



8-2019

Examining the Factor Structure and Validity of a Retrospective Report Measure Assessing Parent Strategies for Responding to School Bullying

Kathryn Francis Smeraglia
University of Tennessee, ksmeragl@vols.utk.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss

Recommended Citation

Smeraglia, Kathryn Francis, "Examining the Factor Structure and Validity of a Retrospective Report Measure Assessing Parent Strategies for Responding to School Bullying. " PhD diss., University of Tennessee, 2019.
https://trace.tennessee.edu/utk_graddiss/5757

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate School at TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. It has been accepted for inclusion in Doctoral Dissertations by an authorized administrator of TRACE: Tennessee Research and Creative Exchange. For more information, please contact trace@utk.edu.

To the Graduate Council:

I am submitting herewith a dissertation written by Kathryn Francis Smeraglia entitled "Examining the Factor Structure and Validity of a Retrospective Report Measure Assessing Parent Strategies for Responding to School Bullying." I have examined the final electronic copy of this dissertation for form and content and recommend that it be accepted in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, with a major in Psychology.

L. Christian Elledge, Major Professor

We have read this dissertation and recommend its acceptance:

Jenny Macfie, Todd Moore, Delores Smith

Accepted for the Council:

Dixie L. Thompson

Vice Provost and Dean of the Graduate School

(Original signatures are on file with official student records.)

**Examining the Factor Structure and Validity of a Retrospective Report Measure Assessing
Parent Strategies for Responding to School Bullying**

A Dissertation Presented for the

Doctor of Philosophy

Degree

The University of Tennessee, Knoxville

Kathryn Francis Smeraglia

August 2019

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First, I would like to thank my advisor, Dr. Chris Elledge for his guidance, support, and patience throughout my research endeavors. I would also like to thank my dissertation committee members, Drs. Macfie, Moore, and Smith, for their thoughtful discussion and meaningful feedback throughout this process.

I most certainly need to acknowledge my family and close friends for providing unconditional support and encouragement throughout my graduate school tenure. I could not have gone through this process without you. My fellow co-hearts provided an endless amount of laughs, joy, and solace throughout the years as well.

Additionally, in light of the fact that I have completed this dissertation while on pre-doctoral internship, I sincerely thank my training director, Dr. Megan Paxton, for guidance and perspective throughout this process. Further, I must thank my fellow interns for the infinite support, camaraderie, and encouragement throughout this time. I could not have been more blessed to receive such a wonderful support system while on internship. Finally, I must express my gratitude to Dr. Erin Jenkins Baker, for her steadfast mentorship and unwavering support. Thank you, Erin, for holding all of the hope, and seeing potential in me when I could not.

ABSTRACT

This study examined the factor structure, reliability, and concurrent validity of a new retrospective report measure assessing parent strategies for responding to school bullying. Prior studies have investigated the strategies that children use or teachers recommend for coping with or responding to school bullying, but few studies have considered the strategies that parents recommend to their children as an appropriate response to school bullying. Parents have substantial influence on young children's behavior, and it is possible that parental guidance for how to respond to school bullying has implications for children's peer victimization experiences as well as for their behavioral, social, and emotional functioning. The current investigation had 3 primary aims. The first objective was to identify the factor structure of a newly developed retrospective report measure assessing parent-suggested child strategies and beliefs toward responding to school bullying (PSBB) in a sample of 282 young adults. Exploratory factor analysis revealed a 6-factor solution, and the factors were labeled *Aggressive Retaliation*, *Ignore the Bully*, *Victim Support*, *Minimizing*, *Victim Blaming*, and *Parent Action*. All factors align with previous research on response styles and strategies to manage bullying behavior. Internal consistency of each factor was good. Finally, the current investigation examined the concurrent validity of the retrospective parent strategies measure by examining correlations between factor scores on the parent-strategies measure and psychosocial outcomes, and the extent to which factors of the parent-strategies measure emerged as unique predictors of psychosocial outcomes. *Aggressive Retaliation* was associated with premeditated aggression, and multiple group path models revealed this was especially true for high school victims and chronic victims. *Ignore the Bully* was negatively associated with self-esteem and positively associated with peer victimization in elementary and high school. *Victim Support* was negatively associated with internalizing symptoms and self-

esteem for both victims in high school and non-victims. *Victim Blaming* was negatively associated with self-esteem. *Parent Action* was negatively associated with victimization in high school, but only for non-victims. These findings provide initial support for the validity of the PSBB and support the need for more quantitative research examining the association between parent responses to school bullying and later psychosocial adjustment.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
I. Introduction	1
Long-Term Effects of Peer Victimization in College Students	2
Coping with and Response to Peer Victimization	3
Parental Support in the Context of School Involvement	7
Parent-Suggested Strategies for Bullying Behavior	10
The Present Study	13
II. Methods	1
Participants	15
Procedure	15
Measures and Measure Development of PSBB	15
Data Analytic Plan	18
III. Results	23
Preliminary Analyses	23
Primary Analyses	23
IV. Discussion	35
Factor Structure of the PSBB	36
Group Differences in PSBB Factors by Sex and Victim Status	37
Concurrent Validity of the PSBB	38
Summary	45
Strengths and Limitations	45

Clinical Implications.....	46
References.....	48
Appendix	64
Parent Strategies and Beliefs about Bullying (PSBB)	96
Retrospective Bullying Questionnaire.....	100
Depression Anxiety Stress Scale	110
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale	112
Impulsive and Premeditated Aggression Scale.....	113
Vita.....	114

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
Table 1. Descriptive Characteristics for Primary Study Variables.....	65
Table 2. Correlations among Primary Study Variables	66
Table 3. Model Fit Indices on 1-8 Factor Models (40 Items	67
Table 4. Factor Loadings for 8-Factor Model (40 Items	68
Table 5. Factor Loadings for 7-Factor Model (40 Items	70
Table 6. Factor Loadings for 7- Factor Model (33 Items	72
Table 7. Factor Loadings for 6-Factor Model (40 Items	74
Table 8. Factor Loadings for 6-Factor Model (29 Items	76
Table 9. Mean Statistics for Final PSBB Items (N=282.....	78
Table 10. Chi-Square Values for Multi-Group Models.....	79
Table 11. Summary of Regression Analyses for PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Symptoms and Self-Esteem (N=282	80
Table 12. Summary of Regression Analyses for PSBB Factors and Associations among Aggression Outcomes (N=282.....	81
Table 13. Summary of Regression Analyses for PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes(N=282.....	82
Table 14. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in Elementary School (N=282.....	83
Table 15. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in High School (N=282.....	84
Table 16. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in High School (N=282.....	85

Table 17. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Aggression Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in High School (N=282	86
Table 18. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in High School (N=282	87
Table 19. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Aggression Outcomes Grouped by Chronic Victim-Status (N=282	88
Table 20. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes Grouped by Chronic Victim Status (N=282	89
Table 21. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Outcomes Grouped by Non-Victim Status (N=282	90
Table 22. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Outcomes Grouped by Non-Victim Status (N=282	91
Table 23. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Aggression Outcomes Grouped by Non-Victim-Status (N=282	92
Table 24. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes Grouped by Non- Victim Status (N=282.....	93

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Bullying is a serious public health problem that affects children of all races, gender, and socioeconomic status (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Graham, 2006; Christie-Mizell, 2003). The term “bullying” has been defined as a subcategory of interpersonal aggression (Smith & Morita, 1999; Hymel & Swearer, 2015) that can be physical, verbal, or social in nature. Bullying can also be distinguished from other forms of aggression or victimization by intentionality, chronicity, and an imbalance and abuse of power (Valliancourt, Hymel, & McDougal, 2003). While prevalence rates can vary by measure, developmental level, and victimization type (Ladd & Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2002; Nicolaidis, Toda, & Smith, 2002), a recent meta-analysis of 80 studies measuring the bullying experiences of individuals aged 12-18 found that 36% of children are victims of bullying (Modecki et al., 2014). However, there is a general consensus in the literature that only about 10-15% of elementary school students and 5-10% of middle or junior high school students are chronically bullied (Goldbaum, Craig, Pepler, & Connolly, 2003; Ladd & Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2002; Olweus, 1993; Salmivalli, 1999; Solberg & Olweus, 2003).

Bullying is linked to a number of negative adjustment outcomes for children including internalizing (e.g. depression, anxiety, and chronic stress) and externalizing symptoms (e.g., aggression), physical health problems, social adjustment difficulties, and academic functioning (Card & Hodges, 2008). Children who are victimized by peers are more likely to experience symptoms of depression, depressive self-schemas and strong negative cognitions as well as weak positive cognitions, and a diminished ability to view themselves in a positive light (Cole et al 2014; Hawker and Boulton 2000). Research has found that anxiety and loneliness serve as both

antecedents and consequents of children's victimization experiences (Reijnjes et al, 2010).

Additionally, deficits in social skills and an overreliance on internalizing strategies to cope with instances of bullying are also thought to predict increased victimization experiences (Andreou, 2001). According to a meta-analysis by Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, and Sadek (2010), poor social competence is one of the strongest predictors for children's receipt of bullying. That is, children who are targeted by bullies tend to be less assertive, more easily emotionally distressed, and are less effective in resolving conflict or problem solving than other children.

Long-term Effects of Peer Victimization in College Students

Less is known about the negative and long-term consequences of peer victimization, but increasing evidence suggests that victimization in childhood has lasting negative impacts that persist into adulthood (Olweus, 1993), and that victimization in adolescence can predict an increased likelihood of mental health and social adjustment problems in adulthood (Gibb, Horwood & Fergusson, 2011). A prospective Finnish study reported the involvement of children in bullying starting at 8 years of age and monitored outcomes throughout adulthood. Results found that females who were chronic victims of bullying had a higher rate of suicide attempts and completions up to the age of twenty five. Further, females who were chronic victims were more likely to have received inpatient psychiatric treatment and used psychiatric medications (Sourander et al., 2007). A study by Copeland et al. (2013) found that both male and female victims had an increased risk for depression, males reported suicidality more often than females, and female victims reported anxiety and agoraphobic symptoms in early adulthood. Takizawa and colleagues found that in a 50-year prospective follow-up of a British birth cohort, victims of frequent bullying had higher rates of depression, anxiety disorders, suicidality, and that childhood bullying was associated with a lack of social relationships, economic hardship, and a

poorly perceived quality of life at age 50 (2014). While it is possible that individuals who endorse victimization have characteristics mentioned above (e.g., poor social skills, anxiety and loneliness, and strong negative cognitions) that might make them more of a target for peer victimization, emerging evidence only solidifies the notion that the effects of being bullied are direct and long-lasting. Findings that indicate such effects should begin to discredit the widely-held notion that bullying is just a “harmless rite of passage or an inevitable part of growing up” (Arseneault et al., 2010; Copeland et al., 2012, pp. 419).

Coping with and Response to Peer Victimization

How children respond to incidents of bullying may influence the extent to which such experiences are sustained or whether those experiences influence children’s health and wellbeing. There is a growing body of research exploring the relation between children’s responses to peer victimization and future victimization experiences (Andreou, 2001; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Elledge et al., 2010 Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Salmivalli et al., 1996). Although investigators have discovered ineffective responses to peer aggression that predict the development and chronicity of peer victimization, such as crying, giving in to bully’s demands, striking back, cognitive distancing, and revenge seeking (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Patterson, Littman & Bricker, 1967; Perry, Willard & Perry, 1990; Schwartz, Dodge & Coie, 1993), there is less consensus around specific behavioral strategies that are effective in reducing risk for peer victimization. Studies have indicated that building social skills such as assertiveness, problem-solving, and relaxation are effective strategies for managing bullying experiences (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; DeRosier, 2004). Kochenderfer-Ladd (2004) found that children who seek advice from adults (e.g., teachers or parents) or peers in an effort to resolve conflict experience reductions in peer victimization over the course of a single academic

year (Sawyer et al., 2011). However, such techniques may be ineffective and counterproductive over time when used by chronically bullied children (O'Connell, Pepler, & Craig, 1999; Elledge et al., 2010). For example, Elledge and colleagues (2010) found that chronically bullied boys generally endorsed adult-recommended strategies, but such strategy endorsement was associated with greater levels of peer victimization in the following grade. While most children learn to cope with instances of victimization effectively over time, it is evident that victimization does not affect all children in the same manner (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Ladd, 2001). For example, Hoover, Oliver and Hazler (1992) found that while almost all children had been victimized at some point during their school years, many of them did not feel that such experiences had severely harmed them. Conversely, children who are distinguished as chronic victims of bullying tend to be more easily identified and more seriously victimized than children who are able to escape the victim role (Smith, Shu, & Madsen, 2001; Nicolaides et al., 2002).

There is also evidence that bullied boys and girls endorse different strategies when responding to peer victimization. Studies that conducted interviews with children to determine their responses to peer aggression found that bullied boys are likely to respond with coercion or retaliation, whereas bullied girls are likely to respond with helplessness (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Salmivalli et al., 1996).

When considering the reason certain coping strategies are effective in reducing the risk of future victimization, one must consider the stress and coping paradigm and how it relates to child strategies. The stress and coping paradigm (Causey & Dubow, 1992; Lazarus, 1984; Roth & Cohen, 1986) suggests that coping strategies children use can be grouped into two basic types: approach and avoidance. Approach strategies, or direct attempts to alter stressful situations (e.g. problem solving, social support seeking), provide opportunities to cognitively and behaviorally

confront the stressor (Fields & Printz, 1997). Alternatively, avoidance strategies are indirect attempts to manage cognitive and emotional reactions to stressful situations (Fields & Printz, 1997). Common avoidance strategies include cognitive distancing (e.g., refusing to think about the experience) as well as making internalizing attributions (e.g., turning anger inward on oneself for doing something to deserve the abuse) and externalizing attributions (e.g., taking out negative emotional reactions on others) to distract from instances of peer victimization (Causey & Dubow, 1992). Lashing out at others in response to peer victimization, an externalizing avoidance strategy, has been shown to increase children's risk for peer victimization (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Perry, Perry & Kennedy, 1993). Evidence suggests that retaliating not only perpetuates victimization, but can cause bullying episodes to increase in quantity and severity (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004). Children who act aggressively toward or seek revenge on a bully may motivate the perpetrator to victimize further. Other children may attempt to ignore perpetrators of bullying, but evidence suggests that children who are victimized are rarely able to ignore chronic abuse over an extended period of time (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004). In addition, choosing to actively ignore peer victimization does not necessarily negate the psychological consequences often associated with chronic peer victimization (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002). Overall, evidence from the stress and coping literature suggests that bullied children who use approach-oriented strategies are more likely to experience a reduction in subsequent victimization (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Smith, Shu, & Madsen, 2001) and positive psychological outcomes compared to children who use strategies aimed at avoiding the interpersonal stressor (active ignoring, distraction; Carver, Scheier & Weintraub, 1989; Roth & Cohen, 1986; Endler & Parker, 1990; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002).

When considering the approach method to coping with stressors, Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner (2002) distinguished between problem solving and social support seeking coping strategies. The authors argued that problem solving implies the independence of action, whereas social support involves the inclusion of others in the coping process. Such a distinction may be important when considering whether the outcomes for using specific coping responses are different for boys and girls. For example, findings from Kochenderfer-Ladd and Skinner's (2002) study indicated that boys who utilized problem solving behaviors experienced fewer social problems, while those that sought social support experienced more social problems and were associated with lower peer preference. Conversely, girls tended to place more emphasis on peer acceptance, and those who sought social support by asking for advice were buffered from social problems (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002). Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner found that girls who tried to internalize, distance themselves, or ignore peer problems experienced greater social problems than those who were less likely to endorse these responses, while boys who internalized experienced higher levels of anxiety, however such strategies did not affect boys' level of peer acceptance (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002). Other studies have found that deficits in social skills and a reliance on internalizing strategies are thought to predict increased victimization (Andreou, 2001; Roecker Phelps, 2001), but some studies do not find these associations (Terranova, 2007).

Bullying responses and strategies may vary in effectiveness depending on the child's sex or victimization status (e.g. chronic versus non-chronic victim), but little research has examined whether strategies are differentially effective for these groups of children . There is some evidence that girls may be more likely to report their victimization experiences to school personnel (Williford, Fite, & Cooley, 2015), suggesting that telling an adult may be a strategy

that is more comfortable to girls than boys. Moreover, support-seeking has predicted reductions in peer victimization for girls (Shelley & Craig, 2010), while having a friend help with instances of peer victimization predicted reductions in victimization for kindergarten boys (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997). Further, a study by Elledge and colleagues (2010) examined the strategies endorsed by children who were categorized as victims or non-victims of peer victimization. Findings from this study revealed that chronically bullied children were more likely to endorse coercive (e.g., hitting or punching) strategies instead of adult-recommended strategies when compared to non-chronic victims, despite the fact that there was no difference in the frequency of coercive behaviors (Elledge et al., 2010). The authors suggest that it is possible that chronic victims see value in fighting back, but are hesitant to assert themselves in an aggressive way due to negative consequences that may arise (Elledge et al., 2010). Thus, common, effective strategies that children use to combat bullying still remain unclear, which indicates not only a need for more research on effective bullying strategies, but also calls into question whether heavily emphasized strategies noted in the literature are truly beneficial to children who are chronically bullied.

Parental Support in the Context of School Involvement

Although a number of studies have examined children's responses to peer victimization, few studies have considered the role that parents play in helping children effectively respond to peer victimization. The social-ecological systems perspective proposes that social behavior patterns, including bullying, are impacted by a range of environmental factors, dynamics and experiences (Espelage and Swearer 2003; Mishna et al., 2006). Essentially, this perspective, based on Bronfenbrenner's ecological systems theory (1977) suggests the degree to which a child is chronically bullied is affected by peers, teachers, parents, and the community as a whole

(Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Barboza et al., 2009; Mishna et al., 2006). As such, it is important to consider the role that all stake holders within these environments play in influencing children's peer victimization experiences (Harcourt et al., 2014). The majority of bullying research has focused on the influence of peers, teachers, and school administrators on peer victimization experiences (Cortes and Kochenderfer- Ladd 2014; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Pelletier, 2008; Oliver & Candappa, 2007; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002). Although teachers and school personnel play a critical role in addressing peer victimization, children are often reluctant to report their peer victimization experiences to adults. Evidence suggests that children are more likely to report instances of peer victimization to a parent than a teacher or school official (Holt, Kaufman Kantor, & Finkelhor, 2009). For example, a qualitative study of Australian parents found that when parents reported bullying to school administrators, officials were frequently unaware of the child's plight (Humphrey and Crisp, 2008). Thus, considering the role that parents play in identifying and responding to peer victimization is critical, as peer victimization can take place in contexts that are often less well monitored by school administrators, teachers, and staff (Leff, Kupersmidt, Patterson, & Power, 1999).

The role that parents play in helping their children manage bullying is examined less often in the empirical literature, but there is some evidence suggesting that parenting style and overall parental support contribute to children's experience of chronic victimization (Kaufmann et al., 2000; Ladd & Kochenderfer Ladd, 1998; Smith & Myron-Wilson, 1998; Troy & Sroufe, 1987). Studies have shown that a permissive parenting style is associated with increased risk for peer victimization, while authoritarian parenting is more strongly associated with bullying behavior (Baldry & Farrington, 2000). In a more recent study, Georgiou et al. found that authoritarian parenting was positively associated with both bullying and peer victimization at

school (2013). Given the specific practices of parents who adopt an authoritarian or permissive parenting style, children may not receive the necessary level of parental support to help them cope with or respond effectively to instances of peer victimization. Consistent with this supposition are findings from a recent study suggesting that parental support served as a protective factor from negative outcomes associated with peer victimization, and was associated with lower levels of school bullying and victimization experiences (Wang, Iannotti, and Nansel, 2009). A recent meta-analysis of 70 studies examining the association between parenting factors and children's peer victimization (Lereya et al., 2013) found that high parental involvement and support, good communication between parents and children, warm and affectionate relationships, and parental supervision served as protective factors against instances of peer victimization, while abusive, maladaptive parenting behaviors were associated with being identified as a victim or bully-victim. There is also evidence that parental attitudes toward bullying and parental responsiveness to their child's involvement in bullying incidents may affect children's ability to cope with peer victimization experiences (Georgiou, 2008). In summary, available evidence suggests that parents have influence over children's peer victimization experiences and that children have more positive outcomes when parents are supportive and involved (Benson, Scales, Hamilton, & Sesma, 2006; Lovegrove et al., 2013).

It is important to acknowledge, however, that distinguishing bullying behaviors from other forms of social interaction can be difficult for parents, which may affect parents' response, level of involvement, and how children perceive parental support (Craig & Pepler, 1997; Hazler, 1998). This is in part due to the fact that bullying is at times, perceived by parents as "a normal part of growing up," and as an inevitable experience of childhood (Sawyer et al., 2011, p. 1797; Harcourt et al., 2014). Parents' general attitude and response toward bullying incidents may

affect children's ability to cope effectively (Georgiou, 2008). A study by Mishna and colleagues (2008) found that parents tended to normalize verbal and relational bullying more than incidents of physical bullying. In other cases, parents expressed that it was in their child's best interest to solve the bullying on their own. Several studies have found that parents tend to normalize bullying behaviors, and place the problem of bullying, and the responsibility for managing it back onto the victim (Brown et al., 2010; Zaklama 2003; Harcourt et al., 2013). When adults actively dismiss or fail to acknowledge children's victimization experiences, children may respond with increased caution or reluctance to disclose future bullying incidents to adults (Mishna, 2004). Parents who lack knowledge about bullying and the plight of victimized children may be ill-equipped to respond effectively to children who have expressed that they are bullied or harassed by peers. Providing guidance to or coaching children on how to respond to peer victimization is a difficult task, and parents often express doubt about whether they have responded effectively when they learn their child is bullied (Brown, 2010; Mishna et al., 2008).

Parent-Suggested Strategies for Bullying Behavior

Learning more about parental responses to bullying and how these responses affect outcomes for children is an important area for future research. The majority of studies investigating the strategies that parents recommend to children who are victims of bullying are qualitative and use parent interviews to identify response themes (Sawyer et al., 2011; Brown et al., 2010; Harcourt et al., 2013; Cassidy et al., 2012). Findings from qualitative studies suggest that parents often encourage their children to tell an adult, retaliate against the bully, actively ignore the bully, promote children's pro-social behaviors, give advice, or contact school officials (Brown et al., 2010; Sawyer et al., 2011). A systematic review of 13 qualitative studies that examined parents' perceptions of bullying, including parents' strategies for coping with bullying

(Harcourt et al., 2013), found that when parents did not take direct action to address bullying, they were primarily focused on relieving their children's distress and providing emotional support (Cassidy et al., 2012; Mishna et al., 2008). When more commonly recommended parent strategies failed to lead to improved outcomes for children, some parents took more drastic action to prevent or reduce peer victimization, including transferring children to another school or enrolling them in self-defense classes (Brown, 2010; Zaklama, 2003). Another central theme that has emerged from existing research examining parenting responses to school bullying is that parents often struggle with the question of how best to respond to children who are victims of bullying. It is clear that parents desire evidence-based resources for how to respond when they learn their children are bullied (Sawyer et al., 2011).

Although an overarching theory or paradigm has not been used to classify parent responses to bullying into larger response styles, it could be argued that research from the stress and coping literature as well as research investigating children's responses to school bullying provide a valuable framework for understanding and classifying parents' responses to school bullying. Some parental responses identified through qualitative research fit within an approach- or avoidance-oriented framework (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Smith, Shu, & Madsen, 2001), while other identified responses more readily align with a direct versus indirect conceptualization (Brown, 2010; Cassidy et al., 2012; Humphrey and Crisp, 2008). Approach-oriented strategies generally attempt to alter or resolve a stressful situation. Parents who respond to bullying by encouraging their children to tell them to stop in a firm voice or ask a teacher or adult for help are using approach-oriented strategies. Alternatively, avoidance-oriented strategies are parent-recommended strategies that aim to distract from the bullying instances. Instructing children to ignore the bullying (Sawyer et al., 2011) is an example

of an avoidance strategy (Brown 2010; Mishna et al., 2006). Direct strategies, although similar in some respects to approach strategies, involve taking direct action to curtail peer victimization (Brown 2010; Cassidy et al., 2012; Humphrey and Crisp, 2008). For example, parents who involve the child's school or contact the bully's parents are using direct strategies. In addition, advising children to respond to bullying with retaliation is often classified as a direct approach to responding to bullying (Purcell 2012; Sawyer et al., 2011). Alternatively, indirect parental responses to bullying are those that focus on providing support and comfort to the victimized child. Indirect strategies include providing emotional support to children (Cassidy et al., 2012), promoting prosocial behaviors, expressing to children that bullying is "just something kids do" (Sawyer et al., 2011, p.1797) and attempting to maintain their children's self-esteem (Humphrey and Crisp, 2008) to alter the experiences with and consequences of the victimization. Finally, there are also researchers who have used an alternative classification approach to categorizing parents' recommended strategies for responding to school bullying. For example, Harcourt and colleagues classified strategies for responding to peer victimization into two categories: strategies aimed at comforting the distressed child and those aimed at taking action to address the problem (Harcourt et al., 2013). Comforting the child's distress is also known as emotion-focused coping, which can help children learn to re-frame a situation by teaching them to change the way they think about bullying behavior (Terranova et al., 2011; Harcourt et al., 2013).

Although research investigating parent-suggested child strategies for responding to school bullying is limited, there appears to be overlap between parent-recommended responses and the strategies that children often endorse when responding to school bullying. Lacking is a reliable and valid measure that systematically assesses parent-suggested child strategies for responding to bullying, or research that has investigated whether certain parent strategies are

associated with better outcomes for children who are victims of school bullying. This represents a considerable gap in the literature and an area that could have important implications for bullying prevention or intervention efforts. This study seeks to address these gaps in the literature.

The Present Study

The current study explores the factor structure, factor reliability, and concurrent validity of a new retrospective-report measure assessing young adult perceptions of parent-suggested child strategies for responding to school bullying. The current investigation had 3 primary aims. The first objective of the current investigation was to identify a factor structure of the newly developed retrospective report measure of parent-suggested strategies for responding to school bullying in a sample of 282 young adults. In selecting items for this measure (see methods section for selection process) the goal was to identify a pool of items that cut across emerging themes from qualitative research on parents' response to school bullying and quantitative research on children's response to school bullying. In line with this aim, a measure was created with items that focused on the content that cut across specific dimensions of parents' responses to school bullying that emerged in the literature (e.g. approach- versus avoidance-oriented strategies, direct versus indirect). Item-level and factor-level descriptive statistics were reported, and an estimate of internal consistency was reported for each factor. The second aim of the current investigation was to examine the extent to which there are mean level differences in the factor scores for parent-suggested strategies based on the peer victimization status (child victim or non-victim) or sex of the young adult. While the author expected factors to align with strategies and beliefs regarding bullying that were supported within the literature, no specific a priori hypotheses regarding differences in strategies endorsed were made. The third aim of the

current investigation was to establish concurrent validity of the retrospective parent-strategies measure. In other words, the current study evaluated whether PSBB factors that emerged from the EFA were related in expected ways with constructs of psychosocial adjustment. Concurrent validity was measured by examining a) correlations among factor scores on the parent-strategies measure, b) correlations between factor scores on the parent-strategies measure and measures of psychosocial adjustment and c) the extent to which factors of the parent-strategies measure emerge as unique associations with psychosocial outcomes. Finally, given that it is unclear whether the effectiveness of strategies will differ depending on the sex or the victim status of the student, the current study also examined whether concurrent validity varied based on victimization status and sex of the young adult.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 581 college students at a southeastern university who were enrolled in introductory psychology courses. Of the 581 participants, 282 completed the Parent Strategies and Beliefs about Bullying scale (PSBB) that was created for the purpose of this study.

Participants from the sample were between 18 and 41 years old, with a mean age of 19.2 years.

Participants were 41.4% male and 58.3% female, and 81.7% of participants identified themselves as Caucasian, 9% as African American, and 4.4% as Asian American.

Procedure

Participants completed measures through an online survey system that uses encryption to secure data. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board at a university in the southeastern United States. Participants provided informed consent online prior to completing measures for the current study. Measures were then presented with standardized instructions.

Students were initially provided with a definition of bullying prior to taking the Parent Strategies and Beliefs about Bullying scale. Part of this definition also instructed students on what does not constitute bullying. Local referrals for psychological services were provided at the conclusion of the survey. Participants received course credit as compensation for participating.

Measures and Measure Development of PSBB

An extensive literature review was conducted in order to help inform the development of the PSBB. Specifically, the following research themes were included in the literature review:

child response to bullying, parental involvement and support in bullying, and positive and

negative outcomes associated with child response and parent involvement. Based on the author's

review of the literature, no measure was identified that assessed parent-suggested strategies for helping children manage instances of bullying. Thus, guiding our selection of items for this measure was information acquired from qualitative studies that explored how parents respond to children who report that they are bullied, quantitative research on children's responses to bullying, and expert consultation. Items were selected to cover a broad range of content, but selection was guided by prior work categorizing strategies as approach- or avoidant-oriented (Causey & Dubow, 1992), direct and indirect approach-oriented, and emotion-focused (Harcourt et al., 2013).

Finally, consultation from an expert in the field of school bullying and child aggression was sought to provide additional guidance on items selection. In conjunction with a thorough review of the literature and expert consultation, items were selected to map onto several domains, including direct (e.g. reporting bullying to the school administrators, calling the bully's parents, aggressive retaliation), indirect (e.g., parental support, comforting the child, bullying is just part of growing up, and emotion-focused coping), approach-oriented (e.g., confronting the bully, getting a teacher or friend to help) and avoidance-oriented (e.g., walk away, pay no attention to the bully) strategies.

Parent Responses to Bullying Behavior. The 40-item PSBB questionnaire was created for the purpose of this study. Initially, participants were presented with a definition of bullying (Olweus, 1993). Participants were then asked if they identified as a victim of bullying and whether they discussed bullying with their parents during childhood. A participant who responded "yes" to discussing bullying with a parent was presented with a series of parent-suggested child strategies for responding to bullying. Participants who responded "no" were directed to the next portion of the study. Participants were asked to rate each item on a 5-point

scale (“Completely Disagree” “Somewhat Disagree” “Neither disagree or Agree” “Somewhat Agree” or “Completely Agree”) and identify which parent endorsed the strategy.

Retrospective Bullying Questionnaire. The Retrospective Bullying Questionnaire (RBQ) is a 44-item measure assessing the frequency, seriousness, and duration of peer victimization in primary and secondary school; bully-related coping, bully-related psychological trauma, suicidal ideation if bullied, and bullying in college and the workplace in young adults/adults 18-40 years of age (Schafer et al., 2004). The Victim-Only scale was used for the purpose of this study. Items of the RBQ assessing the frequency of bullying were used in the current investigation and participants rated each on a 5-point scale (“Never”, “Rarely”, “Sometimes”, “Frequently” or “Constantly”). The Retrospective Bullying Questionnaire was utilized to identify victims and non-victims of bullying. A previous study found that the 2-month test-retest reliability for items related to primary school and secondary school peer victimization and trauma was .88, .87, and .77, respectively (Schafer et al., 2004). Internal consistency was good in the current sample ($\alpha = .71$).

Depression Anxiety Stress Scale 21. The Depression Anxiety Stress Scale 21 (DASS 21) is a short-form version (21 items) of Lovibond and Lovibond’s (1995) 42-item self-report measure of depression, anxiety, and stress. Participants are asked to rate how much they feel a given statement describes them over the past week on a 0-3 point Likert scale. Items include statements such as “I found myself getting upset by quite trivial things” and “I tended to over-react to situations,” and are scored to yield 3 subscales (e.g., Depression, Anxiety, and Stress) and an overall scale. Previous studies have reported the reliabilities for the DASS-21 scales as .88 for Depression, .82 for Anxiety, .90 for Stress, and .93 for the Total scale (Hendry & Crawford, 2005). The DASS demonstrated good reliability in the current sample ($\alpha = .94$).

Impulsive/Premeditated Aggression Scale. The Impulsive/Premeditated Aggression Scale (IPAS) is a 30-item self-report measure that assesses impulsive and premeditated aggression in relation to aggressive acts committed within the past 6 months. Items are rated on a 5-point Likert scale and are scored to yield two subscale scores: impulsive aggression (IA) and premeditated aggression (PM). Among a sample of college students, these scales evidenced high internal consistency with Cronbach's alphas of .77 for IA (male = .78, female = .76) and .81 for PM (male = .82, female = .81). IA and PM were found to be correlated at .32 (Haden, Scarpa, & Stanford, 2008). Internal consistency estimates were good in the current sample ($\alpha = .81$).

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (*RSE*) is a 10-item measure used to assess an individual's feelings of self-worth relative to peers. Participants are given statements such as "On the whole, I am satisfied with myself", and then asked to rate their level of agreement with the statement on a 4-point (0-3) Likert scale. Internal consistency estimates range from .77 to .88, and test-retest reliability ranges from .82 to .85 (Rosenberg, M., 1965). Internal consistency was good in the current sample ($\alpha = .72$).

Demographic Questionnaire. A 26-item questionnaire was administered to students to acquire basic information on demographics (e.g., age, ethnicity, sex), living situation (on-campus housing, off-campus housing), and academic history.

Data Analytic Plan

Aim 1: Exploratory Factor Analysis. An exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted to establish the factor structure of the PSBB. Although the selection of items was guided by specific content dimensions that emerged in the literature, an EFA was warranted for use with the PSBB because it is unclear whether the factor structure would align with the categories used to guide item selection. Internal consistency of each factor score was examined.

EFA is based on the common factor model in which each observed variable is a linear function of one or more common factors (i.e., the underlying latent variables) in a measure (Harrington, 2009). The goal of EFA is to identify the latent constructs underlying the manifest variables by partitioning the shared variance of a variable from its unique and error variance (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999; Costello & Osborne, 2005). EFA provides an exploratory examination of the nature and number of latent variables present in the PSBB, which characterize the items of the scale (Williams, Brown & Onsmann, 2010). There are three primary steps in an EFA: (1) extraction; (2) rotation; and (3) interpretation (Brown, 2006; Hyland, 2016).

First, item-level descriptive statistics (e.g., mean, standard deviation) and the distributional properties of the items were examined. Next, an EFA was estimated in Mplus version 7.3 using maximum likelihood estimation as the factor extraction technique. Extraction provided a determination of the fewest number of factors that accounted for the most variance in the data, and gave an estimate of the factor model (Brown, 2006; Williams et al, 2010). The second step in EFA is factor rotation. Geomin, which is an oblique rotation technique, was used as the factor rotation method. Oblique rotations assume that factors are correlated and force factor correlations to be non-zero (Muthén & Muthén, 2007). The Geomin rotation depicted how items loaded onto factors. The Geomin rotation provided a pattern matrix, which included lambdas and indicated factor loadings. Lastly, the factors identified through EFA were interpreted. In order to produce the most parsimonious factor structure, Wald statistics indicated which factor loadings are significant. A significant Wald statistic value is greater than the absolute value of two. The Wald statistic also indicates items that fail to load onto factors or that load onto multiple factors. Items that fail to load on a factor or load onto multiple factors were

deleted. Following this deletion, the aforementioned extraction and rotation methods were re-run to produce the most parsimonious factor structure that represented the data.

A common procedure for identifying the correct number of factors to retain, is to examine the eigenvalues. Factors with eigenvalues that are above one are often retained (Fabrigar et al., 1999). However, to provide additional information that could inform the number of factors to retain, a scree plot was generated (Costello & Osborne, 2005). The scree plot provides a graph of eigenvalues. This graph often illustrates a bend or break in the data, and, it is often recommended that all data points above this break or bend should be retained as a factor (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Others, however, have suggested that this method is too subjective (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). In an effort to take a more conservative approach, three models were estimated to identify the best fitting factor model, which included: a) a model that specified the number of factors based on an examination of the scree plot, b) a model that specified one additional factor than suggested by the scree plot, and c) a model that specified one fewer factor than suggested by the scree plot. Factor models were compared via an examination of parameter estimates (e.g. factor loadings) and model fit statistics (e.g. chi-square; RMSEA) identifying the factor structure that best fit the data.

Following the EFA, internal consistency was examined to determine the reliability of the factors that emerged on the Parent Strategies and Beliefs about Bullying questionnaire. Reliability of each factor was assessed on the final factor structure.

Aim 2: Mean Level Differences Based on Victim Status. The second aim of the current investigation was to examine whether there are mean level differences in the factor scores of the PSBB based on the participant's peer victimization status (child victim or non-victim.) and sex. Participants were classified as a victim in elementary school, high school, chronic victim (those

who experienced victimization in both elementary and high school) or a non-victim based on their scores on the Retrospective Bullying Questionnaire. These classifications were made with dummy codes based on victim status (dummy code 1= victim in elementary school; 0 = not an elementary school victim).

A series of regression analyses were conducted to examine mean-level differences in parent-suggested strategy endorsement based on victimization status controlling for race and sex. Additionally, regression analyses were conducted to examine mean-level differences in parent-suggested strategy endorsement based on sex, controlling for race.

Aim 3: Concurrent Validity of PSBB. The third aim of the current investigation was to examine the concurrent validity of PSBB. Concurrent validity was examined in several ways. First, bivariate correlations were computed between factors scores on the PSBB. Next, bivariate correlations were used to examine the association between factor scores of the PSBB and peer victimization, internalizing symptoms (depression, anxiety, and stress), aggression, and self-esteem. Next, a series of regression models were estimated to examine whether factors of the PSBB were uniquely associated with peer victimization, internalizing symptoms, aggression, and self-esteem, controlling for sex and race.

Aim 4: Concurrent Validity as a Function of Victim Status and Sex. Finally, to examine whether concurrent validity of the PSBB varies as a function of victim status and sex, a series of multiple group models were estimated in Mplus version 7.3. The grouping variable for these models was either students' victim status (Victim in Elementary School, Victim in High School, Chronic Victim, or Non-Victim) or sex. One model was estimated for each outcome. Each outcome (i.e. peer victimization, aggression, internalizing symptoms, self-esteem) was simultaneously regressed on the set of PSBB factors and participant race. Models that examined

the associations between PSBB factors and outcomes were freely estimated across the groups. Model fit for freely estimated and constrained models was compared using a chi-square difference test to determine which model best fit the data. Moving forward with a multiple group model would be justified if the freely estimated multiple group model fit the data better than a model where effects were constrained to be equal across groups. Three models were estimated. Internalizing symptoms and self-esteem were grouped together, while aggression and peer victimization were estimated separately. Outcomes (i.e. peer victimization, aggression, internalizing symptoms, self-esteem) were simultaneously regressed on PSBB factors and a set of control variables (race).

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Means, standard deviations, and correlations among the PSBB factor scores and primary study variables are reported in Tables 1-2.

Primary Analyses

Aim 1: Exploratory Factor Analyses. To address Aim 1, the factor structure and psychometric properties of the Parent Suggested Strategies for Bullying Behavior (PSBB) was examined. An EFA was initially estimated on the full item pool of the PSBB to determine the initial factor structure. Eigenvalues were greater than 1.0 for 8 factors (9.09-1.06), and bends in the scree plot emerged at 1, 3, and 8 factors. Factor interpretability was limited and model fit was poor for 1-5 factor models (see Table 3). Due to poor model fit being observed for factor solutions 1-5, a 6-, 7-, and 8-factor solution was further evaluated. Based on these criteria, an 8-factor model was first examined as a possible solution. While model fit was acceptable for the 8-factor model, (e.g., RMSEA = .06, CFI = .93, TLI = .89, SRMR = .03) the factor structure that emerged was difficult to interpret. Several factors had no items with rotated factor loadings $> .4$ and two factors seemed conceptually indistinguishable.

The 7-factor model was considered next as it appeared to be the best fit conceptually. The model fit for the initial 7-factor model containing all 40 items on the PSBB (RMSEA = .06, CFI = .91, TLI = .87, SRMR = .03) was acceptable. However, 7 of the 40 items either did not load or had high cross-loadings on the 7 factors. The 7-factor model was reanalyzed removing items that failed to load on one of the seven factors. Model fit (RMSEA = .07, CFI = .93, TLI = .89, SRMR = .02) for the 7-factor model with 7 items removed remained acceptable. The 33 item 7-factor

model reanalysis revealed that 1 item (“Told me to tell them to stop in a firm voice”) failed to load strongly on its primary factor (assertiveness) and had a high cross-loading on a second factor (supporting the victim). Removing this item from the model resulted in one factor, assertiveness, containing only two items. In light of this, a 6-factor model was examined.

The six-factor model included meaningful factors that represented an aggressive retaliation strategy towards the bully, ignoring the bully, supporting the victim, minimizing, blaming the victim, and parent action. Model fit for the initial 6-factor model containing all 40 items was mediocre to acceptable (RMSEA = 0.07, SRMR = 0.04, CFI = 0.89, and TLI = 0.84). However, 11 out of the 40 items did not load onto one of the six factors. The 6-factor model was reanalyzed removing items that failed to load onto one of the six factors. The model fit improved (RMSEA = .07, CFI = .94, TLI = .90, SRMR = .02) and was deemed acceptable. All 29 items loaded well on to one of the six factors. The 29 item 6-factor model was deemed the model of choice and used in all subsequent analyses. See Table 3 for model fit statistics for 1-8 factors models, and the rotated factor loadings for the full 6-, 7-, and 8-factor solutions are presented in Tables 4-6. Rotated factor loadings for the 40- and 29- item 6-factor solution are presented in Tables 7-8. Means and standard deviations for all 29 items are presented in Table 10.

After reviewing item content, the first factor was labeled “*Aggressive Retaliation*” as it described parents’ strategies for responding to bullying that are physically aggressive (hit, kick, punch) and retaliatory (“get back” at the bully). The second factor was labeled “*Ignore the Bully*” because it described parent strategies that suggest the victim should ignore, walk away, or not pay any attention to the bully. The third factor was labeled “*Victim Support*” as it described elements of support (e.g., reassure, comfort, cheer-up, listen to the child/victim) from parents towards the child victim. The fourth factor was labeled “*Minimizing*” as it described parent

strategies that suggested that the victim minimize the behavior (e.g., not the end of the world, it is part of life, teaches victims how to stand up for themselves or toughen up). The fifth factor was labeled “*Victim Blaming*” as it described parent suggestions that found fault with the victim (e.g., stop whining, did not believe the victim, telling the victim to be a better friend). The final and sixth factor was labeled “*Parent Action*” as it described parent strategies that indicated parents would take action on behalf of the child/victim (e.g., call the teacher and/or school, call the bully’s parents, or punish the bully). Internal consistency for *Aggressive Retaliation* ($\alpha = .84$), *Ignore the Bully* ($\alpha = .91$), *Victim Support* ($\alpha = .91$), *Minimizing* ($\alpha = .84$), *Victim Blaming* ($\alpha = .92$), and *Parent Action* ($\alpha = .79$) was good.

Aim 2: Mean Differences in Strategies based on Victimization Status and Sex. Aim 2 examined mean differences in PSBB factor scores as a function of victimization status (i.e., Victim in Elementary School, Victim in High School, Chronic Victim, or Non-Victim) or sex. Students in the Non-Victim category scored higher on *Victim Support* ($\beta = .13$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$). Further, Non-Victims ($\beta = .04$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$) also scored higher on *Minimizing*. Chronic Victims scored higher on *Parent Action* ($\beta = .16$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$). Victims in Elementary school scored lower on *Victim Support* ($\beta = -.13$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$).

Aim 3: Concurrent Validity of Factors. First, the bivariate associations among the PSBB factors as well as the associations between PSBB factors and measures of social and psychological adjustment were examined (see Table 2). *Aggressive Retaliation* was positively associated with *Minimizing* ($r = .34$, $p < .01$), *Victim Blaming* ($r = .44$, $p < .01$), *Parent Action* ($r = .22$, $p < .01$), and impulsive aggression ($r = .19$, $p < .01$). *Ignore the Bully* was positively associated with *Victim Support* ($r = .56$, $p < .01$), *Minimizing* ($r = .29$, $p < .01$), and *Parent Action* ($r = .19$, $p < .01$). *Victim Support* was positively associated with *Minimizing* ($r = .21$, $p < .01$).

.01), *Parent Action* ($r = .23, p < .01$), and self-esteem ($r = .20, p < .01$), while it was negatively correlated with *Victim Blaming* ($r = .22, p < .01$), depression ($r = .25, p < .01$), anxiety ($r = .14, p < .05$), and stress ($r = .15, p < .05$). *Minimizing* was positively associated with *Victim Blaming* ($r = .44, p < .01$) and *Parent Action* ($r = .26, p < .01$). *Victim Blaming* was positively associated with *Parent Action* ($r = .23, p < .01$), anxiety ($r = .15, p < .05$), impulsive aggression ($r = .22, p < .01$), and premeditated aggression ($r = .17, p < .01$), and was negatively associated with self-esteem ($r = -.21, p < .01$). *Parent Action* was positively associated with impulsive aggression ($r = .17, p < .01$) and premeditated aggression ($r = .22, p < .01$), and negatively associated with depression ($r = .12, p < .05$).

Examined next was whether PSBB factors were uniquely associated with measures of social, behavioral, and psychological adjustment (Tables 11-13). Sex and race were included as covariates in each regression model. *Aggressive Retaliation* was positively associated with self-esteem at the level of a non-significant trend ($\beta = .13, SE = .07, p = .06$), suggesting that college students whose parents suggested aggressive retaliation in response to bullying endorsed higher levels of self-esteem. *Aggressive Retaliation* was also positively associated with engaging in impulsive aggression ($\beta = .15, SE = .07, p < .05$), suggesting that college students whose parents suggested they use aggressive retaliation in response to bullying were more likely to report higher levels of impulsive aggression. *Ignore the Bully* was negatively associated with self-esteem ($\beta = -.14, SE = .07, p < .05$), indicating that college students whose parents suggested they ignore victimization reported lower self-esteem. *Ignore the Bully* was positively associated with peer victimization in elementary school ($\beta = .16, SE = .07, p < .05$) and peer victimization in high school at the level of a non-significant trend ($\beta = .14, SE = .07, p = .06$), suggesting that college students whose parents suggested they ignore victimization were more likely to endorse

victimization experiences in elementary school and in high school. *Victim Support* was negatively associated with depression symptoms ($\beta = -.25$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) and stress in college students ($\beta = -.17$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$) and negatively associated with symptoms of anxiety at the level of a non-significant trend ($\beta = -.14$, $SE = .07$, $p = .06$). This suggests that college students who reported that their parents were supportive when they disclosed victimization are less likely to report high stress levels, and symptoms of depression and anxiety. *Victim Support* was significantly negatively associated with levels of peer victimization in elementary school ($\beta = -.17$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$) and levels of peer victimization in high school at the level of a non-significant trend ($\beta = -.14$, $SE = .08$, $p = .07$), indicating that students whose parents responded to the disclosure of bullying with support were reported lower levels of peer victimization. *Victim Support* was positively associated with self-esteem ($\beta = .21$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$). *Victim Blaming*, was positively associated with impulsive and premeditated aggression ($\beta = .15$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$; $\beta = .15$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$), self-reported anxiety symptoms ($\beta = .14$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) and negatively associated with self-esteem ($\beta = -.27$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$). *Parent Action* was positively associated with premeditated aggression ($\beta = .18$, $SE = .06$, $p < .05$), suggesting that students whose parents took action when bullying was disclosed were more likely to engaged in premeditated aggression.

Aim 4: Concurrent Validity as a Function of Victim Status and Sex. To address whether the association between PSBB factors and measures of social, behavioral, and psychological adjustment varied as a function of victim status and sex, a series of multiple group models were estimated in Mplus version 7.3. Model results were grouped by students who reported victimization in elementary school, high school, both in elementary school and high school, or neither elementary school or high school. Individuals who endorsed victimization in

elementary school on the Retrospective Bullying Questionnaire with a score of 3 or above (indicating that individuals were sometimes victimized) were considered elementary school victims. Individuals who endorsed victimization in high school on the Retrospective Bullying Questionnaire with a score of 3 or above (indicating that individuals were sometimes victimized) were considered high-school victims. Students who met the criteria for victimization both in elementary school and in high school were considered chronic victims. Students who endorsed victimization below the threshold of 3 both in elementary school and in high school were considered Non-Victims.

Models where associations between PSBB factor scores and psychosocial adjustment variables that were freely estimated across groups were compared to models where associations that were constrained to be equal across the groups. Model fit was compared by using a chi-square difference test. Freely estimated multiple group models were fully saturated—all possible relationships among variables were being estimated in the model. A fully saturated model has a chi-square value of zero with zero degrees of freedom. Results from model comparison tests are found in Table 10. For sex, the fit for the freely estimated models for all outcome variables was not significantly different from the model where associations were constrained to be equal across sex. Thus, there was no justification for the multiple group models with sex as the grouping variable. When comparing non-victims to victims, the fit for the freely estimated model was significantly better across all outcome variables (internalizing symptoms and self-esteem, aggression, and peer victimization) when compared to the constrained model. Thus, all models with this grouping variable were included in the results. For the multiple group models comparing chronic victims to non-chronic victims, the freely estimated multiple group models for the aggression and peer victimization outcome fit the data significantly better than the

constrained models. The chronic victim model for internalizing symptoms and self-esteem was not included due there not being a significant difference when compared to the fit of the model that was constrained to be equal across victim status. For models comparing elementary school victims to non-victims in elementary school, the freely estimated model for the peer victimization outcome fit significantly better than the constrained model, whereas the constrained model did not fit the data significantly worse than the freely estimated model for internalizing symptoms and aggression. Thus, multiple group models were not estimated for models predicting internalizing symptoms and aggression. For the model comparing high school victims to non-high school victims, the fit for the freely estimated model was significantly better across all outcome variables (internalizing symptoms, aggression, and peer victimization) when compared to the constrained model. Thus, all multiple group models were retained for this grouping variable. Results are presented below by status indicator and outcome and in Tables 14-24.

Victims in Elementary School and Peer Victimization

For victims in elementary school, *Aggressive Retaliation* was positively associated with victimization in elementary school ($\beta = .32$, $SE = .13$, $p < .05$), suggesting that elementary school victims whose parents suggested they respond to victimization with aggression or retaliation experienced higher levels of victimization in elementary school. For non-victims in elementary school, *Ignore the Bully*, was positively associated with peer victimization in elementary school ($\beta = .19$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$). This finding suggests that individuals who were not categorized as victims in elementary school were more likely to report experiencing victimization in elementary school when their parents encouraged them to ignore bullying.

Victims in High School and Internalizing Outcomes

Ignoring the Bully was negatively associated with self-esteem in high school victims ($\beta = -.36$, $SE = .17$, $p < .05$), suggesting that victims whose parents suggested they ignore the bullying reported lower self-esteem. *Victim Support* was negatively associated with depression and stress for high school victims ($\beta = -.43$, $SE = .14$, $p < .05$; $\beta = -.37$, $SE = .15$, $p < .05$). This suggests that high school victims who endorsed items indicating their parents supported them when disclosing bullying were less likely to endorse depression symptoms and stress. *Victim Support* was positively associated with self-esteem for victims ($\beta = .26$, $SE = .15$, $p = .06$), but at the level of a non-significant trend. *Minimizing* was positively associated with self-esteem for high school victims ($\beta = .34$, $SE = .15$, $p < .05$), suggesting that if victims indicated that their parents suggested they minimize the bullying or externalize the fault, that students would endorse higher levels of self-esteem. *Victim Blaming* was negatively associated with self-esteem for high school victims ($\beta = -.42$, $SE = .15$, $p < .05$), suggesting that victims whose parents blamed them for the bullying were less likely to endorse levels of self-esteem.

For those who did not meet the threshold for victim status in high school, *Ignore the Bully* was negatively associated with self-esteem at the level of a non-significant trend ($\beta = -.15$, $SE = .08$, $p = .07$). *Victim Support* was negatively associated with depression ($\beta = -.18$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$) and positively associated with self-esteem for individuals who were not victims in high school ($\beta = .21$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$). *Victim Blaming* was negatively associated with self-esteem for those who were not victims in high school ($\beta = -.24$, $SE = .15$, $p < .05$). *Victim Blaming* was positively associated with anxiety symptoms for non-victims ($\beta = .19$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$), suggesting that those who were not considered victims in high school endorsed more anxiety symptoms if parents blamed them for occasional instances of bullying. *Parent Action* was

negatively associated with depression symptoms for those who were not victims ($\beta = -.15$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$), suggesting that if students whose parents took action when they disclosed bullying, they were less likely to endorse symptoms of depression.

Victims in High School and Aggression

For victims in high school, *Aggressive Retaliation* was positively associated with impulsive aggression ($\beta = .43$, $SE = .15$, $p < .05$), indicating that victims in high school whose parents suggested aggressive or retaliation strategies were more likely to endorse impulsive aggression as college students. *Parent Action* was positively associated with impulsive ($\beta = .16$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) and premeditated aggression ($\beta = .24$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$). for students who were not victims in high school.

Victims in High School and Victimization

Victim Support was negatively associated with victimization in high school for those classified as victims in high school ($\beta = -.33$, $SE = .15$, $p < .05$) suggesting that high-school victims whose parents were supportive were less likely to report instances of bullying in high school. *Victim Blaming* was negatively associated with high school victimization ($\beta = -.28$, $SE = .13$, $p < .05$). *Parent Action* was negatively associated with victimization for non-victims in high school ($\beta = -.15$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$), suggesting that students who did not meet the victim threshold whose parents took action were less likely to experience victimization in high school. For non-victims in high school, *Aggressive Retaliation* ($\beta = .04$, $SE = .08$, $p = .08$), *Ignore the Bully* ($\beta = .15$, $SE = .08$, $p = .08$), and *Parent Action* ($\beta = .06$, $SE = .07$, $p = .07$) were positively associated with victimization in elementary school, but only at the level of a non-significant trend. *Minimizing* was negatively associated with peer victimization in elementary school for non-victims, but again only at the level of a non-significant trend ($\beta = -.09$, $SE = .08$, $p > .05$).

Chronic Victims and Aggression

Aggressive Retaliation was positively associated with both impulsive ($\beta = .55$, $SE = .19$, $p < .05$) and premeditated aggression ($\beta = .52$, $SE = .22$, $p < .05$) in chronic victims. These findings suggest that chronic victims who reported that their parents endorsed aggressive strategies in response to bullying were more likely to endorse levels of impulsive and premeditated aggression, which may have perpetuated the cycle of victimization. *Victim Blaming* was positively associated with impulsive aggression for chronic victims ($\beta = .44$, $SE = .18$, $p < .05$) as well as premeditated aggression, but only at the level of a non-significant trend ($\beta = .38$, $SE = .21$, $p = .07$). *Parent Action*, was negatively associated with impulsive aggression ($\beta = -.52$, $SE = .16$, $p < .05$) and premeditated aggression ($\beta = -.37$, $SE = .16$, $p < .05$) suggesting that chronic victims who reported that their parents took action were less likely to endorse levels of impulsive aggression.

Parent Action was positively associated with impulsive ($\beta = .16$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) and premeditated ($\beta = .24$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$) aggression for students who were not considered chronic victims. *Victim Blaming* was positively associated with premeditated aggression for those who were not considered chronic victims, but only at the level of a non-significant trend ($\beta = .15$, $SE = .08$, $p = .07$).

Chronic Victims and Victimization

Victim Blaming was negatively associated with victimization in high school for chronic victims ($\beta = -.57$, $SE = .19$, $p < .05$). This suggests that students whose parents blamed them for bullying were less likely to report and/or endorse victimization in high school. For students who did not meet the threshold to be considered a chronic victim, *Ignore the Bully* was positively associated with victimization in elementary school ($\beta = .15$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$), indicating that

students whose parents suggested they ignore bullying were more likely to endorse victimization in elementary school.

Non-Victims and Internalizing Outcomes

Victim Support was positively associated with self-esteem for non-victims ($\beta = .20$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$), suggesting that non-victims whose parents were supportive endorsed higher levels of self-esteem. *Victim Blaming* was negatively associated with self-esteem ($\beta = -.26$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$), indicating that non-victims whose parents blamed them for transient bullying experiences were less likely to endorse levels of self-esteem. For students who did not meet the non-victim threshold, *Victim Support* was positively associated with self-esteem ($\beta = .28$, $SE = .13$, $p < .05$), and negatively associated with depression ($\beta = -.31$, $SE = .12$, $p < .05$), which are also consistent findings across victim groups. *Victim Blaming* was negatively associated with self-esteem for those who did not meet the non-victim threshold ($\beta = -.28$, $SE = .11$, $p < .05$), which is also consistent with previous findings across victim groups.

Non-Victims and Aggression

For Non-Victims, *Victim Blaming* was positively associated with premeditated aggression ($\beta = .19$, $SE = .10$, $p < .05$), suggesting that non-victims whose parents blamed them for instances of bullying were more likely to engage in premeditated aggression. *Parent Action* was also positively associated with premeditated aggression for non-victims ($\beta = .20$, $SE = .07$, $p < .05$). This finding suggests that non-victims were more likely to engage in premeditated aggression if their parents took action when disclosing victimization.

Non-Victims and Victimization

Ignore the Bully was positively associated with peer victimization for non-victims in elementary school ($\beta = .20$, $SE = .09$, $p < .05$), suggesting that for non-victims, parents who

suggested they ignore transient experiences of bullying were more likely to experience victimization in elementary school. *Parent Action* was negatively associated with victimization levels in high school ($\beta = -.15$, $SE = .08$, $p < .05$) for non-victims. This suggests that individuals who were not victims reported less victimization in high school if they indicated their parents took action. For those who did not meet the non-victim threshold, *Aggressive Retaliation* was positively associated with victimization in elementary school ($\beta = .24$, $SE = .11$, $p < .05$), which is consistent with findings for victims in elementary school.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

Bullying is a pervasive public health problem that affects individuals of all ages. Social ecological theory (Bronfenbrenner, 1979) conceptualizes that the development and persistence of bullying is not just the result of individual characteristics, but is influenced by multiple relationships, including those with peers, families, teachers, neighbors, and interactions with societal influences (Swearer & Hymel, 2015). Parents have substantial influence on children's behavior, and it is possible that how parents respond when they learn their children are bullied has implications for children's peer victimization experiences, as well as their behavioral, social, and emotional functioning. Benbenishity and Astor (2005) argue that "one of the most important perspectives that should be added to studies of school violence is that of the students' parents" (p. 163). Consistent with this call, understanding the role that parents play in responding to peer victimization is critical.

Prior studies have investigated the strategies that children use or teachers recommend for coping with, or responding to, school bullying, but few quantitative studies have examined parents' response and strategies towards bullying. The primary aim of the current study was to examine the factor structure and concurrent validity of the PSBB. An aim of the study was to examine if items from the PSBB would load onto factors describing parent responses that reflect strategies found in the stress and coping literature, such as approach- vs. avoidance-oriented strategies, emotion-focused strategies, and direct vs. indirect strategies (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002; Smith, Shu, & Madsen, 2001; Cassidy et al., 2012). It was also predicted that these parent responses would be differentially related to measures of psychosocial adjustment.

Finally, the current study examined whether the concurrent validity for the PSBB factors varied depending on the victimization status of the individual or their sex.

Factor Structure of the PSBB

Results of the EFA supported a 6-factor solution, and estimates of internal consistency were good for each factor score. Factors that emerged mapped onto several domains identified in previous literature, and that were predicted based on expert consultation. Factors 1 and 6, *Aggressive Retaliation* and *Parent Action*, captured responses that could be considered direct (e.g. reporting bullying to the school administrators, calling the bully's parents, or fighting back with physical force) or approach-oriented responses to bullying. The *Victim Support* and *Minimizing* factors captured a more indirect (e.g., parental support, comforting the child, and emotion-focused coping) approach to responding to bullying. Further, *Ignore the Bully* captured responses indicative of avoidance-oriented strategies (e.g., walk away, pay no attention to the bully, bullying is just part of growing up). Further, while *Victim Blaming* does not directly fall within one of these strategies, it could be considered a counter approach to emotion-focused coping. Previous studies have indicated that social skill-building qualities such as assertiveness and problem-solving techniques are effective strategies for managing bullying experiences (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; DeRosier, 2004), but a factor capturing assertiveness (e.g., tell the bully to stop in a firm voice, going to get a friend, teacher, or parent to help) did not emerge from the EFA. It is possible that items selected to assess approach-oriented strategies did not adequately capture the construct. Several PSBB approach-oriented items were considered beliefs (Item 6: "Thought it taught me how to stand up for myself."), while other items were considered specific strategies for responding to bullying (Item 2: "Tell them to stop in a firm voice."). It is

possible that an assertiveness factor may have emerged had item content focused exclusively on assertive strategies for responding to bullying.

Group Differences in PSBB Factors by Sex and Victim Status

The second aim of the study was to examine mean-level differences in PSBB factors as a function of victimization status: Victim in Elementary School, Victim in High School, Chronic Victim, or Non-Victim and Sex. No group differences were observed within the Sex category. Students in the Non-Victim category scored higher on *Victim Support* compared to students who were victims. This suggests that college students who did not report high levels of victimization at any point in childhood were more likely to report that their parents responded with support around discussions of school bullying. Studies provide strong evidence for social support from parents as a salient factor in students' adjustment (Kilpatrick et al., 2005), and that while parental support does not guarantee the bullying will stop, it does provide children with a "line of defense" capable of impacting the extent to which children experience subsequent peer victimization (Kilpatrick-Demaray et al., 2005; Brown pp. 22). It was also found that Non-victims compared to victims were more likely to report that parents endorsed *Minimizing* strategies when they disclosed victimization. It is possible that when the frequency of victimization is low or transient, parents are more likely to minimize peer victimization experiences, or utilize the opportunity to make the experience into a teachable moment (such experiences make you a stronger person, part of growing up, toughens you up). Thus, parents modeled for Non-Victims that any transient victimization experiences are a typical part of growing up (Mishna, 2004).

Students categorized as chronic victims scored higher on *Parent Action* when compared to those who were not classified as chronic victims. Given that these students were victimized

frequently over an extended period of time (throughout elementary and high school), it makes sense that parents of chronic victims would take action by contacting school administrators or the bully's parents. Victims of chronic bullying often experience a number of negative adjustment outcomes (Card & Hodges, 2008), and a study by Brown and colleagues (2013) that examined parental experiences when reporting bullying to school officials found that when parents noticed negative psychosocial outcomes in their child escalate, they sought out help from school officials.

Victims in elementary school scored lower on *Victim Support* when compared to those who were not considered victims in elementary school, suggesting that those who were identified as victims in elementary school did not feel that their parents were as supportive when they disclosed peer victimization experiences. Previous research suggests that children may respond with increased caution or become reluctant to disclose future bullying incidents to adults when parents do not support or acknowledge children's bullying experiences (Mishna, 2004). In the current study, victim's perceptions of lower levels of parental support in response to a victimization disclosure could suggest the need for parent training focused on how to respond well when a child reports feeling victimized at school.

Concurrent Validity of the PSBB

The following section describes the content of and concurrent validity for each PSBB factor. Also reported in this section is whether the association between the PSBB factors and measures of psychosocial adjustment vary as a function of victim status. The current study found no evidence that the association between PSBB factors and measures of psychosocial adjustment was different for male and female college students, so a discussion of sex differences in these relations is not warranted. Concurrent associations between parent responses and strategies

toward bullying behavior factors and measures of victimization, internalizing outcomes and aggression are presented in the following section.

The emergence of an *Aggressive Retaliation* factor is in line with numerous qualitative studies documenting that some victims will attempt to fight back or retaliate against the bully. Four items within the *Aggressive Retaliation* factor tap into aggressive (e.g., “Told me to fight back with physical force.”) or retaliatory behaviors (e.g., “Told me to try and get back at them.”). In support of the validity of this factor, college students whose parents endorsed *Aggressive Retaliation* were more likely to report premeditated and impulsive aggression as young adults. Moreover, *Aggressive Retaliation* was positively associated with impulsive and premeditated aggression for both victims of bullying in high school and chronically bullied students. Victims of bullying in high school and chronic victims of bullying whose parents encouraged aggression and retaliation towards the bully endorsed higher levels of impulsive and premeditated aggression as young adults. This finding is in line with social learning theory (Bandura, 1973, 1986) in that children whose parents’ model, endorse, or condone acts of aggression are more likely to view aggression as an acceptable and functional response in other relationships. Indeed, parents’ behaviors may serve as a model upon which children base their behaviors and expectations of future relationships (Ladd, 1992).

The current study also found evidence that *Aggressive Retaliation* was positively associated with peer victimization in elementary school students. This finding provides further evidence for the validity of the *Aggressive Retaliation* factor as it is consistent with a growing body of literature suggesting that children who respond to bullying with aggression or coercion are more likely to experience persistent victimization over time (Mahady-Wilton, Craig, & Pepler, 2000; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Perry, Perry & Kennedy, 1993).

Ignore the Bully, captured parent responses or strategies that suggested the child should ignore the bully. Items within this factor (3) indicated that parents tell children to walk away, or not pay any attention to the bully/perpetrator. This factor aligns with previous research that has considered avoidance-oriented strategies, or parent-recommended strategies instructing children to ignore the bullying (Sawyer et al., 2011). It has been argued that ignoring the bullying is not an effective strategy for responding to persistent peer victimization because ignoring is not feasible in the face of frequent bullying behavior (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002). The current study found that *Ignore the Bully* was negatively associated with self-esteem in young adulthood and was also a significant negative predictor of self-esteem for students classified as victims in high-school. These findings align with previous research suggesting that choosing to actively ignore peer victimization does not necessarily negate the psychological consequences often associated with chronic peer victimization (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002).

In further support of the validity of this factor, *Ignore the Bully* was positively associated with levels of peer victimization in elementary school, but only for students who were not classified as victims in elementary school or who were not classified as victims in both elementary school and high school. This finding leads further support for the notion that ignoring peer victimization experiences is not an effective strategy for responding to bullying and is consistent with prior research suggesting that children who choose to avoid interpersonal stressors (active ignoring, distraction) are less likely to experience a reduction in subsequent victimization (Carver, Scheier & Weintraub, 1989; Roth & Cohen, 1986; Endler & Parker, 1990; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002).

The third factor that emerged from the EFA was *Victim Support*, which is consistent with an indirect strategy described in the stress and coping literature. Items (6) on this scale indicated

that parents listened (“Listened to me.”) and comforted (“Told me that everything was going to be ok;”; “Reassured me.”) their children when bullying was disclosed. The content of the factor *Victim Support* is consistent with numerous studies suggesting that parents often respond with support and comfort when they learn their child is bullied. It is thought that this type of response strategy provides emotional support to children (Konishi & Hymel, 2009; Kilpatrick-Demaray & Malecki, 2003; Cassidy et al., 2012; Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004), promotes prosocial behaviors (Sawyer et al., 2011), and attempts to maintain child self-esteem (Humphrey and Crisp, 2008) toward the goal of altering children’s experiences with bullying. Consistent with this conceptualization, and in support of the validity of the *Victim Support* factor, college students in the current study whose parents supported them when they were bullied as children were more likely to endorse higher levels of self-esteem. In Sawyer et. al.’s qualitative study, many of the interviewed parents described supporting their child by giving assurances to improve their self-esteem, with such statements as “You are okay,” “You are smart,” “You are bright,” “You are fun,” “You are a good friend to people that you are friends with,” and “I love you no matter what.” (2011, p. 1797). Providing emotional support to bullied children may help them re-frame a situation by teaching them to change the way they think about bullying behavior (Terranova et al., 2011; Harcourt et al., 2013).

Victim Support was negatively associated with retrospective reports of peer victimization in childhood and current levels of depression and stress in young adulthood. *Victim Support* was also positively associated with self-esteem in young adulthood for those categorized as victims in high school. These findings are in-line with previous research indicating that support was a salient protective factor for victims of bullying. Social support from parents has been found in one longitudinal study to protect victims from anxiety, depression, and low self-esteem

(Kilpatrick-Demaray et. al., 2005). The finding is also in-line with previous research finding that victims are more likely to report social support from parents as an important intervention compared to non-victims (Kilpatrick-Demaray & Malecki, 2003), and that children who seek advice from adults (e.g., teacher or parents) in an effort to resolve conflict experience reductions in peer victimization over the course of a single academic year (Kochenderfer-Ladd, 2004; Sawyer et al., 2011). Parental support can buffer the negative effects of being bullied (Konishi & Hymel, 2009).

The fourth factor that emerged, *Minimizing*, is defined by a set of items that represent a response from parents that minimizes the atypicality of a child's bullying experiences, suggesting the experience is a normal part of growing up. Items (5) within this factor align with research that has found that parents tend to normalize bullying behaviors, such as stating that the experiences will make the child a stronger person growing up, and that managing bullying behavior is part of life. (Brown et al., 2010; Zaklama 2003). *Minimizing* was positively associated with self-esteem in young adulthood for students categorized as victims in high school. It is possible that minimizing bullying behavior may be considered supportive and helpful to children, depending on the severity and frequency of the child's experiences. Given that Hoover, Oliver and Hazler (1992) found that the majority children had been victimized at some point during their school years, and that many of them did not feel that such experiences had severely harmed them, it is possible that minimizing the bullying behavior may help children conceptualize victimization as a common social experience (Humphrey and Crisp, 2008). It is important to note that this finding did not extend to chronic victims or students who were classified as victims in elementary school, indicating that the effectiveness of this strategy might

differ for children who are considered chronic victims or for children who are victimized at an early age.

Victim Blaming emerged as the fifth factor from the EFA. Items (8) representing this factor described parental responses blaming a victim (e.g., “Blamed me for being bullied;” “Told me to stop whining about it.”). In support of the validity of this factor, *Victim Blaming* was positively associated with anxiety symptoms and negatively associated with self-esteem. This latter finding was especially true for students who were high school victim and for students who were not classified as victims during childhood. Previous research suggests that children who are victimized are less able to see themselves in a positive light, are more self-critical, and have higher levels of internalizing distress (Cole et al 2014; Hawker and Boulton 2000). It is possible that victim blaming, negative parenting behavior, could exacerbate these tendencies. The current study also found that *Victim Blaming* was negatively associated with levels of peer victimization for high school victims and chronic victims. This finding is difficult to interpret, but it may suggest parents may be more likely to blame or actively dismiss the experience of the victim when their score on victimization was less severe (i.e., closer to the study’s cut score of 3 or more). However, it is also possible that when children are blamed for their bullying experiences, they may respond with increased caution or reluctance to disclosing future bullying incidents (Mishna, 2004). In other words, students who were blamed for their victimization experiences may have been less likely to endorse being bullied.

The final factor to emerge from the EFA was *Parent Action*, which is a parenting response consistent with an direct and approach-oriented coping strategy. Items (3) in this factor consisted of direct parent actions intended to address bullying (e.g., “Would call my teacher or school immediately”; “Would call the bullying child’s parents immediately”). There is some

evidence that youth believe parent action is a common response to learning about a child's victimization (Glover et al., 2000). There was some evidence to support the concurrent validity of this factor. *Parent Action* was negatively associated with levels of peer victimization in high school for non-victims, indicating that students who were identified as non-victims reported less high school peer victimization when they endorsed higher scores on *Parent Action*. It is important to note that this finding was not found for chronic victims or for victims whose experiences were more transient (e.g. high school or elementary school only). It is possible that this strategy may be more effective for children who are experiencing low levels of peer victimization at school.

In further support for the validity of this factor, *Parent Action* was positively correlated with impulsive aggression and premeditated aggression, and negatively correlated with depression. Similarly, for children categorized as non-victims, *Parent Action* was positively associated with aggression. It is possible that *Parent Action* could be interpreted by children as an aggressive parental response (e.g., The bully will be punished), which when modeled, influences the likelihood that children will use aggression in their own relationships (Bandura, 1973; Ladd, 1992). Interestingly, *Parent Action* was negatively associated with aggression in young adulthood for students categorized as chronic victims. This suggests that chronic victims engaged in less aggression in young adulthood if their parents took action when they were bullied. It is possible that for chronic victims, immediate parent action could reduce frustration associated with feeling helpless in the face of bullying. For this group of children, parent action could be viewed as a form of support rather than an aggressive parental response. It possible that reductions in feelings of frustration and helpless may make it less likely that individuals respond to an interpersonal stressor with aggression. These findings need replication and should be

interpreted with caution.

Summary

Overall, this study provided evidence for the reliability and validity of the PSBB. Factors that emerged from EFA were *Aggressive Retaliation*, *Ignore the Bully*, *Victim Support*, *Minimizing*, *Victim Blaming*, and *Parent Action*. These factors aligned with strategies and responses identified in several qualitative studies (Brown et al., 2012; Sawyer et al., 2011; Harcourt et al., 2013; Cassidy et al., 2012) and with strategies noted in the stress and coping literature. Although an assertiveness factor did not emerge in the current study, it is possible that this factor would emerge in a future study including a larger pool of items tapping into assertive responses to bullying. This study also provided evidence that factors of the PSBB were related to children's peer victimization experiences and to measures of adjustment in young adulthood. In particular, *Victim Support* was often associated with positive outcomes for students while *Aggressive Retaliation* and *Ignoring the Bully* were often associated with worse outcomes for students.

Strengths and Limitations

The current study has several strengths worth noting. The PSBB addressed a gap in the literature regarding the measurement of parent strategies and responses to bullying. To the author's knowledge, this is the first quantitative evaluation of content-specific strategies and responses parents endorse when children disclose bullying. Moreover, identification of items for the PSBB were grounded in a thorough review of the literature and were informed by consultation with a researcher with expertise in the content area. The current study assessed the concurrent validity of PSBB factors and whether evidence for validity varied as a function of victimization status and sex

There are also several limitations of the current investigation that need discussion. The number of participants who completed the PSBB was relatively small ($N= 282$), reducing statistical power to detect significant effects. The factor structure of the measure needs replication in a larger sample. In addition, this measure assesses young adult's retrospective reports of parents' responses to bullying. It is unclear whether a similar factor structure would emerge in an adapted version of this measure for children or parents. Future research investigating the factor structure of the PSBB should also consider including more items related to assertiveness, as it is possible that this factor may emerge with the addition of more items or by modifying existing items to tap assertive responses more directly.

A better understanding of what specific strategies are effective based on victim status is needed. More quantitative studies are needed to further understand the strategies parents use when children disclose bullying, and how said strategies are affecting children both short and long term. The inclusion of parents in anti-bullying programs, such as parent meetings and trainings in bullying policies, has been found to be significantly correlated with the reduction of bullying and victimization within schools (Ttofi and Farrington, 2011). Thus, more knowledge of parent responses may help facilitate better understanding around the effectiveness of strategies to combat bullying to be utilized in anti-bullying programs in schools and communities.

Clinical Implications

Parents are considered vital sources of support for children, and it is important for parents to help their children find appropriate ways to respond to bullying. Findings from this study suggest that some strategies might be more appropriate and/or effective for children who are transiently victimized compared to chronically bullied children. Specifically, parent strategies such as *Victim Support* and *Minimizing* appear to be associated with better outcomes in young

adulthood, while *Aggressive Retaliation*, *Ignore the Bully*, and *Victim Blaming* are associated with worse psychosocial adjustment. However, it is important to note that the extent to which a parent strategy or response is helpful or harmful could depend on the child's victimization status. For example, when students who were classified as non-victims or transient victims reported that their parents took action, they were more likely to endorse impulsive and premeditated aggression. However, chronic victims who endorsed that their parents took action endorsed less impulsive and premeditated aggression. These results suggest that the value or implications of parents taking action in response to bullying depends on the severity or chronicity of the child's bullying experience. Future studies should further consider whether the implications of particular parent responses to school bullying depends on the victimization status of the child. Factors on the PSBB appear to capture a broad range of parent strategies or responses to peer victimization that have implications for students' psychosocial adjustment. Continued research in this area could lead to interventions focused on training parents how to respond effectively to children who report bullying experiences.

REFERENCES

- Andreou, E. (2001). Bully/victim problems and their association with coping behavior in conflictual peer interactions among school-age children. *Educational Psychology, 21*(1), 59–66.
- Arseneault L, Bowes L, Shakoor S. (2010). Bullying victimization in youths and mental health problems: ‘much ado about nothing’? *Psychol Med, 40* (5), 717-729.
- Atlas, R. S., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. *Journal of Educational Research, 92*(2), 86–99.
- Baldry, A. C., & Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and delinquents: Personal characteristics and parental styles. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 10*, 17–31.
- Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A social learning analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Barboza, G. E., Schiamberg, L. B., Oehmke, J., Korzeniewski, S. J., Post, L. A., & Herauz, C. G. (2009). Individual characteristics and the multiple contexts of adolescent bullying: An ecological perspective. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 38*(1), 101–121.
- Benbenishty, R., & Astor, R. V. (2005). *School violence in context: Culture, neighborhood, family, school, and gender*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Benson, P. L., Scales, P. C., Hamilton, S. F., & Sesma, A., Jr. (2006). Positive youth development: Theory, research, and applications. In R. M. Lerner, & W. Damon (Eds.), *6th ed.; Handbook of child psychology: Theoretical models of human development (vol. 1, 6th ed.)* (6th ed. ed., pp. 894-941, Chapter xx, 1063 Pages)
<https://login.proxy.lib.utk.edu:443/login?url=https://search-proquest->

com.proxy.lib.utk.edu/docview/621367646?accountid=14766

- Bronfenbrenner, U. (1979). Contexts of child rearing: Problems and prospects. *American Psychologist*, 34, 844–850. doi:10.1037//0003-066X.34.10.844
- Brown, J. R. (2010). Trajectories of parents' experiences in discovering, reporting, and living with the aftermath of middle school bullying. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses (UMI No. 3409133).
- Brown, T. A. (2006). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York, NY, US: The Guilford Press.
- Brown, T. A. (2015). *Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research*. New York: Guilford.
- Brown, J. R., Aalsma, M. C., & Ott, M. A. (2012). The Experiences of Parents Who Report Youth Bullying Victimization to School Officials. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 28(3), 494-518. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0886260512455513
- Card, N. A., & Hodges, E. V. E. (2008). Peer victimization among schoolchildren: Correlations, causes, consequences, and considerations in assessment and intervention. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(4), 451-461. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0012769
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F. & Weintraub, J. K. (1989). Assessing coping strategies: A theoretically based approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 56, 267–283.
- Cassidy, W., Brown, K., & Jackson, M. (2012). "Making kind cool": Parents' suggestions for preventing cyber bullying and fostering cyber kindness. *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, 46(4), 415-436.
doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.2190/EC.46.4.f
- Causey, D. L. & Dubow, E. F. (1992). Development of a self-report coping measure for elementary school children. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology*, 21, 47–59.

- Christie-Mizell, C. (2003). Bullying: The consequences of inter-parental discord and child's self-concept. *Family Process, 42*(2), 237-251. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1545-5300.2003.42204.x>
- Cole, D. A., Dukewich, T. L., Roeder, K., Sinclair, K. R., McMillan, J., Will, E., Felton, J. W. (2014). Linking peer victimization to the development of depressive self-schemas in children and adolescents. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 42*(1), 149-160. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu/90/10.1007/s10802-013-9769-1>
- 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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020149>
- Copeland, W. E., Wolke, D., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2013). Adult psychiatric outcomes of bullying and being bullied by peers in childhood and adolescence. *JAMA Psychiatry, 70*(4), 419-426.
- Cortes, K. I., & Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2014). To tell or not to tell: What influences children's decisions to report bullying to their teachers? *School Psychology Quarterly, 29*(3), 336-348. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000078>
- Costello, A. B. & Osborne, J. (2005). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. *Practical Assessment, 10*(7), 1-9.
- Costello, A. B., & Osborne, J. W. (2016). Best practices in exploratory factor analysis: Four recommendations for getting the most from your analysis. In G. J. Boyle, J. G. O'Gorman & G. J. Fogarty (Eds.), pp. 125-136, Chapter lxxxvii, 1649 Pages) Sage Publications, Inc, Thousand Oaks, CA. Retrieved from

<http://proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/1861221646?accountid=14766>

Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1997). Observations of bullying and victimization in the school yard. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13*(2), 41–60.

Craig, W., Pepler, D., & Blais, J. (2007). Responding to bullying: What works. *School Psychology International, 28*(4), 465-477.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.1177/0143034307084136>

Dehue, F., Bolman, C., Völlink, T., & Pouwelse, M. (2012). Coping with bullying at work and health related problems. *International Journal of Stress Management, 19*(3), 175-197.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.1037/a0028969>

DeRosier, M. E. (2004). Building relationships and combating bullying: Effectiveness of a school- based social skills group intervention. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology, 33*(1), 196 –201.

Duncan, N. (2004). It's important to be nice, but it's nicer to be important: Girls, popularity and sexual competition. *Sex Education, 4*(2), 137-152.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.1080/14681810410001678329>

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*(2), 129-141. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0020313>

Endler, N. S., & Parker, J. D. A. (1990). Multidimensional assessment of coping: A critical evaluation. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 58*, 844–854.

Espelage, D. (2001). Bullying and victimization during adolescence: Peer influences and psychosocial correlates. *Journal of Emotional Abuse, 2*(2/3), 124-141.

- Espelage, D. L., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review, 32*, 365–383.
- Fabrigar, L. R., Wegener, D. T., MacCallum, R. C., & Strahan, E. J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*(3), 272-299. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1082-989X.4.3.272>
- Fabrigar, L. R., & Wegener, D. T. (2012). *Exploratory factor analysis* Oxford University Press, New York, NY. Retrieved from <http://proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/login?url=https://search.proquest.com/docview/922505234?accountid=14766>
- Fields, L. & Printz, R. J. (1997). Coping and adjustment during childhood and adolescence *Clinical Psychology Review, 17*(8), 937–976.
- Glover, D., Gough, G., Johnson, M., & Cartwright, N. (2000). Bullying in 25 secondary schools: Incidence, impact, and intervention. *Educational Research, 42*(2), 141-156.
- Georgiou, S. (2008). Bullying and victimization at school: The role of mothers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*, 109–125.
- Georgiou, S. N., Fousiani, K., Michaelides, M., & Stavrinides, P. (2013). Cultural value orientation and authoritarian parenting as parameters of bullying and victimization at school. *International Journal of Psychology, 48*(1), 69-78.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00207594.2012.754104>
- Gibb, S. J., Horwood, L. J., & Fergusson, D. M. (2011). Bullying victimization/perpetration in childhood and later adjustment: Findings from a 30 year longitudinal study. *Journal of*

Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 3(2), 82-88.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu/90/10.1108/17596591111132891>

Goldbaum, S., Craig, W. M., Pepler, D. J., & Connolly, J. (2003). Developmental Trajectories of Victimization: Identifying Risk and Protective Factors. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 139-156.

Graham, S., Bellmore, A. D., & Mize, J. (2006). Peer Victimization, Aggression, and Their Co-Occurrence in Middle School: Pathways to Adjustment Problems. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34(3), 363-378. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10802-006-9030-2>

Haden, S. C., Scarpa, A., & Stanford, M. S. (2008). Validation of the Impulsive/Premeditated aggression scale in college students. *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 17(3), 352-373. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926770802406783>

Harcourt, S., Jasperse, M., & Green, V. A. (2014). “We were sad and we were angry”: A systematic review of parents’ perspectives on bullying. *Child Youth Care Forum*, 43(3), 373-391. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10566-014-9243-4>

Harcourt, S., Green, V. A., & Bowden, C. (2015). “It is everyone’s problem”: Parents’ experiences of bullying. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 44(3), 4-17.

Harrington, D. (2009). *Confirmatory factor analysis*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2003). Twenty years' research on peer victimization and psychosocial maladjustment: A meta-analytic review of cross-sectional studies. In M. E. Hertzig, & E. A. Farber (Eds.), *Annual progress in child psychiatry and child development: 2000–2001; annual progress in child psychiatry and child development: 2000–2001* (pp. 505-534, Chapter xvii, 632 Pages) Brunner-Routledge, New York, NY.

Retrieved from <https://login.proxy.lib.utk.edu:443/login?url=https://search-proquest-com.proxy.lib.utk.edu/docview/620254627?accountid=14766>

- Hazler, R. (1998). Promoting personal investment in systemic approaches to school violence. *Education, 119*(2), 222–231.
- Henry, J. D., & Crawford, J. R. (2005). The short-form version of the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales DASS-21): Construct validity and normative data in a large non-clinical sample. *British Journal of Clinical Psychology, 44*(2), 227-239.
- Hoertel, N., Strat, Y. L., Lavaud, P., & Limosin, F. (2012). Gender effects in bullying: Results from a national sample. *Psychiatry Research, 200*(2-3), 921-927.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.psychres.2012.03.036>
- Holt, M. K., Kaufman Kantor, G., & Finkelhor, D. (2009). Parent/child concordance about bullying involvement and family characteristics related to bullying and peer victimization. *Journal of School Violence, 8*, 42–63.
- Hoover, J. H., Oliver, R. & Hazler, R. J. (1992). Bullying: Perceptions of adolescent victims in the Midwestern USA. *School Psychology International, 13*, 5–16.
- Humphrey, G., & Crisp, B. R. (2008). Bullying affects us too: Parental responses to bullying at kindergarten. *Australian Journal of Early Childhood, 33*, 45–49.
- Hyland, P. (2016). Exploratory factor analysis in Mplus [PowerPoint slides]. Retrieved from <http://slideplayer.com/slide/5993563/>
- Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. M. (2015). Four decades of research on school bullying: An Introduction. *American Psychologist, 70*(4), 293-299.
- Kaufmann, D., Gesten, E., Santa Lucia, R. C., Salsedo, O., Gobioff, G. R., & Gadd, R. (2000). The relationship between parenting style and children's adjustment: The parents'

- perspective. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 9(2), 231–245.
- Kilpatrick-Demaray, M., Kerres-Malecki, C., Davidson, L. M., Hodgson, K. K., & Jacob- Rebus, P. (2005). The relationship between social support and student adjustment: A longitudinal analysis. *Psychology in the Schools*, 42(7), 691-706.
- Kilpatrick-Demaray, M., & Malecki, K. (2003). Perceptions of the frequency and importance of social support by students classified as victims, bullies, and bully/victims in an urban middle school. *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 471- 489.
- Kochenderfer, B. J. & Ladd, G. W. (1997). Victimized children's responses to peers' aggression: Behaviors associated with reduced versus continued victimization. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9, 59–73.
- Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. (2004). Peer victimization: The role of emotions in adaptive and maladaptive coping. *Social Development*, 13(3), 329-349.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2004.00271.x>
- Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. & Ladd, G. W. (2001). Variations in peer victimization: Relations to children's maladjustment. In J. Juvonen and S. Graham (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 25–48). New York: Guilford Press.
- 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(2), 267-278.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.38.2.267>

Konishi, C., & Hymel, S. (2009). Bullying and stress in early adolescence: The role of coping and social support. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 29*(3), 333-356.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.1177/0272431608320126>

Ladd, G. W. (1992). Commentary: Play, parenting, and peer partners: Keys to understanding children's social development? *Early Education and Development, 3*(4), 401-406.

doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.1207/s15566935eed0304_9

Ladd, G. W., & Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. J. (1998). Parenting behaviors and the parent– child relationship. Correlates of peer victimization in kindergarten? *Developmental Psychology, 34*, 1450–1458.

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. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/1040-3590.14.1.74>

Lazarus, R. S. & Folkman, S. (1984). *Stress, appraisal and coping*. New York: Springer.

Leff, S. S., Kupersmidt, J. B., Patterson, C. J., & Power, T. J. (1999). Factors influencing teacher identification of peer bullies and victims. *School Psychology Review, 28*(3), 505–517

Lereya, S. T., Samara, M., & Wolke, D. (2013). Parenting behavior and the risk of becoming a victim and a bully/victim: A meta-analysis study. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 37*(12), 1091-1108. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2013.03.001>

Lester, L., Pearce, N., Waters, S., Barnes, A., Beatty, S., & Cross, D. (2017). Family involvement in a whole-school bullying intervention: Mothers' and fathers'

- communication and influence with children. *Journal of Child and Family Studies*, 26(10), 2716-2727. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10826-017-0793-6>
- Lovegrove, P. J., Bellmore, A. D., Green, J. G., Jens, K., & Ostrov, J. M. (2013). "My Voice Is Not Going to Be Silent": What Can Parents Do About Children's Bullying? *Journal of School Violence*, 12, 253-267. doi:<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2013.792270>
- Lovibond, S. H., & Lovibond, P. F. (1995). *Manual for the Depression Anxiety Stress Scales (DASS)*. New South Wales: Psychology Foundation Monograph.
- Maccoby, E. (1990). Gender and relationships: A developmental account. *American Psychologist*, 45, 513-520.
- Mahady-Wilton, M., Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (2000). Emotional regulation and display in classroom bullying: Characteristic expressions of affect, coping styles and relevant contextual factors. *Social Development*, 2, 226-244.
- Mishna, F. (2004). A qualitative study of bullying from multiple perspectives. *Children & Schools*, 26(4), 234-247. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.1093/cs/26.4.234>.
- Mishna, F., Pepler, D., & Wiener, J. (2006). Factors associated with perceptions and responses to bullying situations by children, parents, teachers and principals. *Victims and Offenders*, 1(3), 255-288.
- Mishna, F., Wiener, J., & Pepler, D. (2008). Some of my best friends—Experiences of bullying within friendships. *School Psychology International*, 29(5), 549-573. doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.1177/0143034308099201>
- 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.

- Muthén, L.K. and Muthén, B.O. (1998-2012). *Mplus User's Guide*. Seventh Edition. Los Angeles, CA: Muthén & Muthén
- Nicolaides, S., Toda, Y., & Smith, P. K. (2002). Knowledge and attitudes about school bullying in trainee teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72(1), 105–118.
- Patterson, G. R., Littman, R. A. & Bricker, W. (1967). Assertive behavior in children: A step toward a theory of aggression. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 35(5).
- O'Connell, P., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: Insights and challenges for intervention. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22(4), 437– 452.
- Oliver, C., & Candappa, M. (2007). Bullying and the politics of telling. *Oxford Review of Education*, 33, 71–86. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03054980601094594>
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Cambridge, MA: Blackwell.
- Patterson, G., Littman, R., & Bricker, W. (1967). Assertive Behavior in Children: A Step toward a Theory of Aggression. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development*, 32(5), iii-43. doi:10.2307/1165737
- Perry, D. G., Perry, L. C., & Kennedy, E. (1993). Shantz & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), Conflict in child and in Personal Relationships, 4, 261–294. adolescent development. Cambridge University Press
- Perry, D. G., Willard, J. C. & Perry, L. C. (1990). Peers' perceptions of the consequences that victimized children provide aggressors. *Child Development*, 61, 1310–1325.
- Purcell, A. (2012). A qualitative study of perceptions of bullying in Irish primary schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice: Theory, Research and Practice in Educational*

- Psychology*, 28, 273–285. doi:10.1080/02667363.2012.684343.
- Reijntjes, A., Kamphuis, J. H., Prinzie, P., & Telch, M. J. (2010). Peer victimization and internalizing problems in children: A meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 34, 244–252.
- Roecker Phelps, C. E. (2001). Children's responses to overt and relational aggression. *Journal of Clinical and Child Psychology*, 30, 240–252.
- Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Roth, S. & Cohen, L. J. (1986). Approach, avoidance, and coping with stress. *American Psychologist*, 41, 813–819.
- Salmivalli, C. (1999). Participant role approach to school bullying: Implications for intervention. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22(4), 453-459.
doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu:90/10.1006/jado.1999.0239
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15(2), 112-120. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007
- Salmivalli, C., Karhunen, J., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1996). How do the victims respond to bullying? *Aggressive Behavior*, 22(2), 99-109.
- Sawyer, J., Mishna, F., Pepler, D., & Wiener, J. (2011). The Missing Voice: Parents Perspectives of Bullying. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 33(10), 1795-1803.
doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chilyouth.2011.05.010
- Schäfer, M., Korn, S., Smith, P. K., Hunter, S. C., Mora-Merchán, J. A., Singer, M. M. and Van der Meulen, K. (2004), Lonely in the crowd: Recollections of bullying. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22, 379–394. doi:10.1348/0261510041552756

- Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A. & Coie, J. D. (1993). The emergence of chronic peer victimization in boys' play groups. *Child Development, 64*, 1755–1772.
- Smith, P., Morita, Y., Junger-Tas, J., Olweus, D., Catalano, R., & Slee, P. (1999). *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Smith, P. K., & Myron-Wilson, R. (1998). Parenting and school bullying. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 3*, 405–417.
- 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: Guilford Press.
- Solberg, M., & Olweus, D. (2003). Prevalence estimation of school bullying with the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 239–268.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.10047>
- Smith, P. K., & Morita, Y. (1999). Introduction. In P. K. Smith, Y. Morita, J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano, & P. Slee (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective* (pp. 1–4). London, UK: Routledge.
- 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: Guilford Press.
- Sourander, A., Jensen P., Rönning, J.A. (2007). What is the early adulthood outcome of boys who bully or are bullied in childhood? the Finnish “From a Boy to a Man” Study. *Pediatrics. 120* (2), 397-404.

- Sourander A, Ronning J, Brunstein-Klomek A, et al. (2009). Childhood bullying behavior and later psychiatric hospital and psychopharmacologic treatment: findings from the Finnish 1981 Birth Cohort Study. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*. 66(9), 1005- 1012.
- Takizawa, R., Maughan, B., & Arseneault, L. (2014). Adult health outcomes of childhood bullying victimization: Evidence from a five-decade longitudinal British birth cohort. *The American Journal of Psychiatry*, 171(7), 777-784.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu/90/10.1176/appi.ajp.2014.13101401>
- Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics*, 4th edition. Needham Heights, Ma; Allyn & Bacon.
- Terranova, A. (2007). Coping with peer victimization in middle childhood. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 67(9-B), 5547.
- Terranova, A. M., Harris, J., Kavetski, M., & Oates, R. (2011). Responding to peer victimization: A sense of control matters. *Child & Youth Care Forum*, 40, 419–434.
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7(1), 27-56. doi: 10.1007/s11292-010- 9109-1
- Troy, M., & Sroufe, L. A. (1987). Victimization among preschoolers: Role of attachment relationship history. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 2, 166–171.
- Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying is power: Implications for school based intervention strategies. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19, 157–176.
http://dx.doi.org/10.1300/J008v19n02_10
- Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the

- United States: Physical, verbal, relational and cyber. *The Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45, 368–375.
- Williams, B., Onsman, A., & Brown, T. (2010). Exploratory factor analysis: A five-step guide for novices. *Australasian Journal of Paramedicine*, 8(3), 1-13.
- Williford, A., Fite, P. J., & Cooley, J. L. (2015). Student– teacher congruence in reported rates of physical and relational victimization among elementary-school-age children: The moderating role of gender and age. *Journal of School Violence*, 14, 177–195.
- Wolke, D., & Samara, M. M. (2004). Bullied by siblings: Association with peer victimization and behaviour problems in Israeli lower secondary school children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 45(5), 1015-1029.
doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.lib.utk.edu/90/10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.t01-1-00293.x>
- Wright, M. (2017) Victimized Children’s Adjustment Difficulties: The Role of Parenting Styles and Parents’ Childhood Peer Victimization Status, *Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma*, 26(5), 493-506, DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10926771.2017.1304475>
- Zaklama, C. (2003). The bullying spectrum in grade schools: Parents, teachers, child bullies and their victims. Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest Dissertations and Theses.

APPENDIX

Table 1. Descriptive Characteristics for Primary Study Variables

Variables	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Age	19.19	2.63
Sex	0.63	0.55
Race	0.97	0.88
Depression	5.00	5.00
Anxiety	3.90	4.11
Stress	6.20	4.56
Self-Esteem	16.44	1.99
Premeditated Aggression	27.81	5.48
Impulsive Aggression	18.47	3.84
Victimization in High School	0.94	0.81
Victimization in Elementary School	1.06	0.79
<i>Aggressive Retaliation</i>	1.23	1.12
<i>Ignore the Bully</i>	3.00	0.96
<i>Victim Support</i>	2.96	0.96
<i>Minimizing</i>	2.10	1.09
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.77	0.91
<i>Parent Action</i>	1.57	1.11

Table 2. Correlations among Primary Study Variables

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
1. Sex	-															
2. Race	-0.066	-														
3. Age	-.125*	0.041	-													
4. Factor 1	-0.05	-	-	-												
5. Factor 2	0.065	0.059	0.097	-	-											
6. Factor 3	0.061	.145*	-	0.037	0.064	-										
7. Factor 4	0.026	0.029	-	0.082	0.116	-	.562**									
8. Factor 5	0.066	-	-	.143*	0.344*	.289**	.208**	-								
9. Factor 6	0.05	-	-	.437*	-0.079	-	.437**	-								
10. Depression	0.06	0.026	-	0.109	0.081	-	.220**	.226**	.255**	.232**	-					
11. Stress	.187**	-	0.058	0.016	-	-0.101	-	-0.066	0.101	-.120*	-					
12. Anxiety	.193**	-	0.044	0.015	-	-0.055	-.147*	-0.014	0.084	-0.041	.719**	-				
13. Self-Esteem	-0.016	0.038	0.03	0.001	0.026	0.024	.198**	0.008	-.210**	0.049	-	-.233**	-			
14. PV in Elementary School	0.039	-	.200*	0.066	0.054	-0.071	-0.044	-0.018	0.061	-.376**	.177**	.202**	-0.057	-		
15. PV in High School	.121*	0.109	.127*	0.015	0.097	-0.015	0.062	0.013	0.042	.251**	.287**	.150*	-0.087	.319**	-	
16. Impulsive Aggression	.139*	-	-	.193*	0.018	-0.009	0.095	.217**	.168**	-0.081	-.143*	-0.049	-0.1	0.011	-0.078	-
17. Premeditated Aggression	.154*	-	0.006	0.095	-0.013	0.023	0.025	.168**	.221**	-.139*	-	-0.1	-0.068	-0.001	-0.046	.732**
		0.021	0.026								.255**					

Note. * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. PV = Peer Victimization, Race (White) = 1,

Male (Sex) = 1, Factor 1 = *Aggressive Retaliation*, Factor 2 = *Ignore the Bully*, Factor 3 = *Victim Support*, Factor 4 = *Minimizing*, Factor 5 = *Victim Blaming*, Factor 6 = *Parent Action*.

Table 3. Model fit indices on 1-8 factor models (40 items).

Model	χ^2 (df)	RMSEA (90% CI)	CFI	TLI	SRMR
1-factor	5519.168 (740)	.150	.320	.283	.193
2-factor	3267.007 (701)	.113	.635	.594	.086
3-factor	2690.710 (663)	.103	.712	.661	.069
4-factor	2101.029 (626)	.091	.790	.739	.055
5-factor	1668.289 (590)	.080	.847	.797	.048
6-factor	1334.606 (555)	.070	.889	.844	.037
7-factor	1133.082 (521)	.064	.913	.870	.029
8-factor	970.903 (488)	.059	.931	.890	.028

Table 4. Factor loadings for 8-factor model (40 items).

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
1. Thought it taught me how to handle conflict.	0.590*	0.008	-0.069	0.056	0.185*	0.089	-0.075	-0.096
2. Told me to tell them to stop in a firm voice.	0.498*	-0.002	-0.003	-0.117	0.221*	0.02	0.076	0.048
3. Told me to go and get help from a teacher or another adult.	0.238*	0.019	0.153*	-0.242*	0.244*	0.065	-0.057	0.241*
4. Told me to go get a friend to help.	0.267*	-0.058	0.028	-0.088	0.206*	0.106	-0.016	0.169*
5. Told me to tell them to be quiet.	0.148	0.157*	0.103	0.118	0.227*	0.067	0.008	0.122
6. Thought it taught me how to stand up for myself.	0.812*	0.033	0.04	0.102	0.024	-0.03	-0.033	-0.04
7. Told me to fight back with physical force.	0.181*	0.787*	0.05	-0.073	-0.029	-0.033	0.104	-0.048
8. Told me to try and get back at them.	-0.061	0.735*	-0.015	0.176	0.037	0.168*	-0.011	-0.024
9. Thought it taught me how to defend myself.	0.489*	0.291*	-0.005	0.225*	-0.015	-0.150*	0.044	0.109
10. Told me to make fun of them.	-0.091	0.417*	-0.015	0.113	-0.011	0.153	0.156*	0.105
11. Told me to hit, kick, or punch them to get them to stop.	0.068	0.761*	-0.048	-0.076	0.005	0.232*	0.023	-0.026
12. Told me to tell them to shut up.	0.013	0.578*	0.073	0.228*	0.003	0.001	-0.091	0.101
13. Told me to ignore them.	0	0.063	0.817*	0.035	0.016	0.05	-0.042	-0.002
14. Told me to walk away.	-0.008	-0.047	0.886*	-0.02	0.017	0.01	-0.03	0.037
15. Told me not to pay any attention to them.	0	0.035	0.891*	0.013	0.033	-0.075	0.019	-0.02
16. Told me to make new friends.	0.246*	-0.07	0.300*	0.151	0.133	-0.018	0.073	0.134*
17. Told me that it was part of life.	0.068	0.023	0.034	0.748*	0.028	0.097	-0.02	-0.014
18. Thought it would make me a stronger person growing up.	0.184*	0.06	-0.055	0.718*	-0.026	0.006	-0.039	0.071
19. Thought it would toughen me up.	0.181*	0.169*	-0.028	0.652*	-0.097	-0.069	0.134*	0.051
20. Told me that it is not the end of the world.	-0.005	-0.08	0.085	0.670*	0.133*	0.015	0.023	0.022
21. Told me not to make a big deal about it.	-0.033	-0.124*	0.075	0.574*	0.068	0.203*	0.117	-0.103
22. Told me that it happens to everyone.	-0.006	-0.027	0.037	0.702*	0.037	0.081	0.103	-0.065
23. Would reassure me.	-0.023	0.078	0.04	0.066	0.809*	-0.039	-0.04	0.058
24. Would comfort me.	-0.061	0.108*	-0.056	-0.02	0.983*	-0.006	-0.023	-0.054
25. Would listen to me.	0.03	-0.03	-0.002	0.004	0.826*	-0.127*	-0.042	0.055
26. Told me that everything will be okay.	0.041	-0.005	0.046	0.032	0.834*	-0.066	0.004	-0.033

Table 4. (continued)

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
27. Told me to cheer up.	0.177*	-0.077	0.037	0.033	0.622*	0.05	0.147*	-0.06
28. Would tell me to stop whining about it.	0.031	0.02	0.033	0.196*	-0.035	0.178	0.589*	-0.141*
29. Told me to stop being such a wuss.	-0.033	0.124	-0.03	0.016	-0.009	0.024	0.891*	0.009
30. Told me to stop tattling.	-0.039	0.141*	-0.176*	-0.013	0.06	0.266*	0.542*	0.106*
31. Told me that they did not believe me.	0.009	0.109*	-0.01	-0.076	-0.09	0.701*	0.134	0.098*
32. Would tell me to handle it on my own.	0.108	-0.012	0.081	0.180*	-0.059	0.349*	0.358*	-0.036
33. Told me to be a better friend.	0.042	-0.067	-0.05	0.088	0.066	0.449*	0.298*	0.05
34. Blamed me for being bullied.	-0.017	0.039	0.041	0.01	-0.101	0.888*	0.018	-0.025
35. Told me not to give children a reason to make fun of me.	0.002	-0.026	-0.016	0.086	-0.101	0.592*	0.230*	0.043
36. Would try to help me resolve the problem.	0.026	-0.082	0.082	-0.117	0.526*	-0.099	0.123	0.211*
37. Would call my teacher and/or school immediately.	-0.053	-0.006	0.121	-0.051	0.08	-0.004	0.031	0.710*
38. Would call the bullying child's parents immediately.	0.021	-0.027	-0.016	0.021	-0.017	0.04	0.113	0.779*
39. Told me that whoever bullied me will be punished.	0.123	0.047	0.002	0.174*	-0.057	0.002	-0.043	0.682*
40. Would let me miss school.	-0.186*	0.08	-0.063	0.162*	0.042	0.246*	-0.01	0.339*
Factor correlations	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7	F8
<i>Assertiveness</i>	-							
<i>Aggressive Retaliation</i>	0.161*	-						
<i>Ignore the Bully</i>	0.291*	-0.147	-					
<i>Minimizing</i>	0.348*	0.160*	0.247*	-				
<i>Victim Support</i>	0.310*	-0.163*	0.588*	0.103	-			
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.014	0.269*	-0.056	0.357*	-0.249*	-		
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.096	0.257*	-0.064	0.441*	-0.121*	0.593	-	
<i>Parent Action</i>	0.203*	0.207*	0.147	0.080	0.191*	0.170*	0.176*	-

Note. * $p < .05$; Bolded values indicate item met retention criteria.

Table 5. Factor loadings for 7-factor model (40 items).

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
1. Thought it taught me how to handle conflict.	0.593*	0.02	-0.033	0.132	0.039	0.025	-0.107
2. Told me to tell them to stop in a firm voice.	0.518*	-0.01	-0.009	0.197*	-0.119	0.095	0.031
3. Told me to go and get help from a teacher or another adult.	0.251*	0.009	0.162*	0.214*	-0.265*	0.014	0.232*
4. Told me to go get a friend to help.	0.283*	-0.067	0.045	0.169*	-0.117	0.109	0.155*
5. Told me to tell them to be quiet.	0.160*	0.162*	0.112	0.215*	0.072	0.093	0.11
6. Thought it taught me how to stand up for myself.	0.812*	0.053	0.049	-0.008	0.113	-0.067	-0.044
7. Told me to fight back with physical force.	0.169*	0.798*	0.023	-0.009	-0.119	0.034	-0.043
8. Told me to try and get back at them.	-0.075	0.758*	0.004	0.029	0.07	0.159*	-0.026
9. Thought it taught me how to defend myself.	0.489*	0.316*	-0.023	0.005	0.21	-0.104	0.107
10. Told me to make fun of them.	-0.096	0.427*	-0.027	-0.011	0.065	0.268*	0.105
11. Told me to hit, kick, or punch them to get them to stop.	0.055	0.771*	-0.031	-0.029	-0.168	0.224*	-0.027
12. Told me to tell them to shut up.	0.007	0.606*	0.094	0.011	0.133	-0.056	0.097
13. Told me to ignore them.	0.003	0.07	0.826*	0.011	0.026	0.022	-0.001
14. Told me to walk away.	-0.002	-0.047	0.885*	0.019	-0.01	-0.008	0.041
15. Told me not to pay any attention to them.	0.005	0.036	0.857*	0.066	0.035	-0.048	-0.012
16. Told me to make new friends.	0.251*	-0.061	0.280*	0.136	0.173*	0.037	0.139*
17. Told me that it was part of life.	0.063	0.062	0.071	0.01	0.712*	0.082	-0.001
18. Thought it would make me a stronger person growing up.	0.177	0.101	-0.028		0.686*	-0.017	0.08
19. Thought it would toughen me up.	0.170*	0.206*	-0.044	-0.068	0.652*	0.041	0.067
20. Told me that it is not the end of the world.	-0.001	-0.055	0.105	0.138*	0.646*	0.065	0.026
21. Told me not to make a big deal about it.	-0.034	-0.107	0.093	0.045	0.569*	0.300*	-0.095
22. Told me that it happens to everyone.	-0.005	-0.001	0.053	0.036	0.684*	0.184*	-0.057
23. Would reassure me.	-0.018	0.08	0.058	0.810*	0.032	-0.048	0.057
24. Would comfort me.	-0.06	0.106*	-0.035	0.974*	-0.049	-0.015	-0.052
25. Would listen to me.	0.031	-0.027	0.009	0.833*	0.003	-0.155*	0.059
26. Told me that everything will be okay.	0.043	-0.002	0.055	0.836*	0.032	-0.058	-0.028

Table 5. (continued)

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
27. Told me to cheer up.	0.179*	-0.081	0.023	0.615*	0.056	0.167*	-0.055
28. Would tell me to stop whining about it.	0.032	0.008	-0.053	-0.011	0.261*	0.643*	-0.128*
29. Told me to stop being such a wuss.	-0.024	0.103*	-0.172*	0.049	0.137*	0.696*	0.027
30. Told me to stop tattling.	-0.032	0.115*	-0.248*	0.067	0.005	0.704*	0.098*
31. Told me that they did not believe me.	0.011	0.092	0.027	-0.203*	-0.145*	0.778*	0.081
32. Would tell me to handle it on my own.	0.118*	-0.027	0.057	-0.089	0.181*	0.650*	-0.048
33. Told me to be a better friend.	0.053	-0.09	-0.063	0.016	0.072	0.698*	0.037
34. Blamed me for being bullied.	-0.027	0.036	0.106*	-0.256*	-0.05	0.812*	-0.024
35. Told me not to give children a reason to make fun of me.	0.006	-0.039	0.003	-0.192*	0.056	0.746*	0.036
36. Would try to help me resolve the problem.	0.037	-0.095	0.052	0.550*	-0.099	0.019	0.207*
37. Would call my teacher and/or school immediately.	-0.054	-0.007	0.097	0.091	-0.065	0.007	0.722*
38. Would call the bullying child's parents immediately.	0.021	-0.03	-0.05	-0.006	0.005	0.129*	0.787*
39. Told me that whoever bullied me will be punished.	0.125	0.064	0.006	-0.063	0.133	-0.038	0.683*
40. Would let me miss school.	-0.189*	0.085	-0.038	0.008	0.103	0.229*	0.337*
Factor correlations	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
<i>Assertiveness</i>	-						
<i>Aggressive Retaliation</i>	0.184*	-					
<i>Ignore the Bully</i>	0.299*	-0.134	-				
<i>Minimizing</i>	0.350*	-0.161*	0.574*	-			
<i>Victim Support</i>	0.328*	0.219*	0.209*	0.094	-		
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.079	0.358*	-0.018	-0.138*	0.437*	-	
<i>Parent Action</i>	0.232*	0.212*	0.160*	0.193*	0.089	0.243*	-

Note. * $p < .05$; Bolded values indicate item met retention criteria.

Table 6. Factor loadings for 7-factor model (33 items).

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
1. Thought it taught me how to handle conflict.	0.538*	0.018	-0.019	0.032	0.180*	0.028	-0.058
2. Told me to tell them to stop in a firm voice.	0.397*	0.005	0.001	-0.069	0.253*	0.081	0.064
6. Thought it taught me how to stand up for myself.	0.926*	0.009	0.052	0.03	0.021	-0.032	0.011
7. Told me to fight back with physical force.	0.135*	0.795*	0.021	-0.009	0.002	0.017	-0.015
8. Told me to try and get back at them.	-0.072	0.711*	-0.01	0.165*	0.014	0.154*	-0.025
11. Told me to hit, kick, or punch them to get them to stop.	0.025	0.786*	-0.03	-0.059	-0.023	0.203*	-0.011
12. Told me to tell them to shut up.	0.006	0.560*	0.082	0.208*	0.002	-0.055	0.088
13. Told me to ignore them.	0.015	0.052	0.815*	0.033	0.021	0.037	0.01
14. Told me to walk away.	-0.004	-0.044	0.879*	-0.003	0.033	0	0.054
15. Told me not to pay any attention to them.	0.014	0.026	0.838*	0.038	0.081	-0.032	-0.003
17. Told me that it was part of life.	0.023	0.048	0.05	0.764*	0.004	0.042	0.009
18. Thought it would make me a stronger person growing up.	0.129	0.087	-0.04	0.728*	-0.026	-0.047	0.092
19. Thought it would toughen me up.	0.126*	0.186*	-0.059	0.708*	-0.066	0.009	0.095*
20. Told me that it is not the end of the world.	-0.013	-0.072	0.085	0.676*	0.126*	0.036	0.011
21. Told me not to make a big deal about it.	-0.042	-0.128*	0.079	0.576*	0.034	0.281*	-0.101
22. Told me that it happens to everyone.	-0.024	-0.023	0.032	0.715*	0.023	0.154*	-0.054
23. Would reassure me.	-0.016	0.073	0.058	0.044	0.808*	-0.035	0.059
24. Would comfort me.	-0.04	0.111*	-0.033	-0.042	0.964*	-0.004	-0.047
25. Would listen to me.	0.042	-0.026	0.013	-0.008	0.833*	-0.138*	0.066
26. Told me that everything will be okay.	0.041	-0.002	0.057	0.035	0.836*	-0.05	-0.019
27. Told me to cheer up.	0.178*	-0.085	0.025	0.034	0.629*	0.181*	-0.036
28. Would tell me to stop whining about it.	0.041	-0.007	-0.063	0.258*	-0.01	0.635*	-0.112*
29. Told me to stop being such a wuss.	-0.038	0.094*	-	0.152*	0.054	0.693*	0.033
30. Told me to stop tattling.	-0.037	0.108*	0.176*	-	0.073	0.707*	0.096*
31. Told me that they did not believe me.	0.008	0.092	0.031	-0.140*	-0.186*	0.787*	0.083
32. Would tell me to handle it on my own.	0.084	-0.035	0.055	0.187*	-0.069	0.645*	-0.031
33. Told me to be a better friend.	0.03	-0.078	-0.063	0.074	0.032	0.688*	0.037
34. Blamed me for being bullied.	-0.008	0.038	0.103*	-0.054	-0.248*	0.810*	-0.029
35. Told me not to give children a reason to make fun of me.	0.012	-0.041	0.004	0.039	-0.181*	0.752*	0.027

Table 6. (continued)

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
37. Would call my teacher and/or school immediately.	-0.088	0.004	0.096	-0.03	0.107	0.014	0.724*
38. Would call the bullying child's parents immediately.	0.005	-0.041	-0.048	0.015	0.008	0.146*	0.799*
39. Told me that whoever bullied me will be punished.	0.109	0.049	0.006	0.151*	-0.044	-0.022	0.673*
Factor correlations	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6	F7
<i>Assertiveness</i>	-						
<i>Aggressive Retaliation</i>	0.180*	-					
<i>Ignore the Bully</i>	0.232*	-0.156*	-				
<i>Victim Support</i>	0.388*	0.137*	0.226*	-			
<i>Minimizing</i>	0.259*	-0.175*	0.559*	0.111	-		
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.077	0.321*	-0.042	0.469*	-0.170*	-	
<i>Parent Action</i>	0.077	0.321*	-0.042	0.469*	-0.170*	0.213*	-

Note. * $p < .05$; Bolded values indicate item met retention criteria.

Table 7. Factor loadings for 6-factor model (40 items).

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
1. Thought it taught me how to handle conflict.	0.151*	0.380*	-0.027	0.213*	-0.152*	0.009
2. Told me to tell them to stop in a firm voice.	0.118	0.207*	-0.001	0.280*	-0.081	0.147*
3. Told me to go and get help from a teacher or another adult.	0.085	-0.084	0.168*	0.266*	-0.075	0.302*
4. Told me to go get a friend to help.	0.008	0.07	0.048	0.226*	0.014	0.222*
5. Told me to tell them to be quiet.	0.178*	0.190*	0.106	0.227*	0.069	0.13
6. Thought it taught me how to stand up for myself.	0.221*	0.559*	0.054	0.103	-0.270*	0.094
7. Told me to fight back with physical force.	0.824*	0.005	0.027	0.001	0.044	-0.041
8. Told me to try and get back at them.	0.688*	0.051	-0.001	-0.007	0.258*	-0.078
9. Thought it taught me how to defend myself.	0.390*	0.512*	-0.029	0.033	-0.195*	0.162*
10. Told me to make fun of them.	0.372*	0.025	-0.028	-0.027	0.357*	0.063
11. Told me to hit, kick, or punch them to get them to stop.	0.779*	-0.107*	-0.024	-0.018	0.261*	-0.036
12. Told me to tell them to shut up.	0.560*	0.154*	0.086	-0.025	0.025	0.052
13. Told me to ignore them.	0.059	0.039	0.814*	0.021	0.035	0
14. Told me to walk away.	-0.049	0.002	0.874*	0.033	-0.006	0.048
15. Told me not to pay any attention to them.	0.026	0.048	0.843*	0.073	-0.038	-0.012
16. Told me to make new friends.	-0.029	0.325*	0.272*	0.164*	-0.012	0.175*
17. Told me that it was part of life.	0.012	0.738*	0.05	-0.042	0.131	-0.06
18. Thought it would make me a stronger person growing up.	0.073	0.794*	-0.05	-0.079	-0.001	0.042
19. Thought it would toughen me up.	0.178*	0.758*	-0.064	-0.113	0.067	0.025
20. Told me that it is not the end of the world.	-0.116*	0.631*	0.087	0.085	0.122	-0.035
21. Told me not to make a big deal about it.	-0.160*	0.535*	0.077	0.018	0.343*	-0.144*
22. Told me that it happens to everyone.	-0.06	0.662*	0.034	-0.011	0.243*	-0.122*
23. Would reassure me.	0.038	0.019	0.059	0.799*	-0.007	0.036
24. Would comfort me.	0.06	-0.091*	-0.028	0.965*	0.028	-0.073*
25. Would listen to me.	-0.049	0.011	0.009	0.834*	-0.138*	0.051
26. Told me that everything will be okay.	-0.021	0.049	0.053	0.844*	-0.05	-0.033
27. Told me to cheer up.	-0.059	0.154*	0.025	0.655*	0.123*	-0.025
28. Would tell me to stop whining about it.	0	0.279*	-0.055	0.019	0.649*	-0.135*
29. Told me to stop being such a wuss.	0.088	0.135*	-0.169*	0.078	0.727*	0.015
30. Told me to stop tattling.	0.103*	0.005	0.241*	0.103	0.732*	0.099*
31. Told me that they did not believe me.	0.113*	-0.110*	0.036	-0.140*	0.766*	0.114*

Table 7 continued.

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
32. Would tell me to handle it on my own.	-0.004	0.265*	0.055	-0.043	0.612*	-0.022
33. Told me to be a better friend.	-0.075	0.117	-0.06	0.066	0.676*	0.062
34. Blamed me for being bullied.	0.049	-0.047	0.111*	-0.199*	0.807*	-0.002
35. Told me not to give children a reason to make fun of me.	-0.027	0.074	0.006	-0.143*	0.740*	0.053
36. Would try to help me resolve the problem.	-0.099	-0.071	0.056	0.569*	0.02	0.221*
37. Would call my teacher and/or school immediately.	-0.032	-0.064	0.098	0.08	0.078	0.696*
38. Would call the bullying child's parents immediately.	-0.044	0.049	-0.047	-0.004	0.187*	0.772*
39. Told me that whoever bullied me will be punished.	0.059	0.234*	0.002	-0.075	-0.002	0.680*
40. Would let me miss school.	0.015	0.003	-0.038	-0.019	0.338*	0.284*
Factor correlations	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
<i>Aggressive Retaliation</i>	-					
<i>Ignore the Bully</i>	0.209*	-				
<i>Victim Support</i>	-0.112	0.296*	-			
<i>Minimizing</i>	-0.074	0.238*	0.560*	-		
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.268*	0.366*	-0.081	-0.230*	-	
<i>Parent Action</i>	0.234*	0.124*	0.153*	0.233*	0.120	-

Note. * $p < .05$; Bolded values indicate item met retention criteria.

Table 8. Factor loadings for 6-factor model (29 items).

Items	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
6. Thought it taught me how to stand up for myself.	0.176*	0.091	0.175*	0.477*	-0.177*	0.052
7. Told me to fight back with physical force.	0.830*	0.013	0.02	0.025	-0.004	-0.007
8. Told me to try and get back at them.	0.677*	-0.018	-0.003	0.081	0.203*	-0.04
11. Told me to hit, kick, or punch them to get them to stop.	0.793*	-0.045	-0.024	-0.068	0.194*	-0.003
12. Told me to tell them to shut up.	0.551*	0.083	-0.001	0.150*	-0.014	0.074
13. Told me to ignore them.	0.052	0.819*	0.024	0.02	0.043	0.012
14. Told me to walk away.	-0.046	0.876*	0.033	-0.001	-0.005	0.054
15. Told me not to pay any attention to them.	0.019	0.838*	0.084	0.044	-0.028	-0.008
17. Told me that it was part of life.	-0.005	0.086	0.006	0.679*	0.162*	-0.043
18. Thought it would make me a stronger person growing up.	0.026	-0.038	-0.026	0.862*	-0.009	0.039
19. Thought it would toughen me up.	0.026	-0.038	-0.026	0.862*	-0.009	0.039
20. Told me that it is not the end of the world.	-0.106	0.125	0.121	0.551*	0.152*	-0.034
23. Would reassure me.	0.058	0.056	0.807*	0.003	-0.008	0.053
24. Would comfort me.	0.088*	-0.042	0.958*	-0.070*	0.01	-0.049
25. Would listen to me.	-0.023	0.006	0.846*	0.003	-0.139*	0.068*
26. Told me that everything will be okay.	-0.004	0.054	0.852*	0.037	-0.04	-0.02
27. Told me to cheer up.	-0.058	0.037	0.666*	0.101	0.166*	-0.026
28. Would tell me to stop whining about it.	-0.024	-0.042	0.011	0.229*	0.684*	-0.130*
29. Told me to stop being such a wuss.	0.069	-0.170*	0.063	0.104	0.736*	0.016
30. Told me to stop tattling.	0.082	-0.253*	0.077	0.009	0.724*	0.088
31. Told me that they did not believe me.	0.106*	0.033	-0.174*	-0.147*	0.769*	0.100*
32. Would tell me to handle it on my own.	-0.037	0.075	-0.045	0.199*	0.666*	-0.043
33. Told me to be a better friend.	-0.093	-0.057	0.048	0.093	0.701*	0.031
34. Blamed me for being bullied.	0.042	0.109*	-0.235*	-0.076	0.808*	-0.017
35. Told me not to give children a reason to make fun of me.	-0.041	0.013	-0.162*	0.027	0.763*	0.028
36. Would try to help me resolve the problem.	-0.087	0.053	0.571*	-0.092	0.027	0.213*
37. Would call my teacher and/or school immediately.	-0.001	0.082	0.083	-0.059	0.012	0.723*
38. Would call the bullying child's parents immediately.	-0.035	-0.064	0.001	0.05	0.122	0.810*
39. Told me that whoever bullied me will be punished.	0.067	0.002	-0.035	0.221*	-0.038	0.661*

Table 8 continued.

Factor correlations	F1	F2	F3	F4	F5	F6
<i>Aggressive Retaliation</i>	-					
<i>Ignore the Bully</i>	-0.122*	-				
<i>Victim Support</i>	-0.142*	0.562*	-			
<i>Minimizing</i>	0.236*	0.229*	0.153*	-		
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.337*	-0.053	-0.193*	0.415*	-	
<i>Parent Action</i>	0.196*	0.145*	0.181*	0.126	0.212*	-

Note. * $p < .05$; Bolded values indicate item met retention criteria.

Table 9. Mean Statistics for Final PSBB Items (N = 282).

Items	M	SD
<u>Aggressive Retaliation</u>		
7. Told me to fight back with physical force.	1.56	1.42
8. Told me to try and get back at them.	.98	1.27
11. Told me to hit, kick, or punch them to get them to stop.	1.01	1.33
12. Told me to tell them to shut up.	1.36	1.40
<u>Ignore the Bully</u>		
13. Told me to ignore them.		
14. Told me to walk away.	3.00	1.08
15. Told me not to pay any attention to them.	3.00	1.04
<u>Supporting the Victim</u>		
23. Would reassure me.	3.01	1.09
24. Would comfort me.	3.14	1.08
25. Would listen to me.	3.11	1.10
26. Told me that everything will be okay.	3.11	1.11
27. Told me to cheer up.	2.63	1.27
36. Would try to help me resolve the problem.	2.77	1.26
<u>Minimizing</u>		
6. Thought it taught me how to stand up for myself.	2.66	1.30
17. Told me that it was part of life.	1.83	1.44
18. Thought it would make me a stronger person growing up.	1.97	1.41
19. Thought it would toughen me up.	1.80	1.42
20. Told me that it is not the end of the world.	2.22	1.38
<u>Victim Blaming</u>		
28. Would tell me to stop whining about it.	1.08	1.28
29. Told me to stop being such a wuss.	.81	1.17
30. Told me to stop tattling.	.66	1.05
31. Told me that they did not believe me.	.54	1.00
32. Would tell me to handle it on my own.	1.01	1.26
33. Told me to be a better friend.	.82	1.15
34. Blamed me for being bullied.	.57	1.03
35. Told me not to give children a reason to make fun of me.	.68	1.10
<u>Parent Action</u>		
37. Would call my teacher or school immediately.	1.87	1.37
38. Would call the bullying child's parents immediately.	1.23	1.23
39. Told me that whoever bullied me will be punished.	1.60	1.38

Table 10. Chi-Square Values for Multi-Group Constrained Models

Model	χ^2 (df)	Degrees of freedom	P-Value
Internalizing Symptoms Grouped by Sex	61.445	49	0.11
Aggression Grouped by Sex	45.776	35	0.11
Peer Victimization Grouped by Sex	36.288	42	0.72
Internalizing Symptoms Grouped by Non-Victims	79.088	59	0.04*
Aggression Grouped by Non-Victims	72.637	45	0.01*
Peer Victimization Grouped by Non-Victims	73.240	52	0.03*
Internalizing Symptoms Grouped By Elementary School Victims	67.444	59	0.21
Aggression Grouped by Elementary School Victims	52.177	45	0.22
Peer Victimization Grouped by Elementary School Victims	70.231	52	0.05*
Internalizing Symptoms Grouped by High School Victims	607.359	76	0.00**
Aggression Grouped by High School Victims	68.778	45	0.01**
Peer Victimization Grouped by High School Victims	94.267	54	0.00**
Internalizing Symptoms Grouped by Chronic Victims	67.675	59	0.20
Aggression Grouped by Chronic Victims	59.925	45	0.05*
Peer Victimization Grouped by Chronic Victims	75.112	52	0.02*

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

Table 11. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Symptoms and Self-Esteem. (N=282)

Association	Depression			Anxiety			Stress			Self-Esteem		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	0.07	0.06	0.24	0.19*	0.06	0.00	0.19*	0.06	0.00	-0.00	0.06	0.98
Race	0.06	0.06	0.27	0.02	0.06	0.75	0.02	0.06	0.80	-0.00	0.06	0.99
<i>Aggressive Retaliation</i>	-0.01	0.07	0.90	-0.06	0.07	0.37	-0.04	0.07	0.51	0.13*	0.07	0.06
<i>Ignore the Bully</i>	0.08	0.07	0.29	0.02	0.07	0.77	0.04	0.07	0.57	-0.14*	0.07	0.05
<i>Victim Support</i>	-0.25*	0.07	0.00	-0.14	0.07	0.06	-0.17*	0.08	0.02	0.21*	0.07	0.00
<i>Minimizing</i>	-0.06	0.07	0.38	-0.02	0.07	0.81	0.00	0.07	0.97	0.07	0.07	0.33
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.11	0.07	0.14	0.15*	0.07	0.04	0.07	0.07	0.36	-0.27*	0.07	0.00
<i>Parent Action</i>	-0.09	0.06	0.17	-0.01	0.06	0.87	-0.02	0.06	0.73	0.04	0.06	0.51

Note. **p*<.05.

Table 12. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Aggression Outcomes (N=282)

Association	Impulsive Aggression			Premeditated Aggression		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	0.14 *	0.06	0.01	0.15 *	0.06	0.01
Race	-0.04	0.06	0.49	-0.00	0.06	0.96
Aggressive Retaliation	0.15 *	0.07	0.03	0.06	0.07	0.39
Ignore the Bully	0.01	0.07	0.87	-0.06	0.07	0.43
Victim Support	0.02	0.07	0.79	0.06	0.07	0.39
Minimizing	-0.06	0.07	0.41	-0.12	0.07	0.10
Victim Blaming	0.15 *	0.07	0.04	0.15 *	0.07	0.04
Parent Action	0.10	0.06	0.12	0.18 *	0.06	0.00

Note. * $p < 0.05$

Table 13. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes (N=282)

Association	PV in Elementary School			PV in High School		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	0.04	0.06	0.48	0.12*	0.06	0.04
Race	-0.00	0.06	0.96	0.11	0.06	0.08
Aggressive Retaliation	0.10	0.07	0.14	0.01	0.07	0.84
Ignore the Bully	0.16*	0.07	0.03	0.14	0.07	0.06
Victim Support	-0.17*	0.08	0.02	-0.14	0.08	0.07
Minimizing	-0.08	0.07	0.30	0.05	0.07	0.51
Victim Blaming	-0.07	0.08	0.35	-0.04	0.08	0.64
Parent Action	0.09	0.06	0.18	0.03	0.06	0.61

Note. * $p < 0.05$

Table 14. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in Elementary School (N=282)

Association	Victims in Elementary School						Non-Victims in Elementary School					
	PV in Elementary School			PV in High School			PV in Elementary School			PV in High School		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	-0.16	0.11	0.16	0.12*	0.06	0.04	-0.04	0.07	0.60	0.10	0.07	0.16
Race	0.06	0.12	0.63	0.11	0.06	0.08	0.03	0.07	0.67	0.15*	0.07	0.03
Aggressive Retaliation	0.32*	0.13	0.01	0.01	0.07	0.84	-0.02	0.08	0.82	-0.02	0.08	0.78
Ignore the Bully	-0.16	0.16	0.31	0.14	0.07	0.06	0.19*	0.08	0.02	0.11	0.08	0.17
Victim Support	0.02	0.15	0.92	-0.14	0.08	0.07	-0.07	0.09	0.45	-0.15	0.09	0.09
Minimizing	0.15	0.15	0.31	0.05	0.07	0.51	-0.06	0.08	0.48	0.09	0.08	0.27
Victim Blaming	-0.06	0.13	0.63	-0.04	0.08	0.64	-0.05	0.09	0.57	-0.08	0.09	0.39
Parent Action	0.10	0.13	0.46	0.03	0.06	0.61	0.018	0.07	0.81	-0.09	0.07	0.24

Note. * $p < 0.05$; PV = Peer Victimization

Table 15. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in High School (N=282)

Association	Victims in High School											
	Depression			Anxiety			Stress			Self-Esteem		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	-0.16	0.13	0.19	0.13	0.14	0.33	-0.02	0.13	0.87	0.31*	0.12	0.01
Race	-0.11	0.12	0.38	-0.20	0.13	0.13	-0.18	0.13	0.18	-0.02	0.12	0.90
Aggressive Retaliation	-0.07	0.15	0.64	-0.14	0.16	0.39	-0.25	0.15	0.10	0.05	0.15	0.76
Ignore the Bully	0.21	0.16	0.20	0.10	0.18	0.58	0.15	0.17	0.37	-0.36*	0.17	0.03
Victim Support	-0.43*	0.14	0.00	-0.15	0.16	0.36	-0.37*	0.15	0.01	0.27	0.15	0.07
Minimizing	-0.24	0.16	0.13	-0.14	0.17	0.40	-0.04	0.17	0.84	0.35*	0.16	0.03
Victim Blaming	0.20	0.13	0.13	0.11	0.14	0.44	0.04	0.14	0.79	-0.42*	0.12	0.00
Parent Action	0.04	0.14	0.76	0.28	0.15	0.07	0.12	0.15	0.40	0.04	0.14	0.78

Note: * $p < .05$

Table 16. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in High School (N=282)

Association	Non-Victims in High School											
	Depression			Anxiety			Stress			Self-Esteem		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	0.12	0.07	0.07	0.20*	0.06	0.00	0.24*	0.06	0.00	-0.05	0.07	0.43
Race	0.12	0.07	0.08	0.05	0.07	0.44	0.06	0.07	0.33	0.01	0.07	0.93
Aggressive Retaliation	-0.02	0.08	0.84	-0.08	0.08	0.32	-0.01	0.08	0.91	0.12	0.08	0.10
Ignore the Bully	0.06	0.08	0.45	0.02	0.08	0.80	0.01	0.08	0.89	-0.15	0.08	0.07
Victim Support	-0.18*	0.09	0.05	-0.12	0.09	0.17	-0.06	0.09	0.52	0.21*	0.09	0.01
Minimizing	-0.02	0.08	0.85	-0.00	0.08	0.99	-0.01	0.08	0.87	-0.01	0.08	0.94
Victim Blaming	0.11	0.09	0.23	0.19*	0.09	0.03	0.12	0.09	0.15	-0.24*	0.09	0.01
Parent Action	-0.15*	0.07	0.04	-0.08	0.07	0.24	-0.08	0.07	0.28	0.07	0.07	0.35

Note: * $p < .05$

Table 17. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Aggression Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in High School (N=282)

Association	Victims in High School						Non-Victims in High School					
	Impulsive Aggression			Premeditated Aggression			Impulsive Aggression			Premeditated Aggression		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	-0.11	0.13	0.39	-0.09	0.13	0.47	0.17*	0.06	0.01	0.16*	0.06	0.01
Race	-0.03	0.13	0.79	0.22	0.13	0.09	-0.01	0.07	0.91	-0.04	0.07	0.53
Aggressive Retaliation	0.43*	0.15	0.00	0.42*	0.15	0.00	0.10	0.07	0.17	0.00	0.07	0.98
Ignore the Bully	0.18	0.16	0.27	0.17	0.17	0.30	0.01	0.08	0.89	-0.08	0.08	0.35
Victim Support	0.23	0.15	0.13	0.21	0.15	0.16	-0.05	0.09	0.55	0.01	0.09	0.87
Minimizing	-0.13	0.16	0.42	-0.22	0.16	0.17	-0.04	0.08	0.59	-0.10	0.08	0.24
Victim Blaming	0.18	0.14	0.17	0.14	0.14	0.32	0.14	0.09	0.11	0.14	0.09	0.12
Parent Action	-0.20	0.14	0.16	-0.14	0.15	0.33	0.16*	0.07	0.03	0.24*	0.07	0.00

Note: * $p < .05$

Table 18. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes Grouped by Victim-Status in High School (N=282)

Association	Victims in High School						Non-Victims in High School					
	PV in Elementary School			PV in High School			PV in Elementary School			PV in High School		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	-0.01	0.14	0.97	-0.11	0.13	0.38	0.01	0.07	0.07	0.11	0.07	0.12
Race	-0.12	0.14	0.38	0.17	0.13	0.18	0.02	0.07	0.07	0.13*	0.07	0.06
Aggressive Retaliation	0.27	0.16	0.09	0.04	0.15	0.80	0.04	0.08	0.08	-0.04	0.08	0.64
Ignore the Bully	0.16	0.18	0.38	0.23	0.17	0.18	0.15	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.08	0.39
Victim Support	-0.01	0.16	0.96	-0.33*	0.15	0.03	-0.17	0.09	0.09	0.07	0.09	0.43
Minimizing	-0.13	0.17	0.45	0.25	0.16	0.12	-0.09	0.08	0.08	-0.02	0.08	0.77
Victim Blaming	0.00	0.15	0.98	-0.28*	0.13	0.04	-0.06	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.09	0.32
Parent Action	0.03	0.16	0.84	0.11	0.14	0.45	0.06	0.07	0.07	-0.15*	0.07	0.04

Note: * $p < 0.05$; PV= Peer Victimization

Table 19. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Aggression Outcomes Grouped by Chronic Victim-Status (N=282)

Association	Chronic Victims						Not Chronic Victims					
	Impulsive Aggression			Premeditated Aggression			Impulsive Aggression			Premeditated Aggression		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	-0.19	0.17	0.26	-0.14	0.20	0.48	0.15*	0.06	0.01	0.15*	0.06	0.01
Race	-0.18	0.18	0.30	-0.13	0.20	0.51	-0.02	0.06	0.71	0.01	0.06	0.90
Aggressive Retaliation	0.55*	0.19	0.00	0.52*	0.22	0.02	0.12	0.07	0.11	0.01	0.07	0.86
Ignore the Bully	0.23	0.22	0.30	0.37	0.25	0.14	0.04	0.08	0.62	-0.05	0.08	0.54
Victim Support	0.10	0.17	0.53	0.06	0.20	0.76	-0.01	0.08	0.92	0.05	0.08	0.53
Minimizing	-0.14	0.20	0.50	-0.38	0.23	0.09	-0.07	0.08	0.39	-0.12	0.08	0.13
Victim Blaming	0.44*	0.18	0.02	0.38	0.21	0.07	0.14	0.08	0.20	0.15	0.08	0.07
Parent Action	-0.52*	0.16	0.00	-0.37*	0.19	0.05	0.16*	0.07	0.02	0.24*	0.07	0.00

Note: * $p < .05$

Table 20. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes Grouped by Chronic Victim Status (N=282)

Association	Chronic Victims						Not Chronic Victims					
	PV in Elementary School			PV in High School			PV in Elementary School			PV in High School		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	-0.33	0.18	0.06	0.11	0.19	0.57	0.01	0.07	0.86	0.09	0.06	0.17
Race	-0.07	0.18	0.69	0.37*	0.19	0.05	0.01	0.07	0.90	0.15*	0.06	0.02
Aggressive Retaliation	0.31	0.20	0.12	0.16	0.22	0.46	0.05	0.07	0.47	-0.05	0.07	0.52
Ignore the Bully	0.02	0.22	0.94	-0.21	0.25	0.39	0.15*	0.08	0.05	0.09	0.08	0.27
Victim Support	-0.23	0.18	0.20	-0.30	0.18	0.10	-0.10	0.08	0.23	-0.04	0.08	0.64
Minimizing	0.20	0.21	0.34	0.37	0.22	0.10	-0.13	0.08	0.10	0.04	0.08	0.58
Victim Blaming	-0.14	0.19	0.48	-0.57*	0.19	0.00	-0.02	0.09	0.78	0.02	0.08	0.86
Parent Action	-0.05	0.18	0.78	0.16	0.19	0.38	0.03	0.07	0.67	-0.09	0.07	0.17

Note. * $p < 0.05$; PV = Peer Victimization

Table 21. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Outcomes Grouped by Non-Victim Status (N=282)

Association	Non-Victims											
	Depression			Anxiety			Stress			Self-Esteem		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	0.08	0.07	0.29	0.128	0.07	0.08	0.17*	0.07	0.02	0.04	0.07	0.56
Race	0.15*	0.07	0.05	0.058	0.08	0.44	0.09	0.08	0.23	0.02	0.07	0.76
Aggressive Retaliation	-0.20	0.09	0.25	-0.145	0.09	0.09	-0.07	0.09	0.41	0.16*	0.09	0.05
Ignore the Bully	-0.02	0.09	0.86	0.023	0.09	0.80	-0.02	0.09	0.87	-0.16	0.09	0.07
Victim Support	-0.12	0.10	0.23	-0.145	0.10	0.13	-0.08	0.10	0.40	0.20*	0.09	0.04
Minimizing	-0.02	0.09	0.86	0.049	0.09	0.58	0.01	0.09	0.95	0.01	0.09	0.88
Victim Blaming	0.20	0.10	0.34	0.167	0.10	0.10	0.08	0.10	0.45	-0.26*	0.10	0.01
Parent Action	-0.14	0.08	0.07	-0.023	0.08	0.77	-0.06	0.08	0.42	0.09	0.08	0.22

Note: * $p < .05$

Table 22. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Internalizing Outcomes Grouped by Non-Victim Status (N=282)

Association	Victims											
	Depression			Anxiety			Stress			Self-Esteem		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	0.00	0.10	0.98	0.20*	0.10	0.05	0.16	0.10	0.11	-0.04	0.10	0.71
Race	-0.09	0.10	0.40	-0.10	0.10	0.34	-0.17	0.10	0.10	-0.02	0.10	0.81
<i>Aggressive Retaliation</i>	0.07	0.11	0.55	0.02	0.12	0.86	-0.07	0.12	0.54	0.10	0.11	0.39
<i>Ignore the Bully</i>	0.15	0.13	0.24	-0.01	0.14	0.92	0.03	0.13	0.82	-0.20	0.13	0.13
<i>Victim Support</i>	-0.31*	0.12	0.01	-0.01	0.13	0.92	-0.14	0.13	0.29	0.28*	0.13	0.03
<i>Minimizing</i>	-0.12	0.13	0.37	-0.08	0.13	0.54	0.02	0.13	0.85	0.13	0.13	0.31
<i>Victim Blaming</i>	0.21	0.11	0.06	0.18	0.11	0.11	0.14	0.11	0.21	-0.28*	0.11	0.01
<i>Parent Action</i>	-0.04	0.11	0.76	-0.02	0.12	0.84	0.02	0.12	0.90	-0.02	0.12	0.83

Note: * $p < .05$

Table 23. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Aggression Outcomes Grouped by Non-Victim-Status (N=282)

Association	Non- Victims						Victims					
	Impulsive Aggression			Premeditated Aggression			Impulsive Aggression			Premeditated Aggression		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	0.12	0.07	0.11	0.16*	0.07	0.03	0.17	0.10	0.08	0.11	0.10	0.27
Race	-0.02	0.08	0.79	-0.05	0.07	0.52	-0.02	0.10	0.86	0.16	0.10	0.11
Aggressive Retaliation	0.13	0.09	0.11	0.06	0.08	0.49	0.17	0.11	0.13	0.10	0.12	0.40
Ignore the Bully	-0.06	0.09	0.52	-0.11	0.09	0.20	0.18	0.13	0.16	0.12	0.13	0.36
Victim Support	-0.02	0.10	0.87	0.05	0.09	0.63	0.00	0.13	0.98	0.03	0.13	0.81
Minimizing	-0.03	0.09	0.74	-0.13	0.09	0.14	-0.12	0.13	0.37	-0.10	0.13	0.47
Victim Blaming	0.16	0.10	0.20	0.19*	0.10	0.05	0.06	0.11	0.59	-0.02	0.12	0.84
Parent Action	0.10	0.08	0.18	0.20*	0.07	0.01	0.08	0.11	0.47	0.11	0.12	0.34

Note: * $p < .05$

Table 24. Summary of Regression Analyses of PSBB Factors and Associations among Peer Victimization Outcomes Grouped by Non- Victim Status (N=282)

Association	Non-Victims						Victims					
	PV in Elementary School			PV in High School			PV in Elementary School			PV in High School		
	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>	<i>b</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>p</i>
Sex	-0.07	0.08	0.34	0.11	0.07	0.14	-0.04	0.10	0.70	0.02	0.10	0.85
Race	0.02	0.08	0.75	0.13	0.07	0.08	-0.11	0.10	0.28	0.10	0.10	0.34
Aggressive Retaliation	-0.05	0.09	0.56	-0.02	0.09	0.84	0.25*	0.12	0.03	-0.03	0.12	0.80
Ignore the Bully	0.20*	0.09	0.03	0.11	0.09	0.23	0.03	0.13	0.84	0.02	0.13	0.87
Victim Support	-0.17	0.10	0.07	-0.05	0.10	0.59	0.08	0.13	0.53	0.00	0.13	0.99
Minimizing	0.03	0.09	0.73	0.07	0.09	0.42	-0.14	0.13	0.31	0.17	0.13	0.20
Victim Blaming	-0.12	0.10	0.24	-0.03	0.10	0.77	0.07	0.12	0.57	-0.02	0.12	0.90
Parent Action	0.07	0.08	0.39	-0.15*	0.08	0.04	0.02	0.12	0.86	0.12	0.12	0.33

Note. * $p < 0.05$; PV= Peer Victimization

First, we would like to ask you a few questions about you.

How old are you? _____

What is your gender? _____

What is your ethnicity? _____

What is your sexual orientation? _____

Are you currently in a romantic relationship?

If yes, what is the gender of your current partner? _____

How long have you been in the relationship with your partner? _____

What is your living arrangement? (check one)

- I live on campus
- I live off-campus
- Prefer not to answer

What is your living arrangement? (check one)

- I live alone
- I live with a spouse/domestic partner
- I live with Roommate(s) /friend(s)
- I live with Parent(s)/guardian(s)
- Prefer not to answer

Are you a member of a fraternity/sorority? (check one)

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

Involved in a registered student organization at the University of Tennessee? (check one)

- Yes
- No
- Prefer not to answer

What is your current class standing? (check one)

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior
- Prefer not to answer

What is your employment status? (check one)

- Employed full-time for wages
- Employed part-time for wages
- Self-Employed
- Out of work and looking for work
- Out of work but not currently looking for work
- A homemaker
- Retired
- Unable to work
- Prefer not to answer

How many credit hours are you enrolled in for the current academic semester? _____

What is your current GPA (on a 4-point scale)? _____

What was your high school GPA (on a 4-point scale)? _____

Parent Strategies and Beliefs about Bullying

Bullying is unwanted, aggressive behavior involving school-aged children that involves a real or perceived power imbalance. These behaviors (making threats, spreading rumors, attacking someone physically or verbally, excluding someone from a group on purpose) happen repeatedly over time. (Stopbullying.gov)

Were you bullied as a child? Yes No

If yes, please answer the questions below.

Circle the number that best describes your experiences.

(0= **Completely Disagree**, 1= **Somewhat Disagree**, 2= **Neither disagree or Agree**, 3= **Somewhat Agree**, 4= **Completely Agree**)

Please indicate whether the strategy or belief was endorsed by your **mother (M)**, **father (F)**, or **both (B)**.

When I was bullied as a child, my parents...

1. Thought it taught me how to handle conflict

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

2. Told me to tell them to stop in a firm voice.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

3. Told me to go and get help from a teacher or another adult.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

4. Told me to go get a friend to help.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

5. Told me to tell them to be quiet.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

6. Thought it taught me how to stand up for myself.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

7. Told me to fight back with physical force.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

8. Told me to try and get back at them.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

9. **Thought it taught me how to defend myself.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
10. **Told me to make fun of them.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
11. **Told me to hit, kick, or punch them to get them to stop.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
12. **Told me to tell them to shut up.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
13. **Told me to ignore them.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
14. **Told me to walk away.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
15. **Told me to not pay any attention to them.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
16. **Told me to make new friends**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
17. **Told me that it was a part of life**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
18. **Thought it would make me a stronger person growing up.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
19. **Thought it would toughen me up.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
20. **Told me that it is not the end of the world.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
21. **Told me not to make a big deal about it.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
22. **Told me that it happens to everyone.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
23. **Would reassure me.**
 0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

24. **Would comfort me.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
25. **Would listen to me.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
26. **Told me that everything will be okay.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
27. **Told me to cheer up.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
28. **Would tell me to stop whining about it.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
29. **Told me to stop being such a wuss.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
30. **Told me to stop tattling.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
31. **Told me that they did not believe me.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
32. **Would tell me to handle it on my own.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
33. **Told me to be a better friend.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
34. **Blamed me for being bullied.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
35. **Told me not to give children a reason to make fun of me.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
36. **Would try to help me resolve the problem.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
37. **Would call my teacher and/or school immediately.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)
38. **Would call the bullying child's parents immediately.**
0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

39. Told me that whoever bullied me will be punished.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

40. Would let me miss school.

0 1 2 3 4 (M) (F) (B)

Are there any other strategies or beliefs your parents used when you were bullied? If yes, please describe below:

Retrospective Bullying Questionnaire:

The following questions are about bullying. Bullying is intentional hurtful behavior. It can be physical or psychological. It is often repeated and characterized by an inequality of power so that it is difficult for the victim to defend him/her self.

All answers will be treated confidentially.

Please think back to your school days. You may have seen some bullying at school, and you may have been involved in some way. (Tick the choice which best describes your own experiences at school.)

- I was not involved at all, and I never saw it happen
- I was not involved at all, but I saw it happen sometimes
- I would sometimes join in bullying others
- I would sometimes get bullied by others
- At various times, I was both a bully and a victim

Can you briefly describe an incident in which you observed someone else being bullied or an incident in which you felt you were bullied?

PART I: PRIMARY SCHOOL

This part deals with your experiences at primary school (4–11 years).

Tick the spaces that are right for you.

1. Did you have a happy time at primary school?

- Detested
- Disliked
- Neutral
- Liked a bit
- Liked a lot

2. Did you have a happy time at home with your family while in primary school?

- Detested
- Disliked
- Neutral
- Liked a bit
- Liked a lot

The next questions are about physical forms of bullying – hitting and kicking, and having things stolen from you.

3. Were you physically bullied at primary school?

Hit/punched yes no
Stolen from yes no

4. Did this happen?

Never
 Rarely
 Sometimes
 Frequently
 Constantly

5. How serious did you consider these bullying-attacks to be?

I wasn't bullied
 Not at all
 Only a bit
 Quite serious
 Extremely serious

The next questions are about verbal forms of bullying – being called nasty names, and being threatened.

6. Were you verbally bullied at primary school?

Called names yes no
Threatened yes no

7. Did this happen?

Never
 Rarely
 Sometimes
 Frequently
 Constantly

8. How serious did you consider these bullying-attacks to be?

I wasn't bullied
 Not at all
 Only a bit
 Quite serious
 Extremely serious

The next questions are about indirect forms of bullying – having lies or nasty rumours told about you behind your back, or being deliberately excluded from social groups.

9. Were you indirectly bullied at primary school?

Had lies told about you yes no

Excluded yes no

10. Did this happen?

Never

Rarely

Sometimes

Frequently

Constantly

11. How serious did you consider these bullying-attacks to be?

I wasn't bullied

Not at all

Only a bit

Quite serious

Extremely serious

The next questions are about bullying in general.

12. How long did the bullying attacks usually last?

I wasn't bullied

Just a few days

Weeks

Months

A year or more

13. How many pupils bullied you in primary school?

I wasn't bullied

Mainly by one boy

By several boys

Mainly by one girl

By several girls

By both boys and girls

14. If you were bullied, why do you think this happened?

PART II: SECONDARY SCHOOL

This part deals with your experiences at secondary school (11–18 years).

15. Did you have a happy time at secondary school?

- Detested
- Disliked
- Neutral
- Liked a bit
- Liked a lot

16. Did you have a happy time at home with your family while in secondary school?

- Detested
- Disliked
- Neutral
- Liked a bit
- Liked a lot

The next questions are about physical forms of bullying – hitting and kicking, and having things stolen from you.

17. Were you physically bullied at secondary school?

- Hit/punched yes no
- Stolen from yes no

18. Did this happen?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- Constantly

19. How serious did you consider these bullying-attacks to be?

- I wasn't bullied
- Not at all
- Only a bit
- Quite serious
- Extremely serious

The next questions are about verbal forms of bullying – being called nasty names and being threatened.

20. Were you verbally bullied at secondary school?

- Called names yes no
- Threatened yes no

21. Did this happen?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- Constantly

22. How serious did you consider these bullying-attacks to be?

- I wasn't bullied
- Not at all
- Only a bit
- Quite serious
- Extremely serious

The next questions are about indirect forms of bullying – having lies or nasty rumours told about you behind your back, or being deliberately excluded from social groups.

23. Were you indirectly bullied at secondary school?

- Had lies told about you yes no
- Excluded yes no

24. Did this happen?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- Constantly

25. How serious did you consider these bullying-attacks to be?

- I wasn't bullied
- Not at all
- Only a bit
- Quite serious
- Extremely serious

The next questions are about bullying in general.

26. How long did the bullying-attacks usually last?

- I wasn't bullied
- Just a few days
- Weeks
- Months
- A year or more

27. How many pupils bullied you in secondary school?

- I wasn't bullied
- Mainly by one boy
- By several boys
- Mainly by one girl
- By several girls
- By both boys and girls

28. If you were bullied, why do you think this happened?

PART III: GENERAL EXPERIENCES AT SCHOOL

29. Which were the main ways you used to cope with the bullying? (Please tick one or more options)

- I wasn't bullied at school
- I tried to make fun of it
- I tried to avoid the situation
- I tried to ignore it
- I fought back

- I got help from friends
- I got help from a teacher
- I got help from family / parents
- I tried to handle it by myself
- I did not really cope
- Other

30. Did you ever take part in bullying anyone while you were at school?

- Hit/punched yes no
- Stole from yes no
- Called names yes no
- Threatened yes no
- Told lies about yes no
- Excluded yes no

31. Did this happen?

- Never
- Rarely
- Sometimes
- Frequently
- Constantly

32. How often did you try to avoid school by pretending to be sick or by playing truant because you were being bullied?

- I wasn't bullied at school
- Never
- Only once or twice
- Sometimes
- Maybe once a week
- Several times a week

33. When you were being bullied, did you ever, even for a second, think about hurting yourself or taking your own life?

- I wasn't bullied at school
- No, never
- Yes, once
- Yes, more than once

34. Have you been bullied since leaving school?

- I haven't been bullied since leaving school
- I have been bullied by my family
- I have been bullied by others (please specify):

Recollections of being bullied at school

35. Do you have vivid memories of the bullying event(s) which keep coming back causing you distress?

- No, never
- Not often
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

36. Do you have dreams or nightmares about the bullying event(s)?

- No, never
- Not often
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

37. Do you ever feel like you are re-living the bullying event(s) again?

- No, never
- Not often
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

38. Do you ever have sudden vivid recollections or “flashbacks” to the bullying event(s)?

- No, never
- Not often
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

39. Do you ever feel distressed in situations which remind you of the bullying event(s)?

- No, never
- Not often
- Sometimes
- Often
- Always

40. If you were bullied, do you feel it had any long-term effects? If so, please describe below:

PART IV: BULLYING OR HARASSMENT IN THE WORKPLACE

41. Have you ever experienced bullying in your workplace?

- I wasn't bullied in my workplace
- I was bullied in one of my previous jobs
- I was bullied in more than one of my previous jobs
- I have been bullied in my present job
- I have been bullied in all of my jobs

42. Please state whether you have been bullied at work over the last six months.

- No
- Yes, very rarely
- Yes, now and then
- Yes, several times per month
- Yes, several times per week
- Yes, almost daily

43. If yes, when did the bullying start?

- Within the last 6 months
- Between 6 and 12 months ago
- Between 1 and 2 years ago
- More than 2 years ago

44. If you have been bullied, what did you do?
(Please tick one or more options)

- Tried to avoid the situation
- Tried to ignore it
- Confronted the bully
- Went to the union/staff association
- Went to personnel
- Discussed it with colleagues
- Went to occupational health
- Went to the welfare department
- Saw my doctor (GP)
- I went for counseling
- I got psychiatric help

- _____ Made use of the organization's grievance procedure
- _____ I left the job
- _____ Did not really cope
- _____ Other

Depression Anxiety Stress Scale:

	Did not apply to me at all	Applied to me to some degree, or a some of the time	Applied to me to a considerable degree, or a good part of time	Applied to me very much, or most of the time
1. I found myself getting upset by quite trivial things.	0	1	2	3
2. I was aware of dryness of my mouth.	0	1	2	3
3. I couldn't seem to experience any positive feeling at all.	0	1	2	3
4. I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g. excessively rapid breathing, breathlessness in the absence of physical exertion).	0	1	2	3
5. I just couldn't seem to get going.	0	1	2	3
6. I tended to over-react to situations.	0	1	2	3
7. I had a feeling of shakiness (e.g. legs going to give way).	0	1	2	3
8. I found it difficult to relax.	0	1	2	3
9. I found myself in situations that made me so anxious I was most relieved when they ended.	0	1	2	3
10. I felt that I had nothing to look forward to.	0	1	2	3
11. I found myself getting upset rather easily.	0	1	2	3

12. I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy.	0	1	2	3
13. I felt sad and depressed.	0	1	2	3
14. I found myself getting impatient when I was delayed in any way (e.g. lifts, traffic lights, being kept waiting).	0	1	2	3
15. I had a feeling of faintness.	0	1	2	3
16. I felt that I had lost interest in just about everything.	0	1	2	3
17. I felt I wasn't worth much as a person.	0	1	2	3
18. I felt that I was rather touchy.	0	1	2	3
19. I perspired noticeably (e.g. sweaty hands) in the absence of high temperatures or physical exertion.	0	1	2	3
20. I felt scared without any good reason.	0	1	2	3
21. I felt that life wasn't worthwhile.	0	1	2	3

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.	0	1	2	3
2. At times I think I am no good at all.	0	1	2	3
3. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.	0	1	2	3
4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.	0	1	2	3
5. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.	0	1	2	3
6. I certainly feel useless at times.	0	1	2	3
7. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.	0	1	2	3
8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.	0	1	2	3
9. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.	0	1	2	3
10. I take a positive attitude toward myself.	0	1	2	3

IPAS

Consider a time in the past 6 months in which you engaged in an aggressive act. For each item listed below, please indicate how much each statement characterizes your experience.

- 1 = Strongly Disagree
- 2 = Disagree
- 3 = Neutral
- 4 = Agree
- 5 = Strongly Agree

1. I planned when and where my anger was expressed.
2. I felt my outbursts were justified.
3. When angry, I reacted without thinking.
4. I typically felt guilty after the aggressive acts.
5. I was in control during the aggressive acts.
6. I feel my actions were necessary to get what I wanted.
7. I usually can't recall the details of the incidents well.
8. I understood the consequences of the acts before I acted.
9. I feel I lost control of my temper during the acts.
10. Sometimes I purposely delayed the acts until a later time.
11. I felt pressure from others to commit the acts.
12. I wanted some of the incidents to occur.
13. I feel some of the incidents went too far.
14. I think the other person deserved what happened to them during some of the incidents.
15. I became agitated or emotionally upset prior to the acts.
17. I was under the influence of alcohol or other drugs during the acts.
16. The acts led to power over others or improved social status for me.
18. I knew most of the persons involved in the incidents.
19. I was concerned for my personal safety during the acts.
20. Some of the acts were attempts at revenge.
21. I feel I acted out aggressively more than the average person over the last six months.
22. I was confused during the acts.
23. Prior to the incidents I knew an altercation was going to occur.
24. My behavior was too extreme for the level of provocation.
25. My aggressive outbursts were usually directed at a specific person.
26. I consider the acts to have been impulsive.
27. I was in a bad mood the day of the incident.
28. The acts were a "release" and I felt better afterwards.
29. I am glad some of the incidents occurred.
30. Anything could have set me off prior to the incidents.

VITA

Kathryn Francis Smeraglia was born on December 6, 1989, in Birmingham, Alabama. She is the only daughter of Frank and Kathy Smeraglia. She graduated from Oak Mountain High School in Birmingham, Alabama in 2008. Kathryn attended Auburn University and graduated *summa cum laude* with a Bachelor of Arts degree in Psychology in 2012. She received her Master of Arts degree in Clinical Psychology from the University of Tennessee, Knoxville, in 2017, followed by her Doctor of Philosophy degree in Clinical Psychology at the University of Tennessee-Knoxville in 2019. Kathryn is currently completing a doctoral internship at The Jefferson County Internship Consortium in Louisville, KY, with an emphasis in early childhood development, and will continue with postdoctoral fellowship training at Centerstone of KY.