bullying: A review of the science and call to action. *Nursing Outlook, 61,* 337-345. doi: 10.1016/j.outlook.2013.04.011

Waasdorp, T. E., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2011). Examining student responses to frequent bullying: A latent class approach. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 103,* 336-352. doi: 10.1037/a0022747

Watson, P. (2014, October 2). Rules of thumb on magnitudes of effect sizes [MRC Cognition and Brain Sciences Unit Wiki]. Retrieved from http://imaging.mrc-

cbu.cam.ac.uk/statswiki/FAQ/effectSize

Whitney, I., & Smith, P. K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research, 35*, 3-25. doi: 10.1080/0013188930350101

Whittaker, E., & Kowalski, R. M. (2014). Cyberbullying via social media. *Journal of School Violence,* 14, 11-29. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2014.949377

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

Yoon, J. S., & Barton, E. (2008). The role of teachers in school violence and bullying prevention. In T. Miller (Ed.), *School violence and primary prevention* (pp. 249-275). New York, NY: Springer.

Yoon, J. S., & Bauman, S. (2014). Teachers: A critical but overlooked component of bullying prevention and intervention. *Theory into Practice, 53,* 308-314. doi: 10.1080/00405841.2014.947226

Yoon, J. S., Bauman, S., Choi, T., & Hutchinson, A. S. (2011). How South Korean teachers handle an incident of school bullying. *School Psychology International*, *32*, 312-329. doi: 10.1177/0143034311402311

Yoon, J. S., & Kerber, K. (2003). Bullying: Elementary teachers' attitudes and intervention strategies. *Research in Education, 69,* 27-35. doi: 10.7227/RIE.69.3

Yoon, J. S., Sulkowski, M. L., & Bauman, S. A. (2014). Teachers' responses to bullying incidents: Effects of teacher characteristics and contexts. *Journal of School Violence,* 1-23. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2014.96359

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Hypothetical Videotaped Bullying Scenarios

Verbal Bullying Scenarios:

Location: Bench

The victim is sitting alone at a bench in the playground writing in his or her notebook when the bully approaches.

Bully Comment: *In a mean and mocking tone:*

"Well if it isn't the teacher's pet, I always thought you were a bit of a dog."

- **Angry victim response:** *In a loud, aggressive tone and with an angry facial expression:*
  "Shut up moron, at least I'm not a cow like you!"
- **Sad victim response:** *Looks down with a sad facial expression.*
- **Confident victim response:** *Looks up at the bully and with a slight shoulder shrug, he or she replies in a calm, confident tone:*
  "Well everyone seems to like dogs."
- **Ignoring victim response:** *Does not acknowledge the bully at all and continues writing in his or her notebook with a neutral facial expression.*

Location: Drinking Fountain

The victim is drinking from the drinking fountain in the playground when the bully approaches.

Bully Comment: *In a mean and mocking tone:*

"It seems like the school freak is really thirsty today, aren't you dimwit?"

- **Angry victim response:** *In a loud, aggressive tone with angry facial expression:*
  "Shut up you moron, you're the freak!"
- **Sad victim response:** *Looks down with a sad facial expression.*
- **Confident victim response:** *Looks up at the bully and with a slight shrug of the shoulders, he or she replies in a calm, confident tone:*
  "I did feel like a drink."
- **Ignoring victim response:** *Does not acknowledge the bully at all and continues drinking.*

Location: Gate

The victim is crouched over his or her school bag near the school gate rearranging some school books when the bully approaches.

Bully Comment: *In a mean and mocking tone:*

"Hey, Loser! Bet the baby is excited to go home to their mummy."

- **Angry victim response:** *In a loud, aggressive tone and with an angry facial expression:*
  "Shut up you idiot, you're the baby!"
- **Sad victim response:** *Looks down with a sad facial expression.*
- **Confident victim response:** *Looks up at the bully and with a slight shoulder shrug, he or she replies in a calm, confident tone:*
  "Going home sounds good to me."
- **Ignoring victim response:** *Does not acknowledge the bully at all and continues re-arranging school books with a neutral facial expression.*

Location: Hall

The victim is walking down the hall towards the classroom holding his or her school books when the bully approaches him or her from behind.

Bully Comment: *In a mean and mocking tone:*

"Better run along to class and learn something airhead, maybe it'll help you become less stupid."

- **Angry victim response:** *In a loud, aggressive tone and with an angry facial expression:*
  "Shut up dummy, at least I'm not as thick as you!"
- **Sad victim response:** *Looks down with a sad facial expression.*
- **Confident victim response:** *Looks up at the bully and with a slight should shrug, he or she replies in a calm, confident tone:*
  "We'll soon see."
- **Ignoring victim response:** *Does not acknowledge the bully at all and continues walking down the hall with a neutral facial expression.*

Physical Bullying Scenarios:

Location: Bench

The victim is sitting alone at a bench in the playground eating a sandwich when the bully approaches.

Bully Action: *Pushes victim from behind so he or she slips off the bench and drops the sandwich and says in a sarcastic tone:* "Woops!".

- **Angry victim response:** *With an angry expression, picks up the sandwich and throws it back at the bully while yelling in a loud, aggressive tone:*
  "Take that dimwit!"

- **Sad victim response:** *Looks down with a sad facial expression and says in a quiet, fragile tone:*
  "I guess that's the end of my lunch".
- **Confident victim response:** *Looks up at the bully and with a slight shoulder shrug, he or she replies in a calm, confident tone:*
  "My sandwich didn't see that one coming."
- **Ignoring victim response:** *Does not acknowledge the bully at al. Sits back on the bench with a neutral facial expression and begins eating the other half of his or her sandwich*

Location: Drinking Fountain

The victim is wearing his or her school backpack while drinking from the drinking fountain in the playground when the bully approaches.

Bully Action: *Grabs at the victim's school bag roughly.*

- **Angry victim response:** *Grabs at bully's school bag in retaliation with angry facial expression and yells in loud, aggressive tone:*
  "How do you like that airhead?"
- **Sad victim response:** *Looks down with a sad facial expression.*
- **Confident victim response:** *Looks up at the bully and with a slight shoulder shrug, he or she replies in a calm, confident tone:*
  "There's nothing like a piggy back."
- **Ignoring victim response:** *Does not acknowledge the bully at all and continues drinking.*

Location: Gate

The victim is crouched over his or her school bag near the school gate rearranging some school books when the bully approaches.

Bully Action: *Kicks the victim from behind with a smirk.*

- **Angry victim response:** *Tries to grab back at the bully's leg while yelling in an aggressive tone and with an angry facial expression:*
  "Get lost you idiot!"
- **Sad victim response:** *Looks down with a sad facial expression and says quietly:*
  "Ow."
- **Confident victim response:** *Looks up at the bully and with a slight shoulder shrug, he or she replies in a calm, confident tone:*
  "That's one way to practice soccer skills."
- **Ignoring victim response:** *Does not acknowledge the bully at all and continues rearranging his or her books with a neutral facial expression.*

Location: Hall

The bully is leaning against the wall in the hallway, when the victim walks past him or her holding school books.

Bully Action: *The bully kicks out his or her foot in front of the victim so that he or she trips over. The bully smiles and laughs.*

- **Angry victim response:** *In a loud, aggressive tone and with an angry facial expression:*
  "Get lost you moron!"

- **Sad victim response:** *Looks down with a sad facial expression.*
- **Confident victim response:** *Looks up at the bully and with a slight shoulder shrug, he or she replies in a calm, confident tone:* "That was some fancy footwork."
- **Ignoring victim response:** *Does not acknowledge the bully at all, stands up, and continues walking down the hall with a neutral facial expression.*

Appendix B

Validation of the Hypothetical Videotaped Bullying Scenarios

Method

Sixteen postgraduate psychology students (M_{age} = 34.88 years, *SD* = 9.51, 5 males) with experience in developmental and clinical psychology validated the victim responses displayed in the videos. These participants were blind to the study's design and hypotheses. Participants were randomly allocated to watch eight videos, such that they viewed each of the four victim responses both within physical bullying scenarios involving females and within verbal bullying scenarios involving males or vice versa. For each video, fifteen ratings describing the victim's response ("aggressive", "angry", "annoyed", "assertive", "calm", "confident", "ignoring", "nonchalant", "passive", "provocative", "sad", "scared", "self-assured", "unaffected", "upset") were provided using a 5-point rating scale (1 = *not at all* to 5 = *very much*). These ratings were selected based on a review of literature examining victims' responses to bullying. Using the same 5-point rating scale, participants also rated the extent to which they considered the videos to be "realistic" and "believable".

Data Analytic Strategy

Using an overall alpha of .05, a series of mixed model analyses were computed to validate the victim responses portrayed in the videos. Bonferroni adjustments were made when testing victim response paired comparisons and follow-up simple effects for each level of the interacting factor (e.g., separately for each bullying type).

Believability of the Videos

The videos were rated as both realistic (*M* = 4.07, *SD* = 0.96) and believable (*M* = 4.06, *SD* = 0.95), with means falling above the "Quite a Bit" anchor. The extent to which videos were rated as realistic and believable did not vary by victim response, student gender, or bullying type.

Victim Response Ratings

Descriptive statistics for all ratings organised by victim response and based on the estimated marginal means are displayed in Table A1. A series of mixed model analyses were then conducted on each of these variables. For variables where victim response interacted with bullying type or student gender, additional descriptive statistics are presented in Table A1 separated by these latter variables. A significant student gender main effect was found for the assertive variable, F (1, 98) = 4.40, p = .04. Male victims (M = 2.41, SD = 0.60) were rated as more assertive than female victims (M = 2.03, SD = 0.60), MD = .38, SE = .18, p = .04. Several significant bullying type main effects were obtained with relevant descriptive and inferential statistics presented in Table A2. Victims were rated as more angry, annoyed, and passive, and less calm and assertive, in physical bullying situations compared to verbal bullying situations.

Significant victim response main effects were obtained for all variables (Table A1). Table A3 displays the inferential statistics for the post-hoc analyses. Angry victims were rated as less calm and more angry, aggressive, provocative, and annoyed compared to the other victims. Sad victims were rated as more scared than the other victims. Sad victims were also rated as less calm compared to confident and ignoring victims and more annoyed compared to ignoring victims. Angry and sad victims were rated as more upset than confident and ignoring victims. Confident and ignoring victims were rated as more nonchalant and unaffected compared to angry and sad victims. Sad victims were rated as less confident compared to the other victims. Ignoring victims were also rated as less confident compared to confident victims. Sad and ignoring victims were rated as more passive compared to angry and confident victims. Ignoring victims were rated as ignoring the bully more than the other victims. Sad and confident victims were also rated as ignoring the bully more than angry victims.

Table A1

Descriptive Statistics Organised by Victim Response (and Other Significant Interacting Variables) and Inferential Statistics Pertaining to Victim Response Main Effects for all Variables

	Angry Victim		Sad Victim		Confident Victim		Ignoring Victim		Variance Explained	Victim Response Main Effect	
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	R^2	*F(3, 98)*	*p*
Aggressive	3.53	0.96	1.38	0.96	1.47	0.96	1.66	0.96	0.33	33.96	< .001*
Angry	3.69	0.66	1.66	0.66	1.50	0.66	1.22	0.66	0.60	88.06	< .001*
Annoyed	3.66	0.73	2.22	0.73	1.75	0.73	1.63	0.73	0.48	43.01	< .001*
Assertive	2.60	0.77	1.13	0.77	3.34	0.77	1.81	0.77	0.43	28.89	< .001*
Physical Bullying	2.50	1.05	1.13	1.05	2.50	1.05	1.81	1.05			
Verbal Bullying	2.69	1.05	1.13	1.05	4.19	1.05	1.81	1.05			
Calm	1.78	0.93	2.53	0.93	3.47	0.93	3.41	0.93	0.24	18.10	< .001*
Confident	3.22	0.79	1.38	0.79	3.75	0.79	2.63	0.79	0.40	28.85	< .001*
Ignoring	1.16	0.80	2.63	0.80	2.19	0.80	4.06	0.80	0.46	40.49	< .001*
Nonchalant	1.56	0.83	1.66	0.83	3.31	0.83	3.03	0.83	0.31	23.39	< .001*

Passive	1.31	0.91	3.81	0.91	1.97	0.91	3.22	0.91	0.41	28.73	< .001*
Provocative	2.75	1.12	1.44	1.12	1.63	1.12	1.72	1.12	0.11	11.51	< .001*
Sad	1.56	0.75	3.59	0.75	1.59	0.75	1.97	0.75	0.43	37.45	< .001*
Male Victims	1.75	0.98	3.19	0.98	1.56	0.98	1.69	0.98			
Female Victims	1.38	0.98	4.00	0.98	1.63	0.98	2.25	0.98			
Scared	1.47	0.73	2.78	0.73	1.47	0.73	1.47	0.73	0.26	20.45	< .001*
Self-assured	3.16	0.79	1.34	0.79	3.66	0.79	2.97	0.79	0.39	26.04	< .001*
Physical Bullying	3.25	1.12	1.38	1.12	3.06	1.12	3.00	1.12			
Verbal Bullying	3.06	1.12	1.31	1.12	4.25	1.12	2.94	1.12			
Unaffected	1.53	0.89	1.56	0.89	3.13	0.89	3.56	0.89	0.33	25.62	< .001*
Upset	3.31	0.81	3.44	0.81	1.50	0.81	1.91	0.81	0.40	40.04	< .001*

* indicates significance at a .05 level.

Table A2

Descriptive and Inferential Statistics for Significant Bullying Type Main Effects

	Physical Bullying		Verbal Bullying		Bullying Type Main Effect			
Variable	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*	*F(1, 98)*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*
Angry	2.20	0.14	1.83	0.14	9.71	.38	.12	.002*
Annoyed	2.64	0.15	1.98	0.15	21.34	.66	.14	< .001*
Assertive	1.98	0.15	2.45	0.15	6.88	.47	.18	.01*
Calm	2.61	0.19	2.98	0.19	3.97	.38	.19	.05*
Passive	2.84	0.17	2.31	0.17	6.23	.53	.21	.01*

* indicates significance at a .05 level.

Several significant interactions were also obtained and simple effects analyses were conducted using a nominal alpha of .004 (Table A3). There was a significant Student Gender × Victim Response interaction for ratings of how sad victims appeared, F (3, 98) = 2.84, p = .04 (see descriptive statistics in Table A1). Simple effects analyses separated by student gender revealed that sad victims were rated as sadder than the other victims across both genders. Simple effects analyses separated by victim response revealed that females rated sad victims as significantly more sad compared to males, p = .01. A significant Bullying Type × Victim Response interaction was obtained for ratings of how assertive victims appeared, F (1, 98) = 5.23, p = .002 (see descriptive statistics in Table A1). Simple effects analyses separated by bullying type revealed that, in verbal bullying situations, confident victims were rated as more assertive compared to the other victims. In physical bullying situations, confident victims were rated as more assertive than sad victims. Angry victims were also rated as more assertive than sad victims across both types of bullying. Simple effects analyses separated by victim response revealed that confident victims were rated as significantly more assertive in verbal bullying compared to physical bullying situations, p < .001. There was also a significant Bullying Type × Victim Response interaction for ratings of how self-assured victims appeared, F (1, 98) = 2.73, p = .05 (see descriptive statistics in Table A1). Simple effects analyses separated by bullying type revealed that sad victims were rated as less self-assured compared to the other victims across both types of bullying. Furthermore, in verbal bullying situations, angry and ignoring victims were both rated as less self-assured than confident victims. Simple effects analyses separated by victim response revealed that confident victims were rated as significantly more self-assured in verbal bullying compared to physical bullying situations, p = .003.

Table A3

Inferential Statistics for Victim Response Pairwise Comparisons and Simple Effects Analyses.

Pairwise Comparison:	Angry vs. Sad Victim			Angry vs. Confident Victim			Angry vs. Ignoring Victim		
Dependent Variable	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*
Aggressive	2.16	.25	< .001*	2.06	.25	< .001*	1.88	.25	< .001*
Angry	2.01	.17	< .001*	2.19	.17	< .001*	2.47	.17	< .001*
Annoyed	1.44	.20	< .001*	1.91	.20	< .001*	2.03	.20	< .001*
Assertive									
Physical Bullying	1.38	.36	< .001*	< .001	.36	1.00	0.69	.36	.06
Verbal Bullying	1.56	.36	< .001*	1.50	.36	< .001*	0.88	.36	.02
Calm	0.75	.27	.006*	1.69	.27	< .001*	1.63	.27	< .001*
Confident	1.84	.27	< .001*	0.53	.27	.05	0.59	.27	.03
Ignoring	1.47	.27	< .001*	1.03	.27	< .001*	2.91	.27	< .001*
Nonchalant	0.09	.27	.73	1.75	.27	< .001*	1.47	.27	< .001*

Passive	2.50	.30	< .001*	0.66	.30	.03	1.91	.30	< .001*
Provocative	1.31	.25	< .001*	1.13	.25	< .001	1.03	.25	< .001
Sad									
Male Victims	1.44	.31	< .001*	0.19	.31	.55	0.06	.31	.84
Female Victims	2.63	.31	< .001*	0.25	.31	.43	0.88	.31	.006
Scared	1.31	.21	< .001*	< .001	.21	1.00	< .001	.21	1.00
Self-assured									
Physical Bullying	1.88	.39	< .001*	0.19	.39	.63	0.25	.39	.53
Verbal Bullying	1.75	.39	< .001*	1.19	.39	.003*	0.13	.39	.75
Unaffected	0.03	.29	.92	1.59	.29	< .001*	2.03	.29	< .001*
Upset	0.13	.22	.57	1.81	.22	< .001*	1.41	.22	< .001*

Pairwise Comparison:	Sad vs. Confident Victim			Sad vs. Ignoring Victim			Confident vs. Ignoring Victim		
Dependent Variable	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*	*MD*	*SE*	*p*
Aggressive	0.09	.25	.71	0.28	.25	.26	0.19	.25	.45
Angry	0.16	.17	.36	0.44	.17	.01	0.28	.17	.10
Annoyed	0.47	.20	0.02	0.59	.20	.004*	0.13	.20	.54
Assertive									
Physical Bullying	1.38	.36	< .001*	0.69	.36	.06	0.69	.36	0.06
Verbal Bullying	1.38	.36	< .001*	0.69	.36	.06	2.38	.36	< .001*
Calm	0.94	.27	.001*	0.88	.27	.001*	0.06	.27	.82
Confident	2.38	.27	< .001*	1.25	.27	< .001*	1.13	.27	< .001*
Ignoring	0.44	.27	.11	1.44	.27	< .001*	1.88	.27	< .001*
Nonchalant	1.66	.27	< .001*	1.38	.27	< .001*	0.28	.27	.29

Passive	1.84	.30	< .001*	0.59	.30	.05	1.25	.30	< .001*
Provocative	0.19	.25	.45	0.28	.25	.26	0.09	.25	.70
Sad									
Male Victims	1.63	.31	< .001*	1.50	.31	< .001*	0.13	.31	.69
Female Victims	2.38	.31	< .001*	1.75	.31	< .001*	0.63	.31	.05
Scared	1.31	.21	< .001*	1.31	.21	< .001*	< .001	.21	1.00
Self-assured									
Physical Bullying	1.69	.39	< .001*	1.63	.39	< .001*	0.06	.39	.87
Verbal Bullying	2.94	.39	< .001*	1.63	.39	< .001*	1.31	.39	.001*
Unaffected	1.56	.29	< .001*	2.00	.29	< .001*	0.44	.29	.14
Upset	1.94	.22	< .001*	1.53	.22	< .001*	0.41	.22	.07

* indicates significance at the Bonferroni corrected alpha value.

Appendix C

Student Questionnaire Measures Utilised in Papers 1 and 3

Demographic Information:

Gender: ☐ Boy ☐ Girl School grade: ☐ Year 5 ☐ Year 7

Age: _____ Years Date of Birth: Date/Month/Year = ____/____/____

Place where I was born:

- ☐ Australia or New Zealand
- ☐ Asia (e.g., China, Vietnam, Philippines, India, Malaysia)
- ☐ Europe (e.g., England, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Germany)
- ☐ Middle East or North Africa (e.g., Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey)
- ☐ North America (e.g., USA or Canada)
- ☐ Other (e.g., Africa, Central America, South America, Fiji) – Please write:

Place where my mother was born:

- ☐ Australia or New Zealand
- ☐ Asia (e.g., China, Vietnam, Philippines, India, Malaysia)
- ☐ Europe (e.g., England, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Germany)
- ☐ Middle East or North Africa (e.g., Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey)
- ☐ North America (e.g., USA or Canada)
- ☐ Other (e.g., Africa, Central America, South America, Fiji) – Please write:

Place where my father was born:

- ☐ Australia or New Zealand
- ☐ Asia (e.g., China, Vietnam, Philippines, India, Malaysia)
- ☐ Europe (e.g., England, Ireland, Italy, Greece, Germany)
- ☐ Middle East or North Africa (e.g., Lebanon, Egypt, Turkey)
- ☐ North America (e.g., USA or Canada)
- ☐ Other (e.g., Africa, Central America, South America, Fiji) – Please write:

Video Ratings:

All items were rated using a 5-point rating scale: 1 = Not at All, 2 = Just a Little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = Quite a Bit, 5 = Very Much.

Baseline Liking

Please rate what you think about each of the students in the photos below.

- I like Student A
- I like Student B
- I like Student C
- I like Student D

Manipulation Check

On the outside, Student 2 seemed to be…

- Angry
- Sad
- Confident
- Calmly ignoring Student 1

Dependent Variables Organised by Group

Attitudes towards the victim. (Adapted from Gini, 2008*).

Please answer the following questions about Student 2.

- I like Student 2
- I dislike Student 2
- I think Student 2 deserved what happened to them
- I blame Student 2 for what happened to them

Perceptions of the victimisation. (Adapted from Craig, Henderson et al., 2000*). Please provide your opinions.

- I think this situation was serious
- I think what Student 1 did to Student 2 was "bullying"

- On the inside, I think Student 2 was feeling upset

Emotional reactions. (Adapted from Litvak-Miller & Mc Dougall, 1997*)

Please answer the following questions about Student 2.

- I tried to think about what things were like for Student 2
- I tried to think about how Student 2 was feeling
- It upset me when I saw what happened to Student 2
- I felt sorry for Student 2

Watching the video made me feel…

- Angry
- Sad

Behavioural intentions. (Adapted from Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al., 1996*).

If you saw this happen at school, how likely would you be to...

- Tell Student 1 to stop
- Stand up for Student 2
- Comfort Student 2
- Go tell a teacher
- Stand by and mind my own business
- Do nothing and not get involved

Evaluations of the victim responses. Please provide your opinions.

- I think that Student 2 handled this situation well
- I think Student 2 will be picked on again

Participants' Own Responses to Bullying:

Quantitative Items

As you saw in the videos, different students respond differently when another student says/does something hurtful to them at school. If this happened to you at school, how likely would you be to respond in each of the following ways?

- I would get angry and say something back
- I would look away sadly and not say anything back
- I would say something in a confident voice
- I would stay calm and ignore them

Qualitative Items

- Describe in your own words what you would be most likely to do if another student said/did something hurtful to you at school.
- Briefly describe why you would respond this way.

Participants' Personal Experiences with Bullying:

All items were rated using a 6-point rating scale: 1 = Not at all in the past term, 2 = About once in the past term, 3 = A couple of times in the past term, 4 = Many times in the past term, 5 = Every week of the past term, 6 = Many times a week in the past term.

Bullying Definition (Adapted from Olweus, 1994*)

Please read the following definition of school bullying:

We say a student is being bullied when one student is repeatedly harassed and picked on by one or a group of students. For example:

- Physical bullying is when someone hits, shoves or kicks another student or hurts them with physical actions.
- Verbal bullying is when someone says mean and hurtful things to another student or makes fun of them by calling them mean or hurtful names.

These things may take place frequently and it is difficult for the student being bullied to defend themselves. We don't call it bullying when two students of about the same strength or power argue or fight.

Personal Experiences with Bullying (Adapted from Barchia & Bussey, 2011*)

Think about your experiences during the past term with other students at your school.

Bullying. In the past term, how often have you bullied someone at school in the following ways?

- Kicked, hit or punched someone
- Shoved or pushed someone
- Physically bullied in another way
- Called someone mean or hurtful names
- Said mean or hurtful things to someone
- Verbally bullied in another way

Victimisation. In the past term, how often have you been bullied at school in the following ways?

- Been kicked, hit or punched by someone
- Been shoved or pushed by someone
- Been physically bullied in another way
- Been called mean or hurtful names
- Had mean or hurtful things said to you
- Been verbally bullied in another way

Witnessing. In the past term, how often have you seen a student being bullied at school in the following ways?

- Kicked, hit or punched someone
- Shoved or pushed someone
- Physically bullied in another way
- Called someone mean or hurtful names
- Said mean or hurtful things to someone
- Verbally bullied in another way

Defending. In the past term, how often have stood up for a student who was being bullied at school in the following ways?

- Kicked, hit or punched someone
- Shoved or pushed someone
- Physically bullied in another way
- Called someone mean or hurtful names
- Said mean or hurtful things to someone
- Verbally bullied in another way

* Modifications to questionnaire items were made to improve comprehensibility and to fit the purpose of the current research.

Appendix D

Teacher Questionnaire Measures Utilised in Papers 2 and 4

Demographic Information:

Please provide the following information about yourself.

1. Gender: ☐ Male ☐ Female
2. Age: _____ years
3. Ethnicity or cultural group: ☐ White/Caucasian
   ☐ Asian
   ☐ Middle Eastern
   ☐ Aboriginal/Pacific Islander
   ☐ Other. Please write here:
   _____
4. Highest level of education completed: ☐ Bachelor's degree
   ☐ Honours degree
   ☐ Master's degree
   ☐ PhD or Doctoral degree
5. I completed most of my teaching training in:
   ☐ Australia or New Zealand ☐ Other, please specify _____
6. Years of teaching experience: _____ years
7. Years I have taught at the school where I am currently working: _____ years
8. I am currently working as a teacher: ☐ Full-Time ☐ Part-Time ☐ Casual
9. At the current time, I predominantly teach:
   ☐ Primary School ☐ High School
10. The grade/s I have experience teaching (write all that apply): Year/s _____
11. The school I teach at is:
    ☐ All Boys ☐ All Girls ☐ Mixed Boys and Girls

12. I teach at a:

☐ Government School ☐ Catholic School ☐ Independent School

13. The school where I teach includes the following age groups:

Year _____ through to Year _____

14. The typical family SES of students at this school is:

☐ Lower Class

☐ Lower Middle Class

☐ Middle Class

☐ Upper Middle Class

☐ Upper Class

15. In which state or territory of Australia is this school located? _____

Video Ratings:

All items were rated using a 5-point rating scale: 1 = Not at All, 2 = Just a Little, 3 = Somewhat, 4 = Quite a Bit, 5 = Very Much.

Baseline Liking

Please rate what you think about each of the students in the photos below.

- o I like Student A
- o I like Student B
- o I like Student C
- o I like Student D
- o I like Student E
- o I like Student F
- o I like Student G
- o I like Student H

Manipulation Check Items

On the outside, Student 2 seemed to be…

- o Angry
- o Sad
- o Confident
- o Ignoring Student 1

Dependent Variables Organised by Group

Attributions of blame (Adapted from Gini, 2008 and Nesdale & Pickering, 2006*). Please answer the following questions about Student 2.

- I blame Student 2 for what happened
- I think Student 2 deserved what happened to him or her

Please answer the following questions about Student 1.

- I blame Student 1 for what happened
- I think Student 1 should be punished for what happened

Perceptions of the victimisation. (Adapted from Craig, Henderson, et al., 2000*). Please provide your opinions.

- I think this situation was serious
- I think what Student 1 did to Student 2 was "bullying"
- On the inside, I think Student 2 was feeling upset

Emotional reactions. Please answer the following questions about Student 2. (Adapted from Litvak-Miller & Mc Dougall, 1997*)

- I tried to think about what things were like for Student 2
- I tried to think about how Student 2 was feeling
- It upset me when I saw what happened to Student 2
- I felt sorry for Student 2

Watching the video made me feel…

- Angry
- Sad
- Upset

Behavioural intentions. (Adapted from Bauman et al., 2008*). If you saw this happen at school, how likely would you be to respond in each of the following ways?

- I would insist that Student 1 "cut it out."
- I would discuss with Student 1 ways he or she could improve the situation.
- I would make sure that Student 1 was suitably punished.
- I would encourage Student 1 to think about how it would feel if he or she were in Student 2's position.
- I would talk with both students *separately* to find out more about the history and context of their interaction.
- I would talk with both students *together* to find out more about the history and context of their interaction.
- I would ask Student 2 if he or she is okay and suggest telling a teacher if this happens again.
- I would encourage Student 2 to behave in a way that shows he or she cannot be intimidated.
- I would refer the matter to other school personnel (e.g., principal, vice-principal, school counsellor)
- I would contact Student 1 and/or Student 2's parents to discuss the situation.
- I would let the students sort it out themselves.

Evaluations of the victim responses. Please provide your opinions.

- I think that Student 2 handled this situation well
- I think Student 2 will be picked on again

Teachers' Advised Responses to Bullying:

As you saw in the videos, different students respond differently when another student says or does something hurtful to them at school.

- Briefly describe how you would advise a female student in late primary school/early high school to respond when another student says something hurtful to her at school.
- How (if at all) would this advice differ if you were advising a male student in late primary school/early high school?
- Briefly describe why you would advise the female and male students to respond in these ways.

Additional Teacher Questionnaires:

All items were rated using a 6-point rating scale: 1 = Not at all in the past term, 2 = About once in the past term, 3 = A couple of times in the past term, 4 = Many times in the past term, 5 = Every week of the past term, 6 = Many times a week in the past term.

Bullying Definition (Adapted from Olweus, 1994*)

Please read the following definition of school bullying:

We say a student is being bullied when one student is repeatedly harassed and picked on by one or a group of students. For example:

- Physical bullying is when someone hits, shoves or kicks another student or hurts them with physical actions.
- Verbal bullying is when someone says mean and hurtful things to another student or makes fun of them by calling them mean or hurtful names.

These things may take place frequently and it is difficult for the student being bullied to defend themselves. We don't call it bullying when two students of about the same strength or power argue or fight.

Exposure to School Bullying (Adapted from Barchia & Bussey, 2011*). *Rated on a 6-point rating scale: 1 = Not at all in the past term, 2 = About once in the past term, 3 = A couple of times in the past term, 4 = Many times in the past term, 5 = Every week of the past term, 6 = Many times a week in the past term.*

Witnessing. In the past term, how often have you personally witnessed students bullying other students at your school in the following ways?

Reporting. In the past term, how often have you had the following types of bullying reported to you by students?

- Called someone mean or hurtful names
- Said mean or hurtful things to someone
- Kicked, hit or punched someone
- Shoved or pushed someone

Self-Efficacy for Dealing with Bullying (Adapted from Bauman et al., 2008*). *Rated on a* 5*-point rating scale: 1 = Not well at all, 2 = Not too well, 3 = Pretty well, 4 = Very well, 5 = Extremely well.*

How well can you use the following techniques when dealing with school bullying?

- Firmly tell the bully that his or her behaviour will not be tolerated
- Discipline the bully and make sure he or she is suitably punished
- Discuss with the bully what he or she can do to improve the situation
- Encourage the bully to think about how he or she would feel if he or she were in the victim's position
- Talk with both students separately to find out more about the history and context of their interaction
- Talk with both students together to find out more about the history and context of their interaction
- Provide support for the victim
- Teach the victim to behave in a way that shows he or she cannot be intimidated
- Consult other school personnel about bullying incidents (e.g., principal, school counsellor, other teachers)

- Contact parents to discuss bullying incidents

Basic Empathy Scale (Joliffe & Farrington, 2006). 20-item scale assessing cognitive and affective empathy. For full measure, contact: Darrick Jolliffe (dj39@leicester.ac.uk)

Rated on a 5-*point Likert scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree.*

Moral Disengagement (Adapted from Bandura et al., 1996; Hymel et al., 2005*).

Rated on a 5-*point Likert scale: 1 = Strongly disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither agree nor disagree, 4 = Agree, 5 = Strongly agree.*

Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about bullying amongst school students.

- Sometimes bullying is needed to teach another kid a lesson.
- It's okay for a student to bully someone, if the other child bullied him or her first.
- For kids, bullying is just a normal part of growing up.
- Bullying isn't such a big deal when you think about the other things children have to deal with.
- If teachers are not given training in how to deal with school bullying, they should not be blamed for not doing enough to stop it.
- Teachers are often so overworked they don't have the time or resources to deal with school bullying.
- Individual teachers can't be expected to intervene when they become aware of bullying if other teachers around them aren't doing anything.
- Bullying doesn't cause any serious or long-term harm.
- Bullying helps children build resilience and learn important social norms.

- If kids didn't get so upset or give in so easily they wouldn't get bullied so much.
- Many students who get bullied bring it on themselves.
- Bullying is less likely to hurt the feelings of students who are frequently bullied.

Anti-bullying Training

Have you ever received any training related to preventing or handling school bullying?

- Yes, both while training and working as a teacher
- Yes, while training to be a teacher only
- Yes, while working as a teacher only
- No

School's Anti-bullying Activities

What anti-bullying policies, procedures and activities are in place at the school where you teach?

- School policies and rules related to bullying
- Promotion of anti-bullying policies or rules to the school community
- Clear procedures for reporting bullying incidents
- Anti-bullying action plan implemented by school staff after bullying occurs
- Analysis of bullying incidents in order to identify vulnerable students, make priorities for action, and inform anti-bullying policies
- Staff training related to bullying
- Prevention activities such as raising awareness about bullying
- Discussions with parents following bullying incidents
- Awareness-raising or information sessions with parents

- In-class anti-bullying activities for all students run by teachers, the school counsellor, or an external organisation
- Programs aimed specifically at victims of bullying
- Programs aimed specificity at bullies
- Research into bullying (other than the present research)

* Modifications to questionnaire items were made to improve comprehensibility and to fit the purpose and sample of Australian teachers studied in the current research.

Appendix E

Ethics Approval Letters

Ethics Approval for Dataset utilised in Papers 1 and 3:

From: Ethics Secretariat <ethics.secretariat@mq.edu.au>

To: Prof Ron Rapee <ron.rapee@mq.edu.au>

CC: A/Prof Kay Bussey <kay.bussey@mq.edu.au>,
Ms Nicole Sokol <nicole.sokol@students.mq.edu.au>,
Ms Hayley Watson <hayley.watson1@students.mq.edu.au>

Date: Tue, Aug 7, 2012 at 1:52 PM

Subject: Approved - Ethics Application - Rapee (Ref: 5201200457)

Dear Prof Rapee

Re: "Promoting positive peer relationships at school" (Ethics Ref: 5201200457)

Thank you for your recent correspondence. Your response has addressed the issues raised by the Human Research Ethics Committee and you may now commence your research.

This research meets the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). The National Statement is available at the following web site: http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/e72.pdf.

The following personnel are authorised to conduct this research:

A/Prof Kay Bussey

Ms Hayley Watson

Ms Nicole Sokol

Prof Ron Rapee

NB. STUDENTS: IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO KEEP A COPY OF THIS APPROVAL EMAIL TO SUBMIT WITH YOUR THESIS.

Please note the following standard requirements of approval:

1. The approval of this project is conditional upon your continuing compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007).

2. Approval will be for a period of five (5) years subject to the provision of annual reports.

Progress Report 1 Due: 7 August 2013

Progress Report 2 Due: 7 August 2014

Progress Report 3 Due: 7 August 2015

Progress Report 4 Due: 7 August 2016

Final Report Due: 7 August 2017

NB. If you complete the work earlier than you had planned you must submit a Final Report as soon as the work is completed. If the project has been discontinued or not commenced for any reason, you are also required to submit a Final Report for the project.

Progress reports and Final Reports are available at the following website:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/for/researchers/how_to_obtain_ethics_approval/human_research_ethics/forms

3. If the project has run for more than five (5) years you cannot renew approval for the project. You will need to complete and submit a Final Report and submit a new application for the project. (The five year limit on renewal of approvals allows the Committee to fully re-review research in an environment where legislation, guidelines and requirements are continually changing, for example, new child protection and privacy laws).

4. All amendments to the project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee before implementation. Please complete and submit a Request for Amendment Form available at the following website:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/for/researchers/how_to_obtain_ethics_approval/human_research_ethics/forms

5. Please notify the Committee immediately in the event of any adverse effects on participants or of any unforeseen events that affect the continued ethical acceptability of the project.

6. At all times you are responsible for the ethical conduct of your research in accordance with the guidelines established by the University.

This information is available at the following websites:

http://www.mq.edu.au/policy/

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/for/researchers/how_to_obtain_ethics_approval/human_research_ethics/policy

If you will be applying for or have applied for internal or external funding for the above project it is your responsibility to provide the Macquarie University's Research Grants Management Assistant with a copy of this email as soon as possible. Internal and External funding agencies will not be informed that you have final approval for your project and funds will not be released until the Research Grants Management Assistant has received a copy of this email.

Please retain a copy of this email as this is your official notification of final ethics approval.

Yours sincerely

Dr Karolyn White

Director of Research Ethics

Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee

Ethics Approval for Dataset utilised in Papers 2 and 4:

From: Ethics Secretariat <ethics.secretariat@mq.edu.au>

To: Prof Ron Rapee <ron.rapee@mq.edu.au>

CC: A/Prof Kay Bussey <kay.bussey@mq.edu.au>,

Ms Nicole Sokol <nicole.sokol@students.mq.edu.au>,

Ms Hayley Watson <hayley.watson1@students.mq.edu.au>

Date: Wed, Nov 21, 2012 at 12:53 PM

Subject: Approved- Ethics application- Rapee (5201200713)

Dear Prof Rapee

Re: "The role of Teachers in Promoting Positive Peer Relationships at School" (Ethics Ref: 5201200713)

Thank you for your recent correspondence. Your response has addressed the issues raised by the Human Research Ethics Committee and you may now commence your research.

This research meets the requirements of the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007). The National Statement is available at the following web site: http://www.nhmrc.gov.au/_files_nhmrc/publications/attachments/e72.pdf.

The following personnel are authorised to conduct this research:

Ms Nicole Sokol,

Prof Ron Rapee,

A/Prof Kay Bussey,

Ms Hayley Watson

NB. STUDENTS: IT IS YOUR RESPONSIBILITY TO KEEP A COPY OF THIS APPROVAL EMAIL TO SUBMIT WITH YOUR THESIS.

Please note the following standard requirements of approval:

1. The approval of this project is conditional upon your continuing compliance with the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research (2007).

2. Approval will be for a period of five (5) years subject to the provision of annual reports.

Progress Report 1 Due: 21 November 2013

Progress Report 2 Due: 21 November 2014

Progress Report 3 Due: 21 November 2015

Progress Report 4 Due: 21 November 2016

Final Report Due: 21 November 2017

NB. If you complete the work earlier than you had planned you must submit a Final Report as soon as the work is completed. If the project has been discontinued or not commenced for any reason, you are also required to submit a Final Report for the project.

Progress reports and Final Reports are available at the following website:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/for/researchers/how_to_obtain_ethics_approval/human_research_ethics/forms

3. If the project has run for more than five (5) years you cannot renew approval for the project. You will need to complete and submit a Final Report and submit a new application for the project. (The five year limit on renewal of approvals allows the Committee to fully re-review research in an environment where legislation, guidelines and requirements are continually changing, for example, new child protection and privacy laws).

4. All amendments to the project must be reviewed and approved by the Committee before implementation. Please complete and submit a Request for Amendment Form available at the following website:

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/for/researchers/how_to_obtain_ethics_approval/human_research_ethics/forms

5. Please notify the Committee immediately in the event of any adverse effects on participants or of any unforeseen events that affect the continued ethical acceptability of the project.

6. At all times you are responsible for the ethical conduct of your research in accordance with the guidelines established by the University.

This information is available at the following websites:

http://www.mq.edu.au/policy/

http://www.research.mq.edu.au/for/researchers/how_to_obtain_ethics_approval/human_research_ethics/policy

If you will be applying for or have applied for internal or external funding for the above project it is your responsibility to provide the Macquarie University's Research Grants Management Assistant with a copy of this email as soon as possible. Internal and External funding agencies will not be informed that you have final approval for your project and funds will not be released until the Research Grants Management Assistant has received a copy of this email.

Please retain a copy of this email as this is your official notification of final ethics approval.

Yours sincerely

Dr Karolyn White

Director of Research Ethics

Chair, Human Research Ethics Committee