BRIDGING THE GAP:

RELATIONAL AGGRESSION IN THE COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

by

Irene R. Delgado

A dissertation submitted to the Graduate Faculty in Educational Psychology in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy,
The City of New York

2011

This manuscript has been read and accepted for the
Graduate Faculty in Educational Psychology in satisfaction of the
Dissertation requirement for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy

Helen L. Johnson, Ph.D.

_____	_____
Date	Chair of Examining Committee

Mario Antonio Kelly, Ed.D.

_____	_____
Date	Executive Officer

Daisuke Akiba, Ph.D.

Laura Saxman, Ph.D.
Supervisory Committee

THE CITY UNIVERSITY OF NEW YORK

Abstract

BRIDGING THE GAP:

RELATIONAL AGGRESSION IN THE COLLEGE ENVIRONMENT

by

Irene R. Delgado

Advisor: Professor Helen L. Johnson

The purpose of this study is to expand the limited research on bullying behaviors and their consequences in the college environment; specifically, frequency of exposure, explanation for bullying behaviors, attribution of blame and help seeking responses. The negative trajectory that has been seen throughout elementary school, middle school and high school is expected to continue through into the college environment.

This investigation was conducted in two parts. In Study A, participants were 348 college students from an ethnically diverse, suburban private college which consisted of 203 females and 153 males. Students self-selected to participate in filling out a sixty-item survey to gain demographic and basic knowledge about their frequency of exposure to bullying in the college environment. Study A provided key evidence that females and males reported bullying/relational aggression, as a witness, in the college environment. In addition, females did not engage in relational aggressive behaviors in higher frequency than males, and females did not blame the victim more often for relationally aggressive victimization as compared to males.

In Study B, participants were thirty-two college students who self-disclosed their interest in participating in in-depth interviews regarding personal accounts of bullying and its effects. Questions were aimed at understanding students' explanations for bullying behaviors, and evaluating their personal experiences with bullying and help seeking as they matured. Each student was individually interviewed by this investigator.

The main conclusions drawn from Study B are: 1) females endorsed *jealousy* as the most relevant reason for bullying as compared to males who endorsed *gaining acceptance* as the most frequently cited explanation; 2) in elementary school, high school, and college, females reported a higher percentage of help seeking as compared to males; and, 3) college students reported experiencing negative feelings from being exposed to bullying in the college environment, in addition to feeling negatively in the classroom.

This study illuminates the continued need to provide bullying intervention programs at the college level, including but not limited to: training professors and staff on how to identify and respond to bullying episodes, provide bullies and victims with individualized support, and, develop and enforce a disciplinary code of conduct.

Table of Contents

List of Tables

Acknowledgements

There are several people I must thank. First and foremost, a big THANK YOU to my advisor, Professor Helen Johnson. With her guidance and insight, I have successfully completed this Herculean task. She is the best advisor I could ever ask for. A profound debt of gratitude is owed to her. I must also thank the students who took time out of their busy schedules to work on this project, and my dissertation committee members and readers who were so generous with their time.

To my two guardian angels, Dr. Maria DiBenedetto and Dr. Heather Brookman; little did I know that by meeting them in the program they would turn from strangers to study buddies to life long friends. I am truly blessed.

To Gio Sindona, my confidant, my circle is incomplete without you. The light will always be on. Happy Easter!

To Lucinda Fleming, my career guru and soul sister, thank you for being there and letting me pretend your kids are my kids!

To Laura Rúa-Reidy, who a long time ago did me a little favor and that has made all the difference. Thank you Laura for honoring our friendship the way you do.

To Tina S. Shedden, who has been there for me more years than I am allowed to admit to and taught me about the color grey.

To Kim S. Kaiman, who knows where ALL the bodies are buried, and never complained about my complaining about how much research and writing I was doing.

Saving the best for last, I must thank my mom and dad. Thank you mom for teaching me how to be organized, for giving me a loving and supportive home as I grew up, for surrounding me with books (and shoes), for all the help you continue to give me everyday. For

greeting my morning phone calls with joy in your voice, for laughing with me, and for believing me when I say “everything has a way of working out.”

Finally to my dad…who is watching me from above. Who everyday told me I was worth a million dollars, tax free. He taught me that I could be anything I wanted to be, and as he sits with Saint Peter, smoking his cigar, with a little cup of espresso, he points me out, smiles and says, “That is MY daughter. She’s a doctor.”

Bridging the Gap: Relational Aggression in the College Environment

Chapter 1: Introduction

"Sticks and stones may break my bones, but names will never hurt me" (Anonymous). Along with the Tooth Fairy and the Easter Bunny, this saying can be considered one of the biggest lies perpetrated on children. However, neither the Tooth Fairy nor Easter Bunny has ever damaged the self esteem or social standing of any child or adult. This saying is a cover for the reality that bullying is hurtful and harmful and its damaging effects can be far-reaching and long-lasting.

In 2001 the National Institute of Health issued a press release announcing the results of a study which comprised 15,686 students in sixth grade, spread over ten public, parochial, and private school districts throughout the U.S. The results revealed that more than 16% of U.S. school children reported that they had been bullied in the current term and 13% said they had engaged in moderate or frequent bullying of others. The report concluded with "bullying is widespread in American schools."

The significance of the statement is profound. Bullying has been linked to an increase in depression, anxiety, low self esteem, and to more serious consequences, including suicide (Swearer, Grills, Haye & Cary, 2004).

Bullying, which was once thought to be limited to playgrounds and school hallways, has crept into our computers and workplaces. January 2008 saw a federal grand jury issue subpoenas to MySpace, as federal prosecutors considered charges of federal and cyber fraud against Lori Drew. Who is Lori Drew? Lori Drew is a 47 year old Missourian mother, of a classmate to

Megan Taylor Meier, who allegedly posed as a young male teenager on the internet and bullied 13 year old Megan into committing suicide (Cathcart, 2008).

Bullying has followed us into the workplace as well. Since 2003, thirteen states have introduced the Health Workplace Bill. This bill has been designed for the protection all employees, working for either public or private employers, regardless of protected group status, who seek redress for being subjected to an abusive work environment. It will become unlawful to be subjected to another employee whose malicious conduct sabotages or undermines the targeted person's work performance. Furthermore, the bill punishes retaliation of the complainant or anyone who helps the complainant (Namie, 2007).

When we look at the available body of research, there is an abundance of data with respect to bullying in elementary school and high school. Bullying topics include frequency, consequences of exposure, identification of bullying, personal characteristics of the bully and the victim, reasons for bullying, gender differences, seeking help from bullying, instruments for proper measuring of bullying, the effects of television on bullying, intervention programs… the list goes on. However, the research on these topics is confined to elementary school students and high school students.

Inexplicably, there is a gap in data. The focus jumps from school bullying to workplace bullying. Business and management journals are crowded with articles and research reviews that expound on the negative consequences of bullying in the workplace. Serious attention is paid to the impact of bullying on the employee and the organization.

This researcher is looking to “bridge the gap” between the research conducted on bullying in elementary and secondary schools and the research available about bullying in the business world. The “gap” refers to the college years. It is illogical to assume that at the

completion of high school, bullying behaviors suddenly disappear, and even more unreasonable to suppose that bullying behaviors abruptly reappear as individuals enter the workforce. What does bullying in the college environment look like? Is there a difference in how students bully due to their maturation and/or academic stage? Does "once a bully always a bully, or once a victim always a victim" hold true as individuals age? As individuals mature, it is expected that negative and socially unacceptable behaviors diminish and become extinct. Unfortunately, one look at the daily newspaper and it is evident that this is not the case. Bullying behaviors seem to continue in a linear fashion, with no specific end in sight. There is a distinction between bullying and relational aggression that appears to be highlighted in the college environment. However, this distinction might have its roots in gender, societal and cultural differences.

The images of old brick quadrangles with Gothic buildings or super futuristic glass edifices populated by students engaged in scholarly work collides with the underbelly of objectionable relationally aggressive behaviors that include gossiping, ostracizing and character assassination by bullies.

It is this researcher's contention that bullying behaviors do not cease while students are in college. In fact, not only do bullying behaviors persist in college, but their effects remain negative and harmful.

The purpose of this study is to expand the limited research on bullying behaviors and their consequences in the college environment; specifically, the prevalence of bullying, reasons for engaging in bullying behaviors, and attribution of blame onto the victim. This study is divided into two parts. The first part will assess the frequency and exposure to bullying in college via a survey. The second part of the study consists of in-depth interviews of college students to gather personal accounts of bullying and its effects. The interview has a three

pronged approach. First, students will recount their personal experiences with bullying in elementary school, high school and college. Second, the students will answer a four item survey on what they perceive as explanations for bullying behaviors. Lastly, the students will view two video clips to assess if the videos meet the student's definition of bullying behaviors. It is expected that college students will report significant levels of bullying in their college environment and will report that said bullying has had a negative impact.

The following chapter is a literature review looking at past and present research on bullying. Key topics including gender differences, bullying in preschool, high school and college, workplace bullying, and obstacles to seeking help from bullying.

Chapter 2: Literature Review

Although bullying is often dismissed as a rite of passage, in reality it is a destructive force that starts in our preschool years and can follow us into high school, college, and the workplace. Bullying is an equal opportunity destructive behavior that negatively affects the perpetrator and the victim. Neither gender nor age, are protective shields against the demoralizing, intimidating, and disparaging effects of being victimized by a bully.

This chapter provides an overview of bullying, and its prevalence in human development starting from early childhood, into adolescence, young adulthood, and then adulthood. This is followed by a brief review of instruments used in the detection of bullying. Research findings on the obstacles to seeking help when being victimized are also reviewed. Concluding this chapter is an outline of the research questions and hypotheses.

Definition of Bullying

A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students (Naylor, Cowie, Cossin, de Bettencourt & Lemme, 2006; Olweus, 1993). Key elements in the definition are:

- ✧ Repeated, and over time
- ✧ Negative actions – intentionally inflicting injury or discomfort
- ✧ On the part of one or more students with the target usually being a single student

Bullying can take on many forms, from physical and verbal aggression to relationship manipulation and verbal insults. All of these forms fall under the umbrella term *aggression*. There is consensus that aggression is behavior that intends to harm and is perceived as hurtful by the victim (Underwood & Galen, 2001). Aggression has been conceptualized as involving two distinct types of expression.

Types of Aggression

Physical/Overt Aggression.

A student is the subject of physical/overt aggression if she/he is hit, pushed, kicked, pinched, and/or restrained (physical contact) (Crick & Casas, 1997; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Grotpeter & Crick, 1996; McNeilly-Choque & Hart, 1996; Olweus, 1993; Ostrov & Keating, 2004; Prinstein, 2001; Russell & Owens, 1999). It bears noting that physical/overt aggression is readily observable and identifiable, either by direct observation or video recording students' interactions. Physical violence is a visible action.

Relational/Indirect/Social Aggression.

The leading researchers in this field have not reached a consensus regarding the use of the words *relational aggression*, *indirect aggression*, and *social aggression*. Several researchers (Crick, 1996; Crick & Bigbee, 1996; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; French, 2002; McEvoy, 2003) favor *relational aggression*. Others (Björkqvist, 1994; Kauiainen, et al, 1999; Osterman, et al, 1998; Owens, 2000) favor *indirect aggression*. The term *social aggression* is used less frequently (Galen & Underwood, 1997).

Relational aggression is defined as behaviors that harm others though damage, or the threat of damage to relationships, feelings of acceptance, friendship, or group exclusion (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). These can include: controlling through friendship "you can't be my friend unless…", spreading rumors to encourage peer rejection, and exclusion from social events; ostracizing, breaking confidences, criticizing clothing, appearance and/or personality, writing abusive messages on desks, walls and notes (Crick 1996; Crick & Casas, 1997; Crick&

Grotpeter, 1995; Crick et al., 2001; Loudin, Loukas & Robinson, 2003; Owens, Shute and Slee, 2000a; Storch, Werner, & Storch, 2003; Werner & Crick, 1999).

Indirect aggression is defined as a "behind–the-back" form of aggression. The victim is targeted with social manipulation. Often, but not always, the aggressor attacks in circuitous ways using a third person in order to conceal the aggressive intent, or they pretend that the attack was not aggressive at all (Bjorkqvist, 1994).

Lastly, *social aggression* is defined as behaviors directed toward damaging another's self esteem, social status, or both. These behaviors may take such forms as verbal rejection, negative facial expressions, or body movement; however, they can also take more indirect forms such as slanderous rumors or social exclusion (Galen & Underwood, 1997).

Because of the considerable overlap between constructs, indirect aggression researchers have argued that relational aggression is simply indirect aggression with a new name (Björkqvist, 1994). Archer and Coyne (2005) posit that there are no important differences between the three terms. All three terms concern the manipulation of the reputation of another, and/or encompass exclusion from the group either overtly or covertly. All three terms encompass comparable alternative strategies to physical aggression and therefore are not as easily and readily observed as physical aggression. It is easy to witness one student punch another, it is often difficult to identify who started a rumor. Each of these constructs entail dependence on language skills and each ultimately harm the social standing of the victim (Archer & Coyne, 2005). All three terms are similar in position, structure, function and characteristics. For the purposes of this research the term *relational aggression* will be used except when citing another researcher's work, in which case the cited researcher's preferred term will be used.

Early Childhood/Preschool Bullying and Gender Differences

There is consensus that aggression is behavior that intends to harm and that the behavior is perceived as hurtful by the victim (Underwood, 2001). But how early in life can it be noticed? Are there gender differences in how early aggression is detected? These questions provide the back drop for research into appropriate intervention and prevention efforts. This researcher has found ample evidence supporting gender differences in bullying behaviors. However, even if there were no biological differences underpinning different abilities, there is certainly systemic societal encouragement of different abilities in males and females (Pressley, 1995). The following sections will review the gender differences found in overt aggression and then relational aggression.

Intuitively we know that children are keenly aware of being picked on. In a study by Galen and Underwood (1997) it was reported that overall, children rated physical aggression as slightly more hurtful than relational aggression. However, there were gender differences in rating hurtfulness; girls rated relational aggression as more hurtful than boys, and boys viewed overt aggression as more hurtful than relational aggression.

Overt Aggression, Earliest Detection and Gender Differences

Fagot and Hagan (1985) followed the development of physical aggression in 48 children for three years, starting at 18 months. Videotaping at six month intervals in those three years (two hours of play at a time), Fagot and Hagan (1985) found that while both boys and girls were physically aggressive at age 18 – 24 months, boys engaged in significantly more physical aggression than girls. Boys aggressed against other boys (65% of all aggressive acts) twice as often as against girls (33%). Of the three age intervals, toddlers initiated significantly more incidents of physical aggression.

Cummings and Iannotti (1989) also reported physically aggressive behavior at age two. Cummings and Iannotti (1989) studied the stability of aggressive behavior in 42 children, testing them at two years of age and then again at five years of age. Physical aggression was scored during videotaped play sessions, but verbal aggression was omitted because most verbalizations were considered inarticulate. At age two, physical aggression was significantly present. Physical aggression at age five was positively associated with physical aggression at age two. Stability of aggression was greater for boys than for girls although girls showed some evidence of stability.

In support of these findings, Tremblay and Boivin (1999) reported the saliency of physical aggression as early as 17 months. In a sample population of 511 maternal reports (260 girls and 251 boys), physical aggression was evident in close to 80% of the children. The most frequent physical aggression was grabbing, followed by pushing and then biting. There were no significant differences in the use of physical aggression between boys and girls who had siblings. The study found significant differences between boys and girls who did not have siblings.

It bears noting, however, that although physical aggression has been reported as early as 17 months, it is difficult to use these findings as concrete evidence given the fact that the "aggression" can be a part of the child's attempt at communication. At 17 months children are starting to build their vocabulary, most children have not had their "vocabulary spurt." Given the limited language, grabbing a toy out of a playmate's hand may be an attempt to communicate wanting of the toy. Early in life, children use physical aggression primarily to achieve what they desire (Coyne, Archer & Elsea, 2006).

Although we can literally "see" physical aggression in toddlers as young as 17 months old, whether this becomes a trajectory for maladjustment requires further research.

Relational Aggression - Earliest Detection and Gender Differences

So far the earliest age for relational aggression to emerge is approximately at three and half years of age (Crick & Casas, 1997; Crick & Casas, 1999). It stands to reason that this is the earliest that relational aggression can be detected. Relational aggression requires the use of language. Through language we can develop or destroy relationships, boost or diminish self esteem. Language competence is a prerequisite for relational aggression. Relational aggression can only exist within a relationship which operates through language. Typically by age three and a half, children are producing their first complex sentences. This coincides with children's ability to use relationally aggressive behaviors.

In support of the hypothesis that most relationally aggressive tactics rely on verbal means, Bonica and Arnold (2003) speculated that evidence of a relationship between relational aggression and language development might rest on: 1) children's ability to attribute mental states to people, which is thought to facilitate relational aggression and is associated with early language development; and, 2) girls' verbal development tends to precede boys' and girls use more relational aggression than boys, suggesting that language and relational aggression might be positively correlated. In looking at 145 preschool children, Bonica and Arnold (2003) found initial support for a positive association between language development and relational aggression in young children. However, this is the only research study to date that explores relational aggression and language development together. This relationship warrants further study.

Crick and Casas (1997) specifically researched relational and overt aggression at the preschool age and their association with social-psychological adjustment. Sixty-five preschoolers (31, 3.5 years old – 4.5 years old; and 34, 4.5 years old to 5.5 years old) were rated by their teachers and peers on their aggression and social behaviors. Four distinct aggression

groups were identified: 1) non-aggressive, 2) overtly aggressive, 3) relationally aggressive, and 4) relationally plus overtly aggressive. Factor analysis yielded separate factors for relational and overt aggression. Boys were found to be significantly more overtly aggressive than girls, and girls were significantly more relationally aggressive than boys. Both forms of aggression were significantly related to social-psychological maladjustment. Relational aggression and overt aggression were positively related to high levels of peer rejection for both boys and girls. In addition, there was agreement between teacher and peer assessments of relational aggression and overt aggression for girls, but agreement only in their assessment of overt aggression for boys. As expected, both forms of aggression are distinct and detectable in both genders at the preschool level.

In a follow up study, Crick and Casas (1999) extended their research to include peer victimization in their examination of relational aggression and overt aggression in the preschool years. Again, they found that ill-treatment of peers starts as early as preschool and that there were gender effects. Examining two age groups (median = 4 years old and median = 5 years old), 129 children were assessed by their teachers and their peers for aggression (relational and physical), victimization, and social-psychological (loneliness and social satisfaction) adjustment. Results showed that girls were significantly more relationally victimized than boys, whereas boys were significantly more physically victimized than girls. Both relationally and physically victimized children were more rejected by peers than were non-victimized children. The majority of children were classified as either aggressive or victimized but not both. Relative to their non-victimized peers, victimized children have been shown to be significantly more depressed, anxious, lonely, and rejected by peers; experience greater school adjustment problems; and hold more negative perceptions of their own competence (Crick & Casas, 1999).

McEvoy (2003) studied 59 preschool children. Teacher ratings, peer nominations, and direct observations were used to assess relational aggression and overt aggression. All three methods yielded the same results: girls were more relationally aggressive than overtly aggressive, and boys were more overtly aggressive than girls. In addition, boys were both more relationally aggressive and overtly aggressive than girls in this study.

McNeilly-Choque and Hart (1996) had already reported that as early as preschool, there are distinct forms of aggression, and there are gender effects as well as socio-economic status (SES) effects. Aggression is also linked to social adjustment difficulties. In their study the sample consisted of 241 children, divided by SES. The lower SES population was 164 Head Start children (92 boys, 72 girls, mean age 4.8 years); the middle class SES population was 77 university preschool children (42 boys, 35 girls, mean age 5 years).

Teacher ratings, peer behavioral nominations and playground observations were used in this study. For the sample as a whole, moderate to low significant correlations were found between teacher rating and peer nomination scores for both relational aggression and overt aggression. As with Crick and Casas (1997), there was significant inter-method agreement among all three types of assessment for overt aggression, especially for boys. However, because the very nature of relational aggression is that it is "invisible," it is harder to detect. It is easy to spot one child shoving another. It is more difficult to spot who says "your mother dresses you funny" or who states "you can only be in our group if you have bangs." This invisibility coupled with possible biases from the teacher ("boys will be boys") may explain why relational aggression has lower inter-rater reliability.

The teacher assessments and observational data found that girls exhibited more relational aggression than boys and boys displayed more overt aggression than girls. In addition, lower

SES children were more overtly aggressive than the higher SES children. Higher SES children were rated as being more relationally aggressive than lower SES. However, Bonica, Arnold, Fisher, Zeljo, and Yershova (2003) could not draw any conclusion with respect to the influence of SES on the association between relational aggression and language development. More research needs to be conducted on SES as a predictor for relational aggression. What other variables might confound these results? Can these results be replicated? Is this effect due to patterns of socialization within the family? How does SES affect parent-child interactions which in turn would affect social skills? A substantial body of research is needed before SES can be used as a predictor for relational aggression.

Two recent studies by Ostrov and Keating (2004) and Ostrov and Wood (2004) also support the gender-linked model of aggression in preschool children. However, Ostrov and Keating (2004) and Ostrov and Wood (2004) highlighted differences in relational aggression and physical aggression. Examining four and one half year olds in a limited resource situation (conflict intentionally provoked during semi-structured task) Ostrov and Wood (2004) reported that as predicted, boys were more physically aggressive than girls (although as a trend, not significantly). Girls were found to be significantly more relationally aggressive than boys. In regards to direction, boys received significantly more physical aggression than girls and girls received more relational aggression than boys. These findings suggest that children are aware of the forms of aggression they use and on whom. Boys give and receive more physical aggression, and girls give and receive more relational aggression. Corroborating Crick and Casas (1997, 1999) and McNeilly-Choque and Hart (1996), physical aggression was associated with both peer rejection and a lack of prosocial behavior whereas relational aggression was associated with exclusion by peers. For girls, giving and receiving relational aggression was associated with a

lack of prosocial behavior and only receiving relationally aggressive behaviors tended to be associated with peer rejection.

To elucidate Ostrov and Wood's (2004) hypothesis of children "knowing" what kind of aggression they are using, Ostrov and Keating (2004) went on to look at the social motives and strategic outcomes of physical and relational aggression in a population of five year olds during playtime and structured tasks. Consistent with their predictions, Ostrov and Keating (2004) found that kindergarten age boys were more physically aggressive than their female peers, and girls in turn, were more relationally aggressive than boys. This held true both during free play and structured tasks. These results supported their contention that physical/overt aggression best served boys' motivation for physical dominance while relational aggression was best used to manipulate social relationships and serve girls' motives for social acceptance. Lastly, children received more physical and verbal aggression from male peers and tended to receive more relational aggression from female peers.

It has been concluded that childhood aggression is one of the best predictors of adult aggression, future maladjustment, adolescent delinquency, and adult criminality (Crick & Casas, 1997; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Grotpeter & Crick, 1996; Tremblay, 1999). Crick and Casas (1997) also found that both relational and overt forms of aggression were significantly related to social-psychological maladjustment. Olweus (1992) found that of those children who were classified as bullies in grades 6 through 9, 60% had at least one conviction by the age of 24 years; 35% – 40% had more than three convictions, as compared with 10% among children who had neither been classified as a perpetrator or victim.

In reviewing this research, we have established that relational aggression can be detected as early as three and half years of age; it crosses gender lines, females tend to use relationally

aggressive behaviors with more frequency that males; and, it is hurtful and harmful to both genders. Evidence of antecedents and consequences of bullying behavior continue in the next developmental stage: adolescence.

Adolescent/High School Bullying and Gender Differences

Recently, we have started to see studies that extend the examination of relational aggression to adolescents. Bullying does not stop when children reach the teenage years. The following studies document that bullying persists in adolescence.

The study of aggressive behavior has slowly evolved from looking solely at the physical version of aggression to the psychological version. A number of research reports have shown that girls are predominantly relationally aggressive and boys are more overtly aggressive (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; McEvoy, 2003; Prinstein, Boergers & Vernberg, 2001; Russell, 1999).

Prinstein, Boergers and Vernberg (2001) studied 566 adolescents from a high school in a small city in South England. Students answered questionnaires about relational aggression, overt aggression, depressive symptoms, loneliness, self esteem, and externalizing symptoms. Noteworthy findings revealed that boys reported significantly higher levels of overt aggression and overt victimization than did girls, and girls reported the use of relational aggression significantly more than overt forms of aggression.

Two years earlier, Russell (1999) had included the aggressor's target's gender as a factor in this research. His research included 422 students ranging from grades 2 through 11 participated. Students were administered the Direct and Indirect Aggression Scale (DIAS). The DIAS is a peer nomination instrument. The results showed that both boys' and girls' aggression differed according to whether the target was of the same gender or cross gender. Boys' used

more physical aggression than indirect aggression to boys and girls' use of indirect aggression is more a feature of their aggression to girls than to boys (Russell, 1999). What is particularly significant in this study is the idea that children will adjust their inter-personal style according to whom they are dealing with. Boys and girls amend their style of aggression according to whether the receiver is male or female.

Relational aggression provides unique information about adjustment and about negative changes in adjustment for girls only. For example, relationally aggressive girls become more rejected by peers over the course of the school year (Crick, 1996). Girls who engage in relationally aggressive behaviors exhibit a number of adjustment problems and have reported higher levels of depression, loneliness and social isolation than their peers. Relational aggression is an equal opportunity destructive factor; both the perpetrator and the victim can suffer serious and long term psychological consequences.

In a sample of 422 high school students in North West England, Coyne, Archer, and Elsea (2006) found that overall teenage girls perceived indirect/relational aggression as more harmful than boys did. Females reported significantly more gossiping, while males reported significantly more hitting. The most hurtful of the indirect/relational aggressive behaviors for both genders, were: 1) breaking confidences; 2) making fun of someone so it makes them look stupid; 3) trying to destroy someone else's relationship; and, 4) making fun of clothes or personality to a person's face. However, the frequency of indirect/relational aggression varied, with the four most frequent indirect/relational aggressive behaviors being: name calling, giving dirty looks, teasing/yelling, and gossiping.

Gender differences were also apparent in a study by Moretti (2001) who reported that in a sample of 84 teenagers, girls engaged in significantly higher rates of relational aggression than

did boys. She found that these girls were heavily engaged in controlling and manipulating their social networks. In addition, Moretti (2001) found that girls who hold a negative view of themselves are more likely than girls who view themselves positively, to manipulate and control their social environment, seeking to punish others whom they feel have slighted them, and ensuring loyalty from others whom they feel may reject them. However, boys who believed that their peers viewed them negatively tended not to engage in socially aggressive behavior.

Relational victimization is troubling to many adolescents regardless of sex. It is associated with higher levels of depression symptoms, higher levels of loneliness, and lower global self-worth (Prinstein, Boergers & Vernberg, 2001). These findings provide evidence that the study of relational aggression is crucial to understanding social adjustment difficulties. Without intervention, relationally aggressive children will most likely remain aggressive throughout their life times.

Although many researchers have studied the gender differences in relational aggression, few have studied the "why" of the engagement in this behavior. When younger children were queried as to why bullies "picked on" other children, Boulton and Underwood (1992) found that the most common response by the bullies was that the victim provoked them. Interestingly, the victims indicated that it was because they were smaller or weaker than the bully or that they did not fight back. In another study, Björkqvist, Ekman and Lagerspetz (1982) found that bully victims considered themselves to be less attractive than others. Echoing these sentiments, Björkqvist, Berts, and King (1982) found that bully victims considered themselves to be weak and fat.

Owens, Slee and Shute (2000) found that teenage girls who were bullied tended to blame themselves, "it was their own fault," and that having few friends, being new, and/or being

"different" or "geeky" were possible catalysts for the bully to pick on them. Owens, Shute and Slee (2000a) replicated these results with a second population finding again that teenage girls believed that victims tended to bring the wrath of others on to themselves, and that having few or no friends and/or being unassertive made the victims vulnerable to bullying. In these ways, victims signal to others that they are insecure and worthless individuals who will not retaliate if they are attacked or insulted (Olweus, 1993).

In a third study, Owens, Shute and Slee (2000b) continued to qualitatively investigate the reasons that teenage girls give for using relationally aggressive behavior against their peers. They found two major categories of explanations for this behavior with a number of sub-categories. The first category, and the most common explanation, was to alleviate boredom and create excitement. Engaging in relationally aggressive behaviors gave the girls "something to do." The second major category they identified was friendship and group processes. This category encompassed the desire for membership in the group or the aspiration to form close friendships. The subcategories included; attention seeking, inclusion in the group, belonging to the right group, self-protection (the desire to avoid being the next victim), jealousy and revenge. This study confirms the key role of friendship and group processes in the development of relational aggression.

There now seems to be a substantial body of research indicating that females of different ages indeed use relational aggression to a significantly greater extent than males, and that females suffer greatly because of it. Having established that bullying/relational aggression is existent as early as preschool and continues into the teen years, it is reasonable to look for evidence of bullying in college populations.

Young Adult/College Bullying and Gender Differences

Studies investigating bullying at the college level are lacking (Chappell, et el, 2004; Storch, Bagner, Geffken & Baumeister, 2004; Werner & Crick, 1999). Existing literature on relational aggression in college is limited, and the vast majority of prior investigations have focused on children (Storch, Bagner, Geffken & Baumeister, 2004; Werner & Crick, 1999). In performing an ERIC and Academic Premier search using the key words of 1) bullying and college; and, 2) relational aggression and college, only a handful of studies appear. Seven of the eight studies are reviewed below.

In a comprehensive study using 1025 undergraduate students, Chappell et al, (2004) reported a total of 33.4% of the students had observed a student bully another student "once or twice," with an additional 24.7% reporting this behavior "occasionally." A total of 18.5% reported having been bullied by another student once or twice, with an additional 5% having been bullied occasionally. Lastly, a total of 13.4% reported having bullied another student in college once or twice, with an additional 3.2% having done so occasionally. Chappell's et al (2004) study is the only study out of the seven reviewed here that specifically reports on the occurrence and prevalence of relational aggression in college. The four studies described below assume that relational aggression in college has already been identified and is prevalent.

Werner and Crick (1999) examined the association between relational aggression and social-psychological adjustment in young adults. Werner and Crick (1999) used 225 residential members of fraternities and sororities and reported that incidents of relational aggression in college students were similar to those found in past research with younger participants. Relational aggression was correlated with higher levels of peer rejection and antisocial personality features as well as lower levels of prosocial behavior.

In assessing the roles of social anxiety and empathy in the relationally aggressive behaviors of college level males and females, Loudin, Loukas and Robinson (2003) found that overall students who feared negative evaluation and endorsed lower levels of empathy reported engaging in more relationally aggressive behavior. Males who reported less empathetic concern were more likely than other males to exhibit relational aggression. Male and female students who reported greater fear of negative evaluation exhibited higher levels of relational aggression.

Storch, Werner and Storch (2003) examined relational aggression among athletes in college. Although they did not report on the frequency of bullying, they did find that relational aggression was significantly associated with maladjustment among both males and females. Higher levels of relational aggression predicted higher levels of peer rejection for both men and women.

In 2004, Storch, Bagner, Geffken, and Baumeister reported that male college students were more overtly and also more relationally aggressive than female college students. This finding contradicts previous research on gender differences. Storch, Bagner, Geffken, and Baumeister (2004) suggest that since young adult males are physically stronger, relational aggression may be used with greater regularity than overt assault when handling conflict. They posit that relational aggression is used by males as a form of negotiating conflicts with their peers. However, in terms of psychosocial adjustments for men, overt aggression significantly predicted alcohol abuse; and, for women, overt aggression significantly predicted social anxiety, loneliness and depressive symptoms.

Alternatively, this researcher notes that on the college level, resorting to overt/physical aggression can carry college sanctions if caught or reported (suspension and/or expulsion) or

societal consequences (fines and/or jail time). The severity of these consequences may inhibit overt/physical aggression and "promote" relational aggression.

It appears that relational aggression is common on the college level, however, more research to examine the frequency and perceptions of relational aggression is needed. Further studies focusing on the overall occurrence of bullying in the college environment are also needed (Chappell, et al, 2004; Storch, Bagner, Geffken & Baumeister, 2004; Werner & Crick, 1999).

It is important to note that bullying has been identified in toddlers, children, and adolescents. As the student continues to development, there are significant changes in language skills, social skills, and environment. With that said, we move to the next milestone after college graduation: the work place. Bullying behaviors do not relent in this arena either.

Adult/Work Place Bullying and Gender Differences

Workplace bullying is defined as the pattern of repeated and enduring negative acts (Jennifer, Cowie, & Ananiadou, 2003) which involve an imbalance of power between the victim and the perpetrator (Coyne, Craig, & Chong, 2004; Lewis, 2006; Rayner & Hoel, 1997) aimed at intentionally harming another employee in the workplace (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Namie 2003). In Europe, workplace bullying is referred to as *mobbing* (Schuster, 1996). Examples of work place bullying include:

- ✧ Dirty looks (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Namie, 2003; Rayner & Hoel, 1997)
- ✧ Threats to professional status (Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Rayner & Hoel, 1997)
- ✧ Silent treatment/ostracizing (Björkqvist, Österman, & Lagerspetz, 1994; Bowling & Beehr, 2006; Namie, 2003; Rayner & Hoel, 1997; Smith, Singer, Hoel, & Cooper, 2003; Tehrani, 2004)

- ✧ Destructive rumors that are started or fail to be stopped (Björkqvist, Österman & Lagerspetz, 1994; Namie, 2003; Smith, Singer, Hoel & Cooper, 2003; Tehrani, 2004)
- ✧ Unfair criticism (Raynor, 1997; Tehrani, 2004)

It bears noting that workplace bullying is the relational manifestation of aggression. As adults, the "option" of hitting, punching, and/or restraining someone now carries a misdemeanor or felony charge. Adult aggressors generally seek behaviors that are effective in harming the victim, while at the same time incurring as little danger to themselves as possible (Björkqvist, Österman, & Hjelt-Back, 1994). Consequently, verbal and passive forms of aggression are more frequent than physical and active forms (Baron & Neuman, 1996).

Baron and Neuman (1996) set out to prove that contrary to what television news reports suggested, most workplace aggression was of the indirect/verbal variety. In a sample of 178 employed adults in the private and public sector, indirect/verbal aggression was rated as significantly more frequent in occurrence than physical aggression, both for witnessed indirect aggression and experienced indirect aggression.

The Workplace Bullying Institute, founded in 1998 by Gary Namie (2007) reported that 37% of American workers had been bullied at work, and women are targeted by bullies more frequently (57% of cases) especially by other women (71% of cases).

In a study of 1137 working adults, Rayner (1997) reported that 77% of the respondents reported having witnessed bullying at work. Furthermore, she highlighted that women were bullied on a more equal basis by men and women, whereas men rarely reported that they had been bullied by women.

Gender differences are visible throughout the research on bullying, and these differences hold true in the workplace as well. Work place bullying repeats the same negative results found in elementary and secondary schools and in college with regards to gender differences.

Björkqvist, Österman, and Lagerspetz (1994) investigated gender differences in aggressive styles among adults in their place of work in Sweden. In a sample of 338 employees, they found that each sex had a preferred style of aggression. Males used "rational appearing aggression" more than females, while females used "social manipulation" more often than males. Björkqvist, Österman, and Lagerspetz (1994) defined *rational appearing aggression* as types of behavior that reduced the victim's opportunity to express themselves and questioned the victim's judgment. *Social manipulation* was defined as spreading rumors, back biting, and ostracizing, also known as relational aggression.

Rayner's (1997) findings in the workplace mirrored those reported in the school environment. In Rayner's (1997) study, 1,137 employees responded to a questionnaire asking about the respondents' worst working situation, attitudes towards bullying, and the frequency with which, if any, the bullying had occurred. Rayner (1997) found that women were bullied on a more equal basis by men and women, whereas men rarely reported that they had been bullied by women. The proportion of individuals who felt they had been bullied at some point in their working lives (53%) surprised Rayner (1997).

In the 2003 Report on Abusive Workplaces, Namie (2003) highlighted once again the disparity between female aggressive tactics as compared to males. The females, in a sample of 1,000 respondents, showed a significantly greater likelihood of adopting the silent treatment and encouraging colleagues to turn against the target as the preferred method of bullying each other. These two tactics are cornerstones in the definition of relational aggression. The males showed a

significantly greater likelihood of using public screaming, sabotaging a person's contribution, and post-complaint retaliation as the preferred tactic. Although these three tactics would be considered relationally aggressive, they to do not meet the threshold so neatly as the tactics adopted by the females. Interestingly, Namie (2003) also found that female-on-female bullying represented 50% of all workplace bullying, whereas male-on-female constituted 30% of workplace bullying, male-on-male yielded 12% and lastly female-on-male only 8%.

Echoing these results, Tehrani (2004) surveyed 165 health care professionals about their experiences with bullying in the work place. Strikingly, Tehrani (2004) reported unusually high levels of bullying (40%) and witnessing of bullying (68%) within the health care professionals she surveyed. She posits that this group might have a heightened awareness to what constitutes bullying and that these employees are likely to be approached for guidance by colleagues, hence the higher reports of exposure to bullying.

It is now established that with regards to bullying, gender differences continue throughout one's life time, regardless of one's station (elementary school, high school, college or the work place). In looking at this pervasive trend, is there a link between school bullying and work place bullying?

Link Between School Bullying and Workplace Bullying

Workplace bullying falls squarely on the relational aggression side of the spectrum called aggression. The parallels between school bullying and work place bullying are staggering.

Table 1

Comparison of School Bullying v. Work Place Bullying

Bullying	School	Workplace
Elements		
Repeated	Yes	Yes
Imbalance of power	Yes	Yes
Negative action/Harming another	Yes	Yes
Location	At school	At work
Types		
Physical/Overt	Yes	No
Relational/Indirect/Social	Yes	Yes

By comparing the key elements in Olewus' (1993) definition of bullying, we see in Table 1 that regardless of location, bullying is a repeated act, with an imbalance of power between the perpetrator and victim with the intent to harm the other. The difference lies within the location, either the bullying is happening at school or at the workplace. In addition, when comparing the two types of bullying behaviors, relational aggression is evident both at school and the work place, but physical aggression is primarily seen in school.

Smith, Singer, Hoel, and Cooper (2003) surveyed 5288 adults from various workplaces throughout Great Britain, examining whether school bullying and workplace bullying were connected. Two of their key research questions were: 1) is there a relationship between being bullied at school and being bullied in the workplace; and, 2) were there coping strategies used at school that reduced the chance of being a victim at work?

As expected, there was a main effect of school victimization in relation to being a victim at work in the last six months of employment and being victimized at work in the last five years of employment. This relationship held true equally for both males and females. However, many of those bullied at work had not been bullied at school.

Surprisingly none of the school coping strategies cited appeared to be significant protective factors in preventing bullying in the workplace. However, "not really coping" revealed a moderate effect size as a risk factor for bullying in the work place. Smith, Singer, Hoel & Cooper (2003) provided evidence that those who are bully/victims in childhood are a particular case for concern; not only are they at risk in terms of immediate problems and family background, but also they are more at risk for reporting later victimization in the workplace.

Consequences of Workplace Bullying

As with the negative trajectories found in bullying, victimization in elementary school, high school and college, work place bullying also only generates negative outcomes. The studies below further document the negative impact of bullying.

Bowing and Beehr (2006) performed a meta-analysis of 90 studies with regards to the antecedents and consequences of workplace bullying. Using hierarchical regression analysis, they reported the following consequences to workplace bullying: 1) harassment was positively associated with frustration, burnout, depression, anxiety, physical symptoms, turnover rates and absenteeism; and, 2) harassment was negatively associated with self esteem, life and job satisfaction, and organization commitment.

In addition, workplace bullying has been linked to low self esteem, depression, job loss, suicide (Leymann, 1993), and "caseness" levels of post traumatic stress disorder, distress, and feeling of helplessness (Tehrani, 2004).

These findings indicate that the negative consequences of bullying behavior do not change in the work place. Bullying no matter when in life or location is profound and extensive, and in the work place, affects the organization and operation.

In trying to identify bullying, regardless of location or station in life, the way it is measured is an important consideration. The next section reviews studies that have examined bullying instruments.

Instruments

Despite extensive research, researchers have yet to find the "perfect" measuring instrument. Given the covert nature of relational aggression it is difficult to observe. To date, no commercially available instruments exist to measure relational aggression (Young, Boye, & Nelson, 2006). However, several scales and checklists have been developed in conjunction with direct observation. In addition, self reporting is the most common method used to measure the extent and nature of bullying in school (Bond, Wolfe, Tollit, Butler, & Patton, 2007).

A review of studies that compare the reliability and validity of different instruments does not provide consensus on the best way to identify and measure bullying. Cole, Cornell, and Sheras (2006) compared two methods of identifying bullies, peer nomination and self reporting. In their sample of 386 students in grades 7 and 8, they found that self reports and peer nomination did not give the same results. Peer nomination identified a much larger group of students reported to engage in bullying and found that these students committed more disciplinary infractions than students identified as bullies by self reports. Cole, Cornell, and Sheras (2006) posit that students might be unwilling to admit bullying others or they might be unaware that their behavior was regarded as bullying by others. In addition, they expressed concern for the use of peer nomination because some students could nominate classmates as a

joke or identify peers they did not like (the irony that this behavior would constitute bullying is not lost on this researcher).

Contrary to Cole, Cornell and Sheras (2006), Crick and Bigbee (1998) found that self reports of victimization were not more biased than peer reports. In their sample of 383 fourth and fifth graders, they suggest that self reports are superior to peer reports because self reports can capture episodes that peers do not know about, they can be obtained in settings in which peer reports are unavailable (e.g., clinical setting), and self reports are less time consuming and easier to administer.

Further clouding the issue, McNeilly-Choque, Hart, Robinson, Nelson, and Olsen (1996) reported significant inter-method agreement among teachers, peer and playground observations for boys' overt aggression. However, for relational aggression, observation was more strongly related to teacher assessments, rather than peer nomination, for girls. McNeilly-Choque, Hart, Robinson, Nelson and Olsen (1996) suggested that different methodologies are needed for assessing boys versus girls.

The researchers mentioned above have done their work within the K-12 population. Shifting to the adult population, Salin (2001) and Forrest, Eatough, and Shevlin (2005) looked at how adult bullying has been measured.

Using 377 business professionals, Salin (2005) compared two different methods for measuring the prevalence of work place aggression. The first method asked the participants to indicate how often they had experienced 32 negative and potentially harassing acts (checklist) within the past 12 months. The second method provided the participants with a short definition of bullying and asked them if they had been subjected to such behavior in the past 12 months. Salin (2005) reported that the checklist revealed a considerably higher frequency of bullying than

providing a definition of bullying and asking if they had been subjected to such behavior. Salin claims that the strength of checklists with defined negative acts can be considered somewhat more reliable since the respondents do not need to make a judgment on whether or not they have been bullied. However, she warns readers that although the checklist can be considered more objective, it cannot distinguish between what the participant can and cannot tolerate (i.e. would they consider the negative act as bullying) and it is not feasible to list all bullying acts on a checklist.

Forrest, Eatough, and Shevlin (2005) state that peer nomination is neither appropriate nor practical for measuring indirect aggression in adult populations which lack comparable peer groups. Therefore, Forrest, Eatough, and Shevlin (2005) developed their own scales based on a series of qualitative interviews with undergraduate and graduate students. They designed two scales, one to measure the individual's usage of indirect aggression towards someone else and another that measured the individual's experience of being a victim of indirect aggression. Factor analysis revealed that both versions had the same three consistent subscales (social exclusion, malicious humor, and guilt indication). In addition, Forrest, Eatough, and Shevlin (2005) reported strong reliability (Cronbach's alphas ranging from .81 to .89). Forrest, Eatough, and Shevlin's (2005) work is striking in that they not only developed a reliable instrument, but also obtained evidence that indirect aggression in the adult population is similar to the behaviors seen in children and adolescents.

As with all instruments, there does not appear to be one single best way to measure bullying. In addition to the types of instruments highlighted above, researchers have also used focus groups (Crothers, Field & Kolbert, 2005), diary keeping (Pellegrini & Bartini, 2000), and vignettes (Crick & Werner, 1998; Owens, Shute & Slee, 2000b; Rayner, 1997) to gather data on

bullying. The vignette approach has proven successful in assessing possible reactions to relational aggression in much younger children (Crick & Werner, 1998).

Help Seeking

Having established that bullying exists as early as preschool and follows us well into adulthood, and knowing its damaging effects on one's well being, one might expect that victims of bullying would reach out for help when distressed. However, research shows that students do not ask for help when being a target of bullying (Newman, 2002; Newman & Murray, 2001; Olweus, 1993). There is an odd and contradictory behavior of needing help and yet not reaching out to those who could help. Perhaps victims believe that there is a potential cost to help seeking.

Looking first at the possible range of responses to bullying, Glover and Gough (2000) completed a comprehensive investigation of the incidence and impact of bullying on 4,700 students, ages eleven – sixteen, in 25 schools in the United Kingdom. They found that approximately 37% of the victims would tell somebody (Table 2). However, there is no way to quantify if that is a "good" number or not. Do we expect children to report on every incident of bullying? Is that feasible or practical? Stated reciprocally, 63% of the victims in this study did NOT seek help.

Table 2

Reactions to Being Bullied

Reactions	% response (N = 4,175)
Stand up, but not fight	54
Tell somebody	37
Avoid where it happens	24
Laugh it off	20
Talk way out of situation	19
Keep quiet	16
Start fight	16
Stay away from school	4
Miss lesson	2

In the context of bullying, what is the cost of asking for help? Do students feel that there are negative consequences to getting help when being bullied? The answer is yes. Reasons include:

- Fear of appearing incompetent or vulnerable. (Glover & Gough, 2000; Unnever & Cornell, 2004). Newman & Murray, (2001) found that boys who considered themselves popular sought help relatively frequently. In contrast, girls who considered themselves popular would not seek help: a need for help would only suggest their inadequacy.
- Teachers set the tone. Students will not ask for help if they believe help is not available or that it's inadequate (Edwards, 2000; Newman & Murray, 2001; Unnever & Cornell, 2004). Glover and Gough (2000) found that out of the 37%

  of the students who would report being bullied, only half believed that the teacher could really help. Students become passive. Students are more willing to seek help when they see the situation as one in which something can be achieved (Hunter & Boyle, 2004).

- Conflicts with personal needs for autonomy. (Glover & Gough, 2000; Newman & Murray, 2001). Newman and Murray (2001) found that students wanted to resolve the conflict on their own. The desire to resolve the conflict independently outweighed the potential value of teacher intervention.
- Fear of retaliation. (Edwards, 2000; Erdley & Asher 1996; Glover & Gough, 2000; Newman and Murray, 2001; Smith 1999). Afraid of reprisals from the bully, students will not ask for help if they suspect that the bully will "find out" about their help seeking.

Given that the same situation can provoke different types of behavior in people, Erdley and Asher (1996) demonstrated that children who attribute hostile intent are more likely to report aggressive responses to ambiguous provocations, whereas children who make benign attributions are more apt to report non-aggressive responses. In addition, individual differences in a child's social goals and self efficacy are strongly related to the differences they show in their behavioral choices. Erdley and Asher (1996) reported that aggressive children rated themselves as "good" at retaliating against a bully and "good" at making others feel bad.

Newman and Murray (2001) explored the responses to ten hypothetical bullying vignettes from 128 third and fourth graders. They reported that the most common reasons for not seeking help were the desire to be independent, a belief that benefits of help seeking were insignificant, and the perceived cost of help seeking (i.e., retaliation from the bully) were too high. In addition, they showed a grade difference where girls were significantly more likely to seek help in the fourth grade than the third grade.

Contrary to Newman and Murray (2001), Hunter and Boyle (2004) did not find grade differences, but they did find gender differences, with girls more willing to seek out help than

boys. They went on to speculate that girls might perceive "telling" to be a more effective strategy in terms of stopping the bullying and helping them deal with their emotions.

Unnever and Cornell (2004) investigated the factors that influence a student's decision to report bullying. In a study with 2,472 middle school children in Virginia, they were able to create a "profile" of the type of student who does report bullying. Through the use of logistical regression they were able to predict that victims were more likely to report being bullied to an adult: 1) if they were chronically bullied, 2) if they were girls, 3) if they were in lower grades, 4) if they perceived that their school would not tolerate bullying, and, 5) if their parent did not use coercive child-rearing techniques.

Preliminary research indicates that the "type" of bullying might also dictate whether the student seeks help or not. Victims of verbal bullying (name-calling) seek help the least, followed by indirect bullying victims (exclusion, having rumors spread about them), with victims of direct bullying (violence, property damage/theft) seeking help the most (Eslea, 2001).

The recurring theme of not asking for help has also been reported by Tehrani (2004) in the workplace. When surveyed, 165 health care professionals sited three main reasons for the lack of reporting victimization: 1) the complaint wouldn't be taken seriously; 2) the manager is the bully; and, 3) reporting the bullying will make matters worse. These findings highlight the legitimate obstacles that prevent victims from reaching out for help.

Literature Review Conclusions

Bullying seems to walk alongside many individuals throughout their development. Aging does not rid individuals of this malevolent force, nor does change of venue. In both the school (Pre K – 12) and workplace setting, bullying and its effects have been observed and well

documented. However, data reflecting the awareness and consequences of bullying in the years between high school and the workplace are surprisingly limited.

Bullies and victims can come in all shapes and sizes. However, in contrast to males, females consistently fall back on relational aggression as their preferred method of bullying. It is surmised that as boys turn into men, less physical aggression is used, due to social sanctioning, and there is a concomitant increase in relational aggression. Again, while there is ample research focusing on gender differences in bullying, this data is extremely limited regarding young adults in college.

It has been established that both the bully and victim share a negative trajectory. No one is unscathed by bullying events; anxiety, loneliness, lower self esteem, absenteeism, and depression are just a few of the consequences.

There is a progressive psychological change as students move into and through the college environment. While descriptions of developmental stages exist and the issues, attitudes, and behaviors that exist within these stages are apparent, much less is known about how to facilitate students' movement through these stages (Komives & Woodward, 1996). This study intends to supplement the lack of data with regards to identifying bullying events, recording exposure to bullying events, and the impact of bullying on college students.

An underlying assumption of the present study is that bullying behaviors do not cease when the individual leaves high school and suddenly resurface when she/he enters the workforce. This researcher believes that bullying is prevalent in the college environment, that there are gender differences in the frequency of exposure to bullying, gender differences in college students' attribution of blame in bullying episodes, and lastly, gender differences in the motivation behind the bullying behavior.

This research examines the incidence and consequences of bullying in the college environment. The study utilizes both quantitative and qualitative methods in two phases. Study A is an anonymous survey that will: 1) assess college students' awareness of relational aggression/bullying episodes; 2) measure their frequency of exposure to bullying/relational aggression; and, 3) assess their attribution of blame in bullying episodes. The second phase, Study B, is comprised of an in-depth interview with a small self-selected sub-sample from the larger group of Study A. A qualitative approach is particularly well suited to this research as it seeks to explain and find meaning in bullying and relational aggressive behavior. By the direct and personal contact with each student, a richer and deeper picture can be drawn.

The interview has been designed to: 1) solicit information regarding explanations for bullying behaviors; 2) reveal personal experiences with bullying; 3) assess help seeking responses to instances of bullying behaviors; and, 4) examine the reasons why students bully one another.

The research reported in this study looks to obtain information relevant to the following hypotheses:

Study A - General Survey

Hypotheses

A. Awareness of bullying and relational aggression episodes

Existing literature on relational aggression in college is limited, and the vast majority of prior investigations have focused on children (Storch, Bagner, Geffken, & Baumeister, 2004; Werner & Crick, 1999). Despite scarcity of the data in college age groups, its presence in younger and older populations has been well documented in both females and males. Consequently:

Hypothesis #1 - It is predicted that in college, bullying/relational aggression will be reported by both females and males.

B. Gender differences in frequency of exposure to bullying and relational aggression

In comparison to males, it is reported that females use more relationally aggressive behaviors (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; French, Jansen & Pidada, 2002; McEvoy, 2003; Österman, et al, 1998). There is substantial data indicating that these behaviors are stable through one's lifetime. Therefore:

Hypothesis #2 - It is expected that females will report significantly higher levels of exposure to bullying as compared to their male counterparts.

Hypothesis #3 – It is expected that females will engage in relationally aggressive behaviors at a significantly higher frequency as compared to their male counterparts.

C. Beliefs regarding blame during bullying episodes

Findings from several lines of research indicate that relative to males, females are more distressed by interpersonal problems, are more likely to react negatively to perceived relational slights, and are more likely to incorporate information gained through social interaction into their self views (Crick, 1995; Galen & Underwood, 1997). Therefore:

Hypothesis #4 - It is expected that females will blame the victim more often for relationally aggressive victimization as compared to males.

Study B – Interview

Research Questions

A. Explanations for bullying behaviors (Question set)

It is argued that girls value close intimate friendships more so than boys, whose groups are larger, less intimate, and more concerned with activity and achievement and themes of instrumentality and physical dominance. (Owens, Shute & Slee, 2000a). Consequently:

Research Questions #1 – Do women endorse different explanations for relationally aggressive behaviors as compared to their male counter parts?

B. Past and present experiences with bullying and help seeking behaviors (Personal history questions)

Newman and Murray (2001) and Hunter and Boyle (2004) reported that when compared to males, females more often sought help when dealing with bullying. Therefore:

Research Questions #2 – Do women seek help more often than men when being victimized in elementary school and high school?

Research Question #3 – Do women seek help more often than men when being victimized in college?

Research has shown that childhood aggression is one of the best predictors of adult aggression, future maladjustment, adolescent delinquency, and adult criminality (Crick & Casas, 1997; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Grotpeter & Crick, 1996; Tremblay, 1999). Therefore:

Research Question #4 – Do college students report negative effects (i.e., depression, anxiety, stress) when they are exposed to bullying/relational aggression?

C. Perceptions of bullying/relationally aggressive episodes – (Video clips)

Erdley and Asher (1996) demonstrated that children who attribute hostile intent are more likely to report aggressive responses to ambiguous provocations while children who make benign attributions are more apt to report non-aggressive responses. Therefore:

Research Question #5 – Will students who have had high exposure to bullying/relational aggression be more likely to assess the video clips as examples of relationally aggressive behavior as compared to students who have had low exposure to bullying and relational aggression?

Research Question #6 - Will women be more likely to assess the video clips as examples of relationally aggressive behavior as compared to the men?

Chapter 3: Methodology

The proposed study used both objective explanations by statistical description and subjective explanations from the student's perspective to capture the highest yield of information. Study A was an anonymous survey used to gain basic knowledge about the frequency of exposure to bullying in the college environment. Study B was a personal in- depth interview that focused on the relationship between: 1) exposure to bullying and its impact on explanations for bullying; and, 2) explanations for bullying behaviors and attribution of blame on the victim. Gender differences were predicted in both sets of responses.

Study A

Sample

The participants for Study A were 348 college students who self selected to participate in an anonymous survey. The participants for Study B were 32 students from the original sample (Study A) who self selected to be interviewed (see section entitled "Study B – Recruitment of participants").

The students were enrolled at the main campus of an ethnically diverse, suburban private college. In 2007, the college reported an enrollment of over 8,600 students distributed over one main campus and four additional "branch" campuses. Demographic information regarding the college is as follows in Table 3.

Table 3

Demographics of Students Enrolled at Participating College

Characteristics	% (n = 8,628)
Ethnicity	
African American	23
Caucasian	35
Hispanic	23
Other	19
Gender	
Females	73
Males	27
Class	
Undergraduate	59
Graduate	41
Status	
Commuter	98
Resident	2

Recruitment of Participants

Using the College's emailing system, all main campus students who registered for classes at the start of the fall 2009 semester received an informational flyer that was an invitation to participate in the survey. The flyer (See Appendix A) included where the student could obtain a copy of the survey and a pick up and drop off deadline. The flyer also specified that the participant had to be 18 years of age or older to participate. The flyer was also posted on the bulletin boards throughout the main campus and placed in the mailboxes of the dormitory students.

Procedures

The surveys were made available for retrieval and deposit in the following offices: Athletics, Academic Advising, Residential Life, and Student Success and Engagement. The

primary investigator met with the department directors to explain the nature of the study and identify appropriate locations where the surveys were to be placed, thereby permitting optimal access, and ease of retrieval and drop off of the completed surveys.

The students self selected to confidentially answer the survey (see Appendix B) which took approximately ten minutes to complete. At the end of the survey document, the students were given the option of disclosing their identity and providing contact information if they were interested in a follow up interview (Study B). To insure confidentiality of the students who disclosed their contact information, the survey had an enveloped attached. The students were instructed to place their completed survey in the envelope and seal it.

Measures

1) The survey was designed to examine gender, age and academic year differences in the 1) awareness and frequency of exposure to bullying/relational aggression episodes; and, 2) beliefs of blaming the victim (see Study A, hypotheses #1, #2, #3 and #4).
    a) The following demographic information was asked: gender, age, undergrad/grad student, credits completed, commuter/resident and athlete status, and ethnicity.
2) The survey included questions regarding the student's bullying and relational aggression experiences.
    a) Olweus' (1993) definition of bullying (a student is being bullied or victimized when he/she is exposed, repeatedly, over time, to negative actions, intentionally inflicting injury or discomfort, on the part of one or more other students) was presented, followed by three questions constructed following the pattern established by Olweus (1996):

        i) In college, have you ever seen a student being bullied by another student?
        ii) In college, have you ever been bullied by another student?
        iii) In college, have you ever bullied another student?

b) Crick and Grotpeter's (1996) definition of relational aggression (a student is being relationally victimized when he/she is harmed by others through purposeful manipulation, disruption and damage to their friendships, relationships and feelings of acceptance; i.e. controlling through friendship "you can't be my friend unless…," rumor spreading so peers will reject him/her, and excluding from social events) was presented followed by the following three questions:

i) In college have you ever seen a student be relationally aggressive towards another student?
ii) In college, has anyone been relationally aggressive to you?
iii) In college, have you ever been relationally aggressive to another student?

3) The survey also included relational aggression vignettes.

a) Using vignettes as a measuring tool for relational aggression in young children has yielded important findings. Consequently, Crick and Werner's (1998) vignettes were modified for use in this study. Six vignettes (see Appendix C) that reflect relational aggression in a college setting were introduced, e.g.:

(1) *You are standing in the hallway one morning before class. As you are standing there, two students from your class walk by. Although they are whispering, you overhear the students talking crap about you to each other. As they walk by, the two students grill you and then laugh as they walk down the hall.*

Each of the six vignettes was followed by the following eight questions:

i) Does this vignette depict bullying/relational aggression?

ii) Did you do anything to provoke this situation?

iii) (a) Have you ever seen a student(s) commit this act?
(b) In the past six months, how often?

iv) (a) Has this or something similar ever happened to you, or one of your friends?
(b) In the past six months, how often?

v) (a) Have you ever done this or something similar to this?
(b) In the past six months, how often?

The six vignettes that were used in the survey were constructed in a pilot study conducted in the spring of 2007 (Delgado, 2007). Seven focus groups consisting of 36 college students were assembled to draw upon the students' attitudes and beliefs. The focus groups were tasked to rewrite six vignettes that previously had been used with younger students by Crick and Werner (1998). Crick and Werner's (1998) vignettes depicted relational aggression at the elementary school level. The focus groups rewrote the vignettes to reflect college age language and events. All seven focus groups and all the students within the groups unanimously agreed that Crick and Werner's (1998) vignettes could be rewritten to mirror how college students might exhibit relationally aggressive behavior against one another. In addition, all the focus group participants confirmed that they had witnessed and/or had been a bully or victim of relational aggression in college.

At the conclusion of the survey the students had the option of disclosing their name and cell phone number if they were interested in participating in a follow up one-on-one interview.

Data coding

To assess college students' awareness of bullying/relational aggression episodes, hypothesis #1, the responses to the following eight questions were scored (Table 4). These eight questions asked the students if they had witnessed specific behaviors that were reflective of bullying/relational aggression episodes and if the vignettes provided met the students' threshold of bullying episodes. All "yes" responses received a score of one and all "no" responses received a score of zero. Scores were summed, yielding a range from zero to eight.

Table 4

Awareness of Bullying/Relational Aggression Survey Questions

Location on Survey	Question	Scoring
Section B - Definitions Subsection 1 – Bullying	#1 – In college, have you ever seen a student being bullied by another student?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section B - Definitions Subsection 2 – Relational aggression	#1 – In college, have you ever seen a student be relationally aggressive towards another?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section C – Vignettes Vignettes # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	#1 - Does this vignette depict bullying/relational aggression?	No = 0 Yes = 1

To determine the level of exposure to bullying/relational aggression, hypothesis #2, responses to the following twenty-four questions were scored/tabulated (Table 5). These twenty-four questions asked the students if they had been either a witness, victim or bully to identified bullying/relational aggression episodes. All “yes” responses received a score of one and all “no” responses received a score of zero. Scores were summed, yielding a range from zero to twenty-four.

Table 5

Exposure to Bullying/Relational Aggression Survey Questions

Location on Survey	Question	Scoring
Section B - Definitions Subsection 1 – Bullying	i. In college, have you ever seen a student being bullied by another student?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section B - Definitions Subsection 1 – Bullying	ii. In college, have you ever been bullied by another student?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section B - Definitions Subsection 1 – Bullying	iii. In college, have you ever bullied another student?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section B - Definitions Subsection 2 – Relational aggression	i. In college, have you ever seen a student being relationally aggressive towards another student?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section B - Definitions Subsection 2 – Relational aggression	ii. In college, has anyone been relationally aggressive to you?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section B - Definitions Subsection 2 – Relational aggression	iii. In college, have you ever been relationally aggressive to another student?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section C – Vignettes Vignettes # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	3a. Have you ever seen a student(s) commit this act?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section C – Vignettes Vignettes # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	4a. Has this ever happened to you, or one of your friends?	No = 0 Yes = 1
Section C – Vignettes Vignettes # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	5a. Have you ever done this (or something similar to this)?	No = 0 Yes = 1

To assess the frequency with which students engage in relationally aggressive behaviors, hypothesis #3, responses to the following eighteen questions were tabulated (Table 6). These eighteen (18) items rated the frequency with which students engaged in relationally aggressive behaviors as either a witness, victim and/or bully in a total of six vignettes. Potential frequency could range from zero (no engagement) to approximately 180 (everyday for six months, each month average 30 days).

Table 6

Frequency of Relationally Aggressive Behavior Survey Questions

Location on Survey	Question	Scoring
Section C – Vignettes Vignettes # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	3b. In the past six months, how often?	Tabulated
Section C – Vignettes Vignettes # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	4b. In the past six months, how often?	Tabulated
Section C – Vignettes Vignettes # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	5b. In the past six months, how often?	Tabulated

To assess the students' attribution of blame, hypothesis #4, the students were asked that within the outlined six vignettes, had the victim done anything to provoke the treatment that they received. (Table 7). All "yes" responses received a score of one and all "no" responses received a score of zero. Scores were summed, yielding a range from zero to six.

Table 7

Attribution of Blame Survey Questions

Location on Survey	Question	Scoring
Section C – Vignettes Vignettes # 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 and 6	2. Did you do anything to provoke this situation?	No = 0 Yes = 1

Study B

Sample

Of the 348 students from Study A, forty-seven indicated that they were interested in participating in an interview. This primary investigator attempted to contact all forty-seven students, however, fifteen students were not interviewed for either lack of a correct phone

number, or the student was no longer enrolled in the college, or the student did not return the initial outreach call. Study B was comprised of thirty-two students.

Recruitment of Participants

Using a script (see Appendix D) the primary investigator called all interested students. In this call, students were reminded of their indication of willingness to participate in the interview. Upon verbal confirmation of their willingness to participate, a date and time for the interview was selected that best suited the student. In this call the student was also apprised of the approximate length of time the interview would take and the location of the interview.

Procedures

Each student was interviewed individually by the primary investigator in a conference room on campus. The duration of each session lasted approximately one hour. Soda, chips and/or cookies was provided to the students at no cost to them.

The students were interviewed by the primary investigator to draw upon the students' personal history and attitudes regarding bullying, relational aggression, attitudes regarding help seeking when being victimized, and attribution of blame during bullying incidents. The interview format was used because it provided access to information in greater depth than would be obtained via a questionnaire. During the interview, the definitions of bullying and relational aggression were not provided. The aim was to have the students discuss their perceptions and own personal assessment of bullying be it as perpetrator, victim and/or witness.

At each interview a consent form (see Appendix E) was read aloud to the student and each student was asked to repeat their understanding of the interview. The consent form included the College's clinical psychologist's contact information, should the student have felt the need to discuss his/her feelings with him after the interview. Students who wished to

participate signed the consent form. The consent form also required consent from the student to be audiotaped during the interview and authorized the primary investigator to access his/her transcript. A copy of the signed consent form was given back to the student at the end of the interview.

The interviews were audio-taped. Please see Appendix F for a script of the interview. The interview was comprised of three sections.

Measures

i. Question set – Explanations for bullying

The first question set was designed to examine the gender differences in the explanations for victimization (see Study B, research question #1). Owens, Shute and Slee (2000b) used focus groups and interviews to examine why high school girls, ages fifteen and sixteen, were indirectly aggressive towards one another. Fifty-four high school girls explained why they adopted indirectly aggressive behaviors towards their peers. Key teachers were also interviewed. Key teachers were defined as teachers to whom students were likely to go if they had peer or relationship difficulties (Owens, Shute and Slee, 2000b).

Two types of explanations for indirect aggression emerged: 1) to alleviate boredom and create excitement; and, 2) the dynamics of group processes. Within the category of "group processes" six sub categories explaining indirectly aggressive behaviors were identified.

(a) Attention seeking – gaining attention for themselves, "to be in the limelight."
(b) Inclusion in the group – to cement their place in the group, create intimacy for those who are "in" against those that are "out."
(c) Belonging to the "right" group – there is a hierarchy of groups based on popularity.
(d) Self protection – the desire to avoid being the next victim and to protect one's own position within the group.
(e) Jealousy – can occur for a variety of reasons, including but not limited to: physical appearance, grades, friendships, and "poaching" another's best friend.
(f) Revenge/retaliation – usually for something another girl has done.

(Owens, Shute & Slee, 2000b)

Based on their findings, a four part question set was administered (See Appendix G). The first section was a checklist, of the seven explanations for relationally aggressive behaviors as reported by Owens, Shute and Slee's (2000b), to be ranked in order of relevance. The second section asked the student to add any additional explanations he/she felt should have been on the checklist but were not included. The third section asked them if they believed that victims of bullying brought it on themselves and the fourth section asked for reasons why they believed that the victim had brought it on themselves.

ii. Personal history questions

This part of the interview was designed to examine gender and individual differences in: 1) feelings surrounding past experiences with bullying; 2) past experiences with help seeking when coping with bullying, and 3) current experiences with bullying and help seeking in the college environment (see Study B, research questions #2, #3 and #4). The questions, listed below, allowed a more detailed follow-up from the initial survey. These questions lead the students to expound on their own personal experiences with bullying.

These questions were chosen partly based on the results of a pilot study administered to ten college students (6 females and 4 males). As a result of that pilot study, the original questions were reordered, and one question was reworded to stress that college bullying could occur both inside and outside of the classroom. The script for the personal history questions follows below.

1. Do you remember being bullied, or being the bully in elementary school?
   a) How often (bullied, bully or witness)?
      i) Daily/weekly/monthly
      ii) How did it make you feel?
   b) If the bully – go to question 2.

c) *If the victim or witness*:
   i) Did you ask for help?
      (1) Why/why not?
   ii) Who did you go to for help?
   iii) Did it make the situation better?

2. Do you remember being bullied, or being the bully in high school?
   a) How often (bullied, bully or witness)?
      i) Daily/weekly/monthly
      ii) How did it make you feel?
   b) If the bully – go to question 3.
   c) *If the victim or witness:*
      i) Did you ask for help?
         (1) Why/why not?
      ii) Who did you go to for help?
      iii) Did it make the situation better?
3. At the college are you exposed to bullying? This can be in or out of the classroom.
   a) Role? Bullied, bully, witness?
   b) How does this affect you?
   c) Does this affect your classroom experience and participation?
      i) How?
      ii) Does this affect your attendance?
      iii) Have you asked for help?
      iv) Why/why not?
      v) How did you ask for help?
      vi) Did it make the situation better?

iii. TV/Movie clips

Two tv/movie clips were shown during the interview to examine the students' perception of bullying/relational aggression episodes. These two relational aggressive tv/movie clips were chosen based on the results of a pilot study administered to ten college students (6 females and 4 males). As a result of the pilot study, these two clips were selected out of four as examples of bullying/relational aggression as students in the pilot study understood bullying/relational aggression. (See Study B, research questions #5 and #6).

At the conclusion of each TV/movie clip, the following two questions were asked:

1. To you, is this clip an example of bullying and/or relational aggression?
2. Why/why not?

Video #1 (synopsis)

This clip is taken from the TV series *Friends* (Jones & Buckner, 1996). This three minute scene takes place in a coffee shop in which the two lead male characters (Ross and Chandler) frequent. Ross and Chandler are taunted by two other males because of where they have chosen to sit. See Appendix H for the script of the scene.

Video #2 (synopsis)

This clip is taken from the movie *Cruel Intentions* (Mortiz & Kumble, 1999). This three minute scene takes place in the living room of an affluent family in which the lead female character (Katherine) is discussing with the lead male character (Sebastian) on how she plans to ruin the reputation of a romantic rival (Cecil). Cecil is not present at the time of this conversation. See Appendix I for the script of the scene.

Data coding

To assess the motivation to engage in bullying behaviors, the motivational reasons on the following list were ranked by the students. These variables were rank ordered from "one" being the most relevant/applicable reasons to engage in bullying behavior to "seven" being the least relevant/applicable reason to engage in bullying behavior. In addition, the rankings were compared to analyze to find preferences with gender in the use of the explanations.

- Part 1 (Survey – Explanations for bullying)
  - Question #1: Please rank the following possible reasons for bullying behavior in college in order of relevance. With "1" being the most relevant reason and "7" being the least relevant reason.

    ____ It's something to do (alleviate boredom/create excitement)
    ____ To gain attention
    ____ Jealousy
    ____ Indicates that you are in the "right" group
    ____ To avoid being a target by a bully (self protection)

____ To get revenge/ to retaliate
____ To gain acceptance (I'm *in*, you're *out*)

The list of motivational reasons for engaging in bullying behaviors that had been provided was by no means exhaustive. Therefore, to capture any other relevant reasons, the students were asked if they could provide any other alternative reasons that were not already listed. The following three questions (Table 8) were used to query the student on any omission from the previous list.

Table 8

Attribution of Blame - Interview Questions

Section of the interview	Question	Scoring
Part 1 – Survey	2. What other reasons can you think of that explain bullying behavior in college?	Coded
Part 1 – Survey	3. Do you think some victims bring it on themselves?	Y/N
Part 1 – Survey	4. How come/In what way?	Coded

To assess individual and gender differences in feelings surrounding past experiences with bullying the responses to the following questions (Table 9) were coded and/or scored. Each student was asked to share their memories from elementary school and high school with regards to being a witness, victim and/or bully in bullying episodes, the frequency of being in these roles, and how being in these roles made them feel. During the analysis, major themes were identified, notations were made regarding how topics linked together, and notable quotes were highlighted. Key words were counted. Questions that require a numerical answer were calculated into percentages.

Table 9

Past History Interview Questions

Section of the interview	Question	Scoring
Part 2 – Interview questions	1. Do you remember being bullied, or being the bully in elementary school?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	1a. How often (bullied, bully or witness)?	Calculated
Part 2 – Interview questions	1a i. Daily/weekly/monthly?	Calculated
Part 2 – Interview questions	1a ii. How did it make you feel?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	2. Do you remember being bullied, or being the bully in high school?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	2 a. How often (bullied, bully or witness)?	Calculated
Part 2 – Interview questions	2 a i. Daily/weekly/monthly?	Calculated
Part 2 – Interview questions	2 a ii. How did it make you feel?	Coded

To assess individual and gender differences with seeking help in coping with bullying, the responses to the following questions (Table 10) were coded. Each student was asked to share their memories from elementary school and high school, and their current experiences in college, with regards to asking for help when being victimized or witnessing others being victimized, why they did or did not ask for help, and if they asked for help, who did they ask. Responses were coded, either into themes or common patterns. Deviations were also highlighted. Particular attention was given to friendships and alliances mentioned. Questions requiring a yes or no answer were calculated into percentages.

Table 10

Help Seeking Interview Questions

Section of the interview	Question	Scoring
Part 2 – Interview questions	1c i. Did you ask for help?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	1c i (1). Why/why not?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	1c ii. Who did you go to for help?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	1c iii. Did it make the situation better?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	2c i. Did you ask for help?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	2ci (1). Why/why not?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	2c ii. Who did you go to for help?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	2c iii. Did it make the situation better?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	3c iii. Have you asked for help?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	3c iv. Why/why not?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	3c v. Who did you go to for help?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	3c vi. Did it make the situation better?	Y/N

To assess individual and gender differences with current experiences with bullying at the college level, the following questions (Table 11) were asked and the responses coded. Each student was asked about their potential role in bullying episodes in college (witness, victim, bully), and the effects of said bullying inside and outside of the classroom. Responses were coded into common ideas. A review of concordance between the student's role in elementary school and high school as compared to college was performed. Questions requiring a yes or no answer were calculated into percentages.

Table 11

Current Experiences With Bullying Interview Questions

Section of the interview	Question	Scoring
Part 2 – Interview questions	3. At the college are you exposed to bullying?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	3a. Role? Bullied, bully, witness?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	3b. How does this affect you?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	3c. Does this affect your classroom experience and participation?	Y/N
Part 2 – Interview questions	3ci. How?	Coded
Part 2 – Interview questions	3cii. Does this affect your attendance?	Y/N

To assess the perceptions of bullying/relational aggression episodes, after watching two tv/video clips that had been predetermined to exemplify episodes of bullying behavior; the students were asked if these clips exemplified bullying to them. The following two questions (Table 12) were asked and the responses scored. These answers were converted into percentages and compared.

Table 12

Movie/TV Clips Interview Questions

Section of the interview	Question	Scoring
Part 3 – Movie/tv clips	1. To you, is this clip an example of bullying and/or relational aggression?	Y/N
Part 3 – Movie/tv clips	2. In college, have you seen this type of behavior?	Y/N

Chapter 4: Results

This chapter presents the results. For Study A, descriptive information regarding a self-selected sample of students who chose to complete an anonymous survey is provided. T-tests examined gender differences with regards to the students' exposure to bullying, frequency of exposure, and attribution of blame. Study B, a smaller sub-sample from Study A, offers descriptive information regarding a sample of self-selected students who agreed to be interviewed. Analysis of the interview responses from Study B identifies explanations for bullying behaviors, examines reasons for help seeking (or lack thereof) in response to victimization, reveals negative effects to bullying, and assesses attribution of blame for said bullying incidents.

Demographics

Three hundred and forty-eight college students between the ages of eighteen and fifty self-selected to participate in the survey. The mean age was 22 years. The characteristics of the students are summarized in Table 13.

Students self-identified as Caucasians (40%), Hispanics (24%), and African Americans (23%). A small percent of the students classified themselves as "other." Fifty-seven percent of the participants were female; forty-three percent of the students were male. Undergraduate students represented the bulk of participants; ninety-six percent.

When comparing the sample to the college population as a whole, the breakdown of ethnicity between the two groups is almost identical. There is a slight difference between the gender breakdown in the sample, versus the target population; the sample is almost equally split, but the target population has a larger female enrollment make-up. The class breakdown is highly skewed. Undergraduates were the primary class of student who participated in the survey

(96%), however, in the target population, (the true enrollment of the college) undergraduates only represented 59% of the students who were enrolled. This unbalanced representation of the class status might stem from the distribution method of the initial survey. Surveys were made available for pick up in various offices throughout the campus, some of which, however, closed at six o'clock in the evening. Many of the graduate course offering at this college begin at 6:30pm, thereby inadvertently denying the same access the undergraduate students had to the survey. There is a slightly higher percentage of residents in the sample population than in the target population. This small difference can be attributed to the distribution of the information flyer. The flyer was placed in the mailbox of each resident; there are no on-campus mailboxes for commuter students. Therefore, residential students had an additional exposure to the request to participate in the study as compared to the commuter students.

It is important to note that unlike in elementary school, middle school and high school, which encompasses the broadest range of participants, not all young adults go to college. There are young adults that head into the work-force right after high school, and a cohort of young adults that immediately drop out of college or find themselves incarcerated.

Table 13

Comparison of Demographics Between Sample and Target Population

Characteristics	Sample % n = 348	Target % n = 8,628
Ethnicity		
African American	23	23
Caucasian	40	35
Hispanic	24	23
Other	13	19
Gender		
Females	43	73
Males	57	27
Class		0
Undergraduate	96	59
Graduate	4	41
Status		
Commuter	77	98
Resident	23	2

Study A – Survey - Hypotheses

Hypothesis #1 - It is predicted that in college, bullying/relational aggression will be reported by both females and males.

To assess college students' awareness of bullying/relational aggression, the students were provided a total of eight opportunities to identify bullying/relationally aggressive behaviors. Within these eight opportunities, the students were queried each time as to their "role" whether a witness, a victim or bully.

In the first two opportunities, the definitions of bullying and relational aggression were provided to the student. Would the students recognize operational definitions as examples in action in their environment? The following six opportunities were vignettes that provided "real

life" examples of bullying/relational aggression, again, looking to see if these scenarios would meet the students' threshold of what they consider bullying/relational aggression. These vignettes described real instances of aggressive behavior in different locations and with different protocols. The first vignette (third opportunity), named the *classroom* vignette, takes place in a classroom and has the perpetrator devaluing the work of the victim and harming the victim's grade. The second vignette (fourth opportunity), named the *hallway* vignette, takes place in the hallway of a college and has the victim taunted with verbal innuendoes and dirty looks by other students. The third vignette (fifth opportunity), named *cutting the line* vignette, describes the perpetrator disregarding the victim's place in the queue for food in a college cafe. The fourth vignette (sixth opportunity), named the *locker room* vignette, outlines the intentional ostracizing of a student-athlete by members of their team. The fifth vignette (seventh opportunity), named *café* vignette, has the perpetrator rejecting the acceptance of a fellow student at a table where the other students are congregating. The sixth vignette (eighth opportunity), named the *ignoring* vignette, exemplifies how a victim's feelings of acceptance are damaged by social exclusion in the café.

Of the eight total opportunities to indicate their awareness of bullying/relational aggression, the mean number of instances reported was five. The typical student reported five of the eight instances, 63.7%, indicative of being bullying/relational aggressive behaviors. In other words, of the eight descriptions provided, the typical student had witnessed at least five episodes similar, if not identical to, the ones described.

The first three items (definition of bullying, definition of relational aggression, and the classroom vignette) were not seen by the majority of the students as evidence of bullying/relational aggression. Well over the majority of students, 72.6%, endorsed the last five

items (hallway, cutting line, locker room, café and ignoring vignettes) as instances indicative of bullying/relational aggression. The highest endorsement, identified by 81% of the students, was with the hallway vignette. Table 14 lists each instance and the percent of students who reported the instance as an example of relationally aggressive behavior.

Table 14

Percent of Students Who Identified Survey Examples as Instances of Bullying/Relational Aggression

Survey examples	% (n = 348)
Definition of Bullying	32
Definition of Relational Aggression	42
Classroom Vignette	45
Hallway Vignette	81
Cutting the Line Vignette	68
Locker room Vignette	69
Cafe Vignette	61
Ignoring Vignette	69

One sample t-tests were used to examine the reports of relational aggression by males and females. The mean female score was 4.93 (sd = 2.09) which is significantly different than zero ($t = 33.54$, $df = 201$, $p \leq .001$). From the eight questions, females identified almost five instances of bullying which is consistent with the hypothesis. The mean male score was 4.21 (sd = 2.28) which is significantly different from zero ($t = 22.79$, $df = 151$, $p \leq .001$). From the eight questions, men perceived more than four instances of bullying, consistent with the hypothesis. Therefore hypothesis #1 was supported: females and males reported bullying/relational aggression, as a witness, in the college environment.

Hypothesis #2 - It is expected that females will report significantly higher levels of exposure to bullying/relational aggression as compared to their male counterparts.

To determine the amount of exposure to bullying/relational aggression that students were experiencing, a series of twenty-four (24) questions were posed. Expanding on the hypothesis #1, the first six questions regarding witnessing, victimization, or committing bullying acts were grounded in the first two concrete definitions; the following eighteen (18) questions regarding witnessing, victimization, or committing bullying acts were grounded in the six (6) vignettes.

The mean score for females reporting exposure to bullying was 5.57, the mean score for men reporting exposure to bullying was 5.26 (sd = 4.84). There is not a significant statistical difference between the mean scores ($t = -0.62$, $df = 352$, $p = .54$). Therefore hypothesis #2 was not supported by the data. Women did not report significantly higher levels of exposure to bullying/relational aggression as compared to their male counter parts.

Hypothesis #3 – It is expected that females will engage in relationally aggressive behaviors at a significantly higher frequency as compared to their male counterparts.

In each of the six vignettes posed, the students were asked about the frequency to which they were engaged, as a witness, victim, and/or bully in relationally aggressive behaviors.

For descriptive purposes, the median for witnessing, being victimized or being the bully in the past six months was zero. The maximum incidents reported in the past six months as a witness was 155, as a victim was 45, and as the bully 31 (see Table 15). The data was highly skewed, therefore for the purposes of comparing females to males the log transformed version of the variables was used.

Table 15

Frequency of Engagement in Relationally Aggressive Behaviors in the Last Six Months

Role	Median	Mean	SD	Minimum	Maximum
Witness	0.00	1.24	1.26	0.00	155.00
Victim	0.00	3.32	7.00	0.00	45.00
Bully	0.00	0.92	3.40	0.00	31.00

With regards to witnessing relationally aggressive behaviors, in an independent sample t-test, females scored a log mean of 1.28, the males scored a log mean of 1.19. There is not a significant statistical difference between the scores ($t = -.61$, $df = 34$, $p = .546$). With regards to being victimized, in an independent sample t-test, females scored a mean of .78, the males scored a mean of .81. There is not a significant statistical difference between the scores ($t = .23$, $df = 35$, $p = .82$). With regards to engaging in bullying behaviors, in an independent sample t-test, females scored a mean of .24, the males scored a mean of .29. There is not a significant statistical difference between the scores ($t = .76$, $df = 35$, $p = .45$). Therefore, contrary to the hypothesis, there was no evidence of statistically significant gender differences in witnessing relational aggression, being the victim of relation aggression or perpetrating relationally aggressive behaviors.

Hypothesis #4 - It is expected that females will blame the victim more often for relationally aggressive victimization as compared to males.

In order to assess attribution of blame, at the end of each vignette the student was asked if the victim had done anything to provoke the aggressive behavior.

Eighty five percent of the students did not attribute blame to the victim in the vignettes. The mean score for females attributing blame to the victim was .12, the mean score for men attributing blame to the victim was .16. There is not a significant statistical difference between

the mean scores (t = 1.12, df = 352, p = .26). Therefore hypothesis #4 was not supported by the data; women did not blame the victim more often for relationally aggressive victimization as compared to males.

Study B Interview – Research Questions

Research Question #1 – Do women endorse different explanations for relationally aggressive behaviors as compared to their male counter parts?

To evaluate the motivation for relationally aggressive behaviors in the entire interview sample and between genders, students were asked to rank a seven (7) item checklist for relationally aggressive behavior. This checklist was derived from the results of Owens, Shute and Slee's (2000b) investigation into the reasons why teenage girls engage in relationally aggressive behaviors. They reported seven (7) explanations as the primary reasons that girls engaged in relationally aggressive behaviors: it's something to do (alleviate boredom/create excitement); to gain attention; jealousy; indicates that you are in the "right" group; to avoid being a target by a bully (self-protection); to get revenge/ to retaliate; and, to gain acceptance (I'm *in*, you're *out*).

The frequency, percentages and ranking of explanations offered as students' reasons for bullying are presented in Table 16. Study B, research question #1 was supported by the data: females endorsed different explanations for their relationally aggressive behaviors as compared to the males. The most frequently cited reason by females was *jealousy*, 26.32% versus the most frequently cited explanation by males was to *gain acceptance*, 38.46%.

A striking difference between the sexes was the endorsement by females of bullying behavior to *gain attention* 21.05% as compared to males, 7.69%.

However, there was agreement between the genders with regards to the least endorsed explanation for relationally aggressive behavior which was *something to do,* 31.58% females and 30.77% of the males. (See Table 17).

Table 16

Most Relevant Reasons for Relationally Aggressive Behavior

	Females		Males		Total	
Reasons	n = 19	%	n = 13	%	n = 32	%
Something to do	2	10.53%	1	7.69%	3	9.38%
Gain attention	4	21.05%	1	7.69%	5	15.63%
Jealousy	**5**	**26.32%**	2	15.38%	7	21.88%
Right group	2	10.53%	2	15.38%	4	12.50%
Avoid being target	0	0.00%	1	7.69%	1	3.13%
Revenge/retaliate	2	10.53%	1	7.69%	3	9.38%
Gain acceptance	4	21.05%	**5**	**38.46%**	9	28.13%

Table 17

Least Relevant Reasons for Relationally Aggressive Behavior

	Females		Males		Total	
Reasons	N = 19	%	n = 13	%	n = 32	%
Something to do	**6**	**31.58%**	**4**	**30.77%**	10	31.25%
Gain attention	0	0.00%	3	23.08%	3	9.38%
Jealousy	1	5.26%	0	0.00%	1	3.13%
Right group	3	15.79%	0	0.00%	3	9.38%
Avoid being target	**6**	**31.58%**	3	23.08%	9	28.13%
Revenge/retaliate	2	10.53%	3	23.08%	5	15.63%
Gain acceptance	1	5.26%	0	0.00%	1	3.13%

As a follow up, each student was asked if they felt that the victim somehow provoked being bullied. Of the 19 females interviewed, seven (36.8%) felt that the victim in some way provoked the bullying. Of the 13 males interviewed, seven, (53.8%) responded that the victim in some way provoked the bullying.

Research Question #2 – Do women seek help more often than men when being victimized in elementary school and high school?

To assess gender differences in whether students sought help when being victimized in elementary and high school, twelve (12) questions were posed. The frequency and percentages of students seeking help when being victimized in school are presented in Table 18. Study B, research question #2 was supported by the data: in both elementary school and high school, as expected, females reported a higher percentage of help seeking, 31.58% and 21.05% respectively, as compared with males, 23.08% in elementary school and 15.38% in high school.

Table 18

Frequency and Percentages of Students Seeking Help When Being Victimized in School

	Females		Males		Total	
School	n = 19	%	n = 13	%	n = 32	%
Elementary school	6	31.58%	3	23.08%	9	28.13%
High school	4	21.05%	2	15.38%	6	18.75%
College	2	10.53%	0	0.00%	2	6.25%

As a follow up, students who disclosed that they did not seek help when being victimized they were asked to explain *why* they did not ask for help. Table 19 lists the reasons why students did not ask for help. There is a shift in reasoning as the student moved through their academic careers. The highest motivating reason for NOT asking for help in elementary school was the fear of retaliation by the bullying. In high school this reason fell to the near bottom, and was replaced with that the student *didn't think of it*, meaning that they did not see seeking help as an option. In college, the most reported reason for not seeking help was that the student felt it was

not their problem to contend with, and the *fear of retaliation* was practically nonexistent. This holds true for those students' whose role was only as witness.

Table 19

Frequency and Percentages of the Reasons Why Students Did Not Seek Help

	Elementary school		High School		College	
Reason	n = 17	%	n = 20	%	n = 17	%
Didn't think to	5	29.41%	**5**	25.00%	0	0.00%
Afraid of retaliation	**6**	35.29%	2	10.00%	1	5.88%
Not their problem	2	11.76%	4	20.00%	**4**	23.53%
It's a phase	1	5.88%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Stepped in themselves	1	5.88%	3	15.00%	0	0.00%
People don't listen	1	5.88%	3	15.00%	2	11.76%
Too shy	0	0.00%	1	5.00%	0	0.00%
Not that serious	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	3	17.65%

Research Question #3 – Do women seek help more often than men when being victimized in college?

To assess gender differences in whether students sought help when being victimized in college, six (6) questions were posed. The frequency and percentages of students seeking help when being victimized in college are presented in Table 18. Study B, hypothesis #3 is supported by the data: in college, females had a higher percentage of help seeking, 10.53%, as compared with males, who did not seek any help when being victimized. However, it is worth noting that both females and males sought less help as they progressed through their academic career.

Research Question #4 – Do college students report negative effects (i.e., depression, anxiety, stress) when they are exposed to bullying/relational aggression?

Table 20

Frequency and Percentages of Negative Feelings from Exposure to Bullying in the College Environment

	Females		Males		Total	
Location	n = 19	%	n = 13	%	n = 32	%
College environment	14	73.68%	5	38.46%	19	59.38%
College classroom	7	36.84%	2	15.38%	9	28.13%

As expected, 59.38% of the college students interviewed reported experiencing negative feelings from being exposed to bullying in the college environment, with 28.13% of the students also feeling negatively in the classroom due to exposure to bullying. Of greater concern however, is that although 38.36% of the males experienced negative feelings from exposure to bullying in the college environment, the females came in at an even higher percentage, 73.68%.

Of the 28.13% who experienced negative feeling in the classroom, the common thread voiced by the students was the inability to concentrate on the class work.

Research Question #5 – Will students who have had high exposure to bullying/relational aggression be more likely to assess the video clips as examples of relationally aggressive behavior as compared to students who have had low exposure to bullying and relational aggression?

The frequency and percentages of students who found the video clips to be examples of relationally aggressive behavior by level of exposure to bullying are presented in Table 21. Two questions were asked at the end of each clip: 1) To you, is this clip an example of bullying and/or relational aggression? 2) Why/why not?

To determine level of exposure, the data from Study A, hypothesis 2, *(it is expected that females will report significantly higher levels of exposure to bullying as compared to their male*

counterparts) was used. Specifically, twenty-four questions were posed regarding if the student had either been a witness, victim or bully in identified bullying/relational aggression episodes. All "yes" responses received a score of one and all "no" responses received a score of zero. Scores were summed, yielding a range from zero to twenty four. The scores were stratified into three categories. Respondents' with scores ranging from zero (0) to eight (8) were categorized as having low exposure to bullying/relational aggression, scores ranging from eight (9) to fifteen (15) were categorized as moderate exposure; and, scores ranging from sixteen (16) to twenty-four (24) as having high exposure.

Regardless of the level of exposure to bullying, the Friends video clip was unanimously interpreted as being an authentic example of relational aggression. The level of exposure did not have any bearing on the interpretation of the video clip. In addition, in all three levels of exposure to bullying (low, moderate and high) more than 50% of the students in the sample interpreted the Cruel Intentions video clip as exemplifying bullying behavior, with 80% of the students in the sample with moderate exposure to bullying interpreting the video as being an example of bullying behavior. Therefore level of exposure to bullying did not appear to be a factor in assessing the clips as examples of relational aggressive behaviors.

Research Question #6 – Will women be more likely to assess the video clips as examples of relationally aggressive behavior as compared to men?

The frequency and percentages of females and males who found the video clips to be examples of relationally aggressive behavior are presented in Table 21. Regardless of gender, the Friends video clip was unanimously (100%) interpreted as being an authentic example of relational aggression. Gender did not have any bearing on the interpretation of the Friends video clip. With regard to the Cruel Intentions clip, although it was not unanimously found as being

an example of relational aggression, the majority of the females (over 70%) found the clip as representative of relationally aggressive behavior, as well as the majority of men (over 50%) found the clip as representative of relationally aggressive behavior. Therefore gender did not appear to be a factor in assessing the clips as examples of relational aggressive behaviors.

When examining gender and level of exposure, there does not appear to be any consequential differences between females and males with low or moderate exposure to bullying. However, females with high exposure to bullying unanimously found both clips as representative of relationally aggressive behaviors. Whereas, males with high exposure to bullying only unanimously agreed that the Friend clip was representative of relationally aggressive behaviors; only 50% of the males with high exposure found the Cruel Intentions clip as representative of relationally aggressive behaviors.

Frequencies and Percentages of Students Who Reported the TV/Movie clips as Examples of Relational Aggressive Behaviors Based on Exposure to Bullying and Gender

	Low						Moderate						High					
	Females		Males		Total		Females		Males		Total		Females		Males		Total	
	n = 7	%	n = 6	%	n = 13	%	n = 10	%	n = 5	%	n = 15	%	n = 2	%	n = 2	%	n = 4	%
Friends	7	100	6	100	13	100	10	100	5	100	15	100	2	100	2	100	4	100
Cruel Intentions	5	71.4	4	66.7	9.00	69.2	7	70	5	100	12	80	2	100	0	0	2	50

Chapter 5: Discussion

This chapter presents a discussion of the observed results. The theoretical significance of this study is addressed. Limitations of the study and suggestions for future research are also provided.

Study A - General Discussion

In reviewing the four hypotheses outlined in Study A, the first hypothesis (bullying/relational aggression will be reported by both females and males) is not a definitive prediction, but rather a foundation to establish that bullying/relational aggression does exist in the college environment.

Awareness of bully/relational aggression

It was first necessary to establish that bullying/relational aggression does not suddenly cease at high school graduation, but is pervasive throughout the college years. Hence, as predicted in hypothesis #1, bullying/relational aggression was reported by both female and male students in the college environment.

It is worth noting however, that in the eight opportunities to identify bullying/relational aggression, the first three examples did not meet the threshold of being identified as instances of bullying behavior by the students. One possible explanation for this is that the first three items did not describe a situation where there was a specific target. In addition, the first two items were definitions, not actual examples of relationally aggressive behaviors. Definitions can be abstract, whereas the vignettes provide context and meaning. The vignettes provided a "live" way to see relationally aggressive behavior that is normally not easily seen or readily identified.

Nonetheless, bullying and relationally aggressive behaviors appear to be "alive and well" in the college environment. It is important to start this research with this basic premise in place.

There is copious data addressing bullying in K – 12 grades, and in the work place. However, to assume that bullying/relational aggression exists in the college environment without testing for it is substandard research. It must first be established that this construct exists in this environment before we can start controlling and predicting the behavior.

Gender differences in frequency of exposure to bullying/relational aggression

Reports of previous studies that suggested that females used more relationally aggressive behaviors in elementary school and high school (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; French, Jansen & Pidada, 2002; McEvoy, 2003; Österman, et al, 1998) were not corroborated in this college sample. The gender differences found in younger students were not present among the college students in this sample. Women did not report significantly higher levels of exposure to bullying/relational aggression as compared to their male counter parts.

Does this suggest that there is a trend that males are using more relationally aggressive behaviors as compared to their younger years? As previous stated, physical aggression has potentially more severe consequences as an adult. In college, students can be subject to disciplinary action, including but not limited to community service hours, loss of privileges, and temporary or permanent expulsion. Coupled with the penal code that can impose monetary sanctions and/or jail time, this can inadvertently cause males to switch their form of aggressive behavior. Because at this time there are NO swift and strong consequences to relational aggression, it has become the “go-to” method to express aggressive feelings.

Educational implications of this data suggest that when counselors are working with college students, they should not assume that males may not be experiencing relationally aggressive behaviors to the same degree as females, or that females are experiencing it more than males.

Beliefs regarding blaming the victim

Eighty five percent of the students did not attribute blame to the victim in the vignettes, and there was no significant difference between males and females in this variable. However, this means that fifteen percent of the students DID blame the victim. There is an assumption that on occasion, the victim will bring the bullying on themselves, thereby liberating the bullying of guilt and responsibility for their actions. Clearly this orientation runs contrary to our judicial system whereby the victim is not at fault for the negative actions of others.

General Discussion - Study B

The results of Study B suggest that there are some marked gender differences with regards to explanations for bullying behavior, and patterns to help seeking when being victimized.

Explanations for Bullying Behavior

The findings in Study B support the previous work which indicated that girls are more relationally oriented than boys, (that girls will use forms of aggression which damage friendship) whereas boys are more motivated by instrumental and physical dominance goals (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

When the students were asked to provided alternative explanations for bullying behaviors (additional explanations that were not provided on the checklist), both genders cited *insecurity* as their top alternative reason. This explanation is not surprising. Insecurity can cross both gender orientations; for females their interpersonal insecurity comes from their friendships (or lack thereof); for males, it can be the insecurity of not being able to assert physical dominance over others.

Provocation of Bullying Behaviors

This researcher also examined the issue of provocation (does the victim "bring it on themselves?"). In this sub-sample, 43.75% of the students felt as though the victim tended to bring the negative actions of others on themselves. Explanations provided by the students interviewed for this view ranged from "they are an easy target" to "they allow it" and "they're socially weird/awkward."

Interestingly, students were much more likely to blame the victim in their interview responses than on the survey. One possible explanation for this difference may be that students felt more comfortable disclosing negative behaviors to a "friendly face." Stated differently, the student might have felt an alliance with the researcher and wanted to unburden themselves of their past negative behavior. A second explanation is that students had the opportunity to be more reflective and thoughtful about their answers when being interviewed.

What is curious in Study B is the gender breakdown of attributing blame to the victim, 36.8% of the females and 53.8% of the males blamed the victim for bullying episodes. This runs contrary to Study A, in which there was no gender difference on the survey when attributing blame to the victim. More specifically, males in a higher percentage responded by blaming the victim. Further research is needed to examine why males blamed the victim in higher frequency than their female counter parts in the interview.

In line with the idea that the victim deserved the bullying, some interviewees inadvertently disclosed that they did believe the victim deserved it when answering other questions in the interview. For example, when asked about their feelings when witnessing bullying behaviors in high school, a male participant answered, "Sometimes I would laugh,

sometimes I thought it was unfair. I felt bad if there was no reason for it, not because of the way they dressed or the way they looked. Only if they deserved it."

When a female participant discussed her feelings when witnessing bullying in college, "It upsets me, it's usually the people who don't deserve it." Unwittingly this participant was also implying that there are those who deserve it.

Help Seeking

An aim of this current research was to 1) corroborate previous work conducted on help seeking amongst victimized children and teenagers, and; 2) examine gender differences in help seeking when being victimized in elementary school, middle school and college. The data fully supports previous work: in elementary school and high school, females are more likely to seek help as compared to their male counterparts when being victimized. This pattern held true in the college environment as well. However, what is of note are the explanations for NOT seeking help.

When examining the pattern of responses between elementary school, high school, and college, there is a definitive shift in the reasons why the students did not seek help, if/when they were witnessing or succumbing to bullying behaviors. This is especially true with the explanation of "it's not my problem" as a reason for not seeking help. In elementary school, *retaliation* was the most frequently cited reason for not seeking help, with *it's not my problem* ranking low on the list. In high school, *didn't think to ask* was the most frequently cited reason, with *it's not my problem* moving up the list to the second most cited reason. In the college environment, *it's not my problem* was the most frequently cited reason that students did not seek help. This has important implications for educators who are creating anti-bullying programs. Perhaps if students were to better understand the far reaching negative effects of bullying, that it

is “their problem” too, students might be able to provide better insight about the adult bully and improve current anti-bullying interventions. In addition, many colleges have not designed a comprehensive and concrete judicial process for handling relational aggression. Administrators and counselors typically rely on their college’s Student Code of Conduct to guide them, “set the tone,” however relational aggression is something not “seen.” Thus, apprehending the guilty party is difficult, and the sanctions that would be mandated have not been incorporated into their process.

When talking about their feeling of witnessing bullying in high school, one student noted, “I wasn’t sure what to do. I was torn between jumping in and losing friends, or go along with it. I was trying to be diplomatic.” This answer speaks to their own feelings of helplessness and the reason why they did not seek help.

Negative Effects

Repeatedly, three adjectives were used by the students to express their “negative” feelings about exposure, as either the victim or witness, to bullying: 1) bad 2) angry, and 3) upset. Although this investigator did not ask the interviewees to further elaborate on these adjectives, it would not be a far reach to define these adjectives in the following manner: 1) bad – having undesirable, negative consequences; 2) angry – feeling displeasure and hostility, and 3) upset – feeling unhappy or being in a worried state.

One student offered “I feel bad when I see it now. It reminds me when I was being bullied in elementary school; I get upset all over again.” Another student presented, “I feel bad for the victim, especially when the teacher doesn’t address it.” A female student commented, “I was crying all the time. I didn’t want to be around anyone. I was embarrassed by the rumors.” A male student referenced, “I have very concrete memories of being verbally bullied in

elementary school. Since I was not born here, I wore different shoes than the other kids. They constantly picked on my shoes. It was horrible; I didn't want to be in school."

A female participant spoke about her varied roles causing different negative feelings, "In elementary school they called me 'blackie' or 'charcoal' because I had bad eczema. Made me feel bad about myself. But then sometimes I was bullying and it made me feel powerful. In high school I just avoided it. There were lots of cliques, a lot of bullying in the cafeteria, so I wouldn't eat there. When I see it here [in college] I get mad. I want to tell them to grow up and move on."

Another student described his continued victimization in the college classroom as follows, "I have a speech impediment. The students pick on me because of it. It makes me nervous in class and it [the speech impediment] gets worse. Then the teacher thinks I'm a dummy. I get more nervous because I know he thinks I'm a dummy, and the students pick on me more. It never stops."

However, two students both commented on their feelings of confidence and pride when stepping in to stop the bullying in the college environment, "I feel bad for the victim, but I feel confident when I stand up for them" and "It's my job to fix it, otherwise it will only become a bigger problem."

Video Clips

One interesting finding was the unanimous agreement between gender and across the three levels of exposure to bullying (low, moderate and high) to the interpretation that the Friends clip represented an accurate depiction of bullying to the viewing students. One possible explanation is that the Friends clip was a strong "concrete" example of bullying; there was no ambiguity to the scene. In the Friends clip, the bully is overt in his threat to the victim, it is established that

there is a history between the bully and victim, both the bully and victim are present during the verbal exchange, and the bullying act is being executed before the viewers' eyes. However, in the Cruel Intentions clip, there was disagreement between gender and level of exposure to the interpretation that the Cruel Intentions clip represented an accurate depiction of bullying to the viewing students. The Cruel Intentions clip might have been considered ambiguous because the bully is not threatening with physical harm, there does not appear to be long history of aggression between the characters, and the victim is not present. The viewer might question if the acts that the two bullies are considering will be executed. Therefore, the Cruel Intentions clip might not be meeting the student's threshold to be considered an example of bullying.

It was interesting to note how one student's answer changed their answer from a *no* to a *yes* when discussing the Cruel Intentions clip: "This is not bullying in the sense of bullying. It's just playing with people's emotions. Bullying can scar people for life, bigger kids versus little kids, popular girl versus not popular girl, oh my gosh, THIS IS BULLYING."

Limitations of the Study

A limitation to both Study A and B is the reliance on the students' memories. Memories, whether highly charged or not, can be subject to decreased accuracy over time, retrospective distortions (people's recollections tend to exaggerate the consistency between their past and present attitudes, beliefs and feelings), unconscious influences, misattribution (situations in which some form of memory is present, but misattributed to an incorrect time, place, or person) and suggestibility (the tendency to incorporate information provided by others, into one's own recollections) (Schacter, 1999).

Second, in both Study A and B, there is a dependence on admitting to engaging in negative behaviors. As with all behavior that might not be socially accepted, there could be bias

in the responses by the student in order to provide a more "socially desirable" answer than the truth of their past and present actions. It is logical to assume that people tend to over report "good" behavior and down play "bad" behavior.

Third, with regards to both Study A and B, the students self-selected to participate in the study. Although the target population is college students, the students who participated in these studies all self selected to participate (this is a nonrandom sample). There is no way to control for why some students chose to participate and others did not. Whether students systematically excluded or included themselves cannot be tested.

Fourth, in Study B, students repeatedly referred to feeling "bad", "angry" and/or "upset" when they were asked to describe how they felt about witnessing or being a victim of bullying. Clearly these words have negative connotations; however it would have been beneficial to further the line of questioning by asking them to explain what *bad, angry* and/or *upset* meant to them specifically.

Lastly, this researcher does not consider the sample size in Study B as a limitation; what is forfeited in generalizability is gained in the depth and breadth of the interview answers.

Future Research

At this moment, the U.S. National Institute of Health (2010) is recruiting participants for a clinical trial entitled "Effectiveness of Treatment for Relational Aggression in Urban African American Girls." The study will evaluate the effectiveness of a school based cognitive group treatment in reducing aggression (bullying) among relationally aggressive urban African American girls. Researchers continue to solely focus on children in the K – 12 grades. However, the tragedy that befell Tyler Clementi in college is changing the legal landscape.

Tyler Clementi was in his freshman year of college at Rutgers University in Fall 2010. That would be his only semester at Rutgers as he committed suicide after his roommate and fellow classmate allegedly placed a camera in his dorm room without his knowledge and streamed on-line his sexual relation with another male. Nationwide outrage has led to proposed federal legislation to be known as the "Tyler Clementi Higher Education Anti-Harassment Act."

This bill will require that colleges and universities that receive federal money will have to adopt policies explicitly prohibiting harassment based on a student's sexual orientation, race, gender and other factors. It will require colleges and universities to recognize "cyber-bullying" as a form of harassment.

Although the platform might change, the characteristics that define bullying/relational aggression do not. This latest buzz word, *cyber-bullying* consists of covert, psychological bullying, conveyed through the electronic mediums such as cell phones, web-logs and web-sites, on-line chat rooms, multi-user domains where individuals take on different characters and on-line personal profiles (Shariff & Gouin, 2005). How much more dangerous is this form of bullying? Electronic media has the ability to instantaneously and repeatedly broadcast events to an exponentially larger pool compared to an incident happening with only one viewing by the witnesses at hand. The victim cannot "live it down" once the incident has been posted on to the web; thereby creating an environment where there is a permanent, repetitive venue to re-victimizing the target. Which begs the question, what intervention programs exist to combat bullying in the college environment? At the college where this study was conducted there are no anti-bullying programs or campaigns. This researcher is employed at a different college that also has no intervention program. What would this program look like? How similar or dissimilar would they be as compared to current elementary school and high school programs?

Are college administrators and professors aware that bullying persists at their college? Can they identify and respond to bullying episodes? How would disciplinary consequences be administered?

Also of concern was students' commentary that bullying "was not their problem." When *does* bullying become their problem? When the students become parents themselves? When they find themselves in a hostile work environment and their boss is bully? How do we as educators change this mind set, how do we get adult students to recognize the damaging effects of bullying and there is a way to help the victims?

Separate from the results of this study, this researcher strongly believes that there is a link between intelligence and relational aggression: the "higher" the intelligence the "better" the individual is at relational aggressive behaviors. It does not take much brain power to trip a student in the hallway, or yell out that another student is ugly. However, the ability to know how to "successfully" hurt another student/friend through the use of manipulating relationships and malicious teasing takes a fine and unique cognitive ability. Theoretically then, what kind of intelligence is needed to be a successful bully? As Howard Gardner (2006) posits, there are multiple intelligences. The question then becomes, what type of intelligence is required? Emotional, social, intellectual? A combination of the three? To what proportion? Is there any instrument that properly quantifies intelligence?

More poignantly however, how do we as educators use the bully's intelligence to reform them? How do we get the bully to recognize the need for sensitivity to others? How do we get the bully to redirect their aggressive behaviors into positive characteristics? As this study began with mention of fairy tale characters, the Tooth Fairy and Easter Bunny, this researcher points out that even Darth Vader eventually left the dark side.

Appendices

Appendix A

Flyer

******We want your input******
Bullying on College Campuses
Research Study

Have you experienced bullying? Can you recognize bullying?
Your input is highly needed for a research study!

Take a few minutes and fill out the Bullying Survey. Pick up the survey at any of the following offices: Advising, Athletics, Residential Life and Student Success.

Your participation is voluntary and confidential.
Must be over 18 years old to participate.
Surveys available starting 9/1/09
Last day for drop off: 10/1/09

For more information, please contact Irene R. Delgado at (914) 674-7664, or email at idelgado@mercy.edu.

Appendix B

General Survey

Fall 2009 & Spring 2010

Dear Mercy College Student:

My name is Irene R. Delgado and I am a student in the Educational Psychology Ph.D. Program at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY). I am writing my doctoral thesis (dissertation) on relational aggression and its impact on academic achievement. Previous research has focused on bullying and its impact on younger children. I would like you to participate in this survey by providing insight on the dynamics of bullying on the college level.

This survey is voluntary and confidential. You must 18 years old or older to participate. There is minimal risk involved in this survey. You may decline to answer specific questions if you feel uncomfortable answering them. You can also reach out to Mercy College's clinical psychologist, Dr. Ori Shinar, to discuss any feelings that might surface from this survey. Dr. Shinar can be reached at 914-674-7233. Dr. Shinar's services are free and completely confidential.

You may keep this cover letter as a record of your consent to participate in this survey. When you have completed the survey please:

- Detach the Survey from the last page entitled "Request for Interview"
- Place the Survey in the envelope labeled "Survey"
- Place Request for Interview form in the envelope labeled "Request for Interview."
- Please seal both envelopes
- Please drop off where you picked up the survey

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact me at 914-674-7664, idelgado@mercy.edu or my faculty advisor Professor Johnson (718) 997-5312, hjohnson@gc.cuny.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this survey, you can contact Kathleen Golisz, Chairperson IRB, Mercy College, at 914-674-7814, mcirb@mercy.edu, or Kay Powell, IRB Administrator, The Graduate Center/City University of New York, (212) 817-7525, kpowell@gc.cuny.edu.

Thank you for taking the time to give me your honest answers. Your responses will help in the understanding and prevention of relational aggression/bullying in young adults.

Sincerely,

Irene R. Delgado

Irene R. Delgado

This page intentionally left blank.

A. DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

1. I am a (circle one): **Male** **Female**

2. How old are you? _____

3. I am a(n) (circle one): **Undergraduate** **Graduate**

4. How many credits have you completed? _____

5. I am a (circle all that apply): **Commuter** **Resident** **Athlete**

6. Please check ***one*** cultural background you would classify yourself as:
   African American _____
   Asian _____
   Hispanic _____
   White/non Hispanic _____
   Other _____

B. DEFINITION OF BULLYING AND RELATIONAL AGGRESSION

Please read the following definitions and answer the accompanying questions.

1. Bullying

A student is being bullied or victimized when he/she is exposed, repeatedly, over time, to negative actions (intentionally inflicting injury or discomfort) on the part of one or more other students (Olweus, 1993).

		Please circle	
ii)	In college, have you ever seen a student being bullied by another student?	**Yes**	**No**
iii)	In college, have you ever been bullied by another student?	**Yes**	**No**
iv)	In college, have you ever bullied another student?	**Yes**	**No**

2. Relational aggression

A student is being relationally victimized when he/she is harmed by others through purposeful manipulation, disruption and damage to their friendships, relationships and feelings of acceptance. (i.e. controlling through friendship "you can't be my friend unless…," rumor spreading so peers will reject him/her, and excluding from social events) (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

Please circle

i. In college, have you ever seen a student be relationally aggressive towards another student? **Yes** **No**

ii. In college, has anyone been relationally aggressive to you? **Yes** **No**

iii. In college, have you ever been relationally aggressive to another student? **Yes** **No**

C. VIGNETTES

Please read the following six vignettes (scenarios) and answer the accompanying questions.

#1 - In class one day, you are working on a project with your lab partner. Just when you are almost done with your half of the project, the other student says, "This sucks." Then they only hand in their half of the project.

vi) Does this vignette depict bullying/relational aggression? **Yes** **No**

vii) Did you do anything to provoke this situation? **Yes** **No**

viii) a) Have you ever seen a student(s) commit this act? **Yes** **No**

(b) In the past six months, how often? _____

ix) a) Has this ever happened to you, or to one of your friends? **Yes** **No**

b) In the past six months, how often? _____

x) a) Have you ever done this (or something similar to this)? **Yes** **No**

b) In the past six months, how often? _____

#2 - You are standing in the hallway one morning before class. As you are standing there, two students from your class walk by. Although they are whispering, you overhear the students talking crap about you to each other. As they walk by, the two students grill you and then laugh as they walk down the hall.

1. Does this vignette depict bullying/relational aggression? **Yes** **No**

2. Did you do anything to provoke this situation? **Yes** **No**

3. a) Have you ever seen a student(s) commit this act? **Yes** **No**

(b) In the past six months, how often? _____

4. a) Has this ever happened to you, or to one of your friends? **Yes** **No**

b) In the past six months, how often? _____

5. a) Have you ever done this (or something similar to this)? **Yes** **No**

b) In the past six months, how often? _____

#3 - In the café one day, you are lining up with your friends to order food. Just as you are lining up, a student cuts in front of you and then ignores you.

1. Does this vignette depict bullying/relational aggression? **Yes** **No**
2. Did you do anything to provoke this situation? **Yes** **No**
3. a) Have you ever seen a student(s) commit this act? **Yes** **No**
   b) In the past six months, how often? _____
4. a) Has this ever happened to you, or to one of your friends? **Yes** **No**
   b) In the past six months, how often? _____
5. a) Have you ever done this (or something similar to this)? **Yes** **No**
   b) In the past six months, how often? _____

#4 - In the locker-room one day, two of your teammates come in and start talking to each other. You hear one of the players invite the other one to a house party. The player says that everyone on the team is invited except for you.

1. Does this vignette depict bullying/relational aggression? **Yes** **No**
2. Did you do anything to provoke this situation? **Yes** **No**
3. a) Have you ever seen a student(s) commit this act? **Yes** **No**
   b) In the past six months, how often? _____
4. a) Has this ever happened to you, or to one of your friends? **Yes** **No**
   b) In the past six months, how often? _____
5. a) Have you ever done this (or something similar to this)? **Yes** **No**
   b) In the past six months, how often? _____

#5 - In the café one day, you are looking for a place to sit. You walk over to a table with one empty seat left. Just as you are about to sit down, another student comes over and says, "That's my seat." Then the student sits down in your seat.

1. Does this vignette depict bullying/relational aggression? **Yes** **No**
2. Did you do anything to provoke this situation? **Yes** **No**
3. a) Have you ever seen a student(s) commit this act? **Yes** **No**

   b) In the past six months, how often? _____
4. a) Has this ever happened to you, or to one of your friends? **Yes** **No**

   b) In the past six months, how often? _____
5. a) Have you ever done this (or something similar to this)? **Yes** **No**

   b) In the past six months, how often? _____

#6 - In the café one day you are looking for a place to sit. You see your friends at a table across the room. They are laughing and talking to each other and they look like they are having a good time. You go over to their table, sit down, and say, "What's up?" They look right at you, smirk, and don't say anything to you. After a few seconds, they start talking to each other again, but no one talks to you at all at all.

1. Does this vignette depict bullying/relational aggression? **Yes** **No**
2. Did you do anything to provoke this situation? **Yes** **No**
3. a) Have you ever seen a student(s) commit this act? **Yes** **No**

   b) In the past six months, how often? _____
4. a) Has this ever happened to you, or to one of your friends? **Yes** **No**

   b) In the past six months, how often? _____
5. a) Have you ever done this (or something similar to this)? **Yes** **No**

   b) In the past six months, how often? _____

~Thank you for your participation~

Request for Interview

Fall 2009 & Spring 2010

Dear Student:

There is limited research available on the effects of bullying in college. My dissertation seeks to add to this incomplete body of work. The survey you just filled out will add greatly to my data, thank you.

In addition, I would like to interview a small number of students for a more in-depth perspective on bullying in the college setting. By participating in this interview, you will be adding insight and depth to a critical field of work.

If you are interested in sharing your thoughts and experiences with bullying/relational aggression, in a one-on-one interview, please provide your name and cell phone number below.

Please do **NOT** fill out this section if you are **NOT** interest in participating in a follow up interview.

Name: _____

Cell phone number: _____

Sincerely,

Irene R. Delgado

Irene R. Delgado

Appendix C

Vignettes

#1 - In class one day, you are working on a group project with another student. Just when you are almost done with your half of the project, the other student says, “This sucks.” Then they only hand in their half of the project.

#2 - You are standing in the hallway one morning before class. As you are standing there, two students from your class walk by. Although they are whispering, you overhear the students talking crap about you to each other. As they walk by, the two students grill you and then laugh as they walk down the hall.

#3 - In the café one day, you are lining up to order food. Just as you are lining up, a student cuts in front of you and then ignores you.

#4 - In the locker-room one day, two of your teammates come in and start talking to each other. You hear one of the players invite the other one to a house party. The player says that everyone on the team is invited except for you.

#5 - In the café one day, you are looking for a place to sit. You walk over to a table with one empty seat left. Just as you are about to sit down, another student comes over and says, “That’s my seat.” Then the student sits down in your seat.

#6 - In the café one day you are looking for a place to sit. You see friends you know at a table across the room. They are laughing and talking to each other and they look like they are having a good time. You go over to their table, sit down, and say, “What’s up?” They look right at you, smirk, and don’t say anything to you. After a few seconds, they start talking to each other again, but no one talks to you at all at all.

Appendix D

Phone Call Script

Hi, this Irene Delgado. A few weeks ago, you completed a survey on bullying in college. You indicated that you might be interested in being interviewed about your thoughts and experiences with bullying. Are you still interested in being interviewed?

If no: Ok, thanks anyway. Have a great day.

If yes: Great. The interview would last about an hour. Is that OK? I'd like to pick and day and time that works best for you. Tell me of your availability……(date and time selected). OK, that's XXXXX at XXXXX. Meet me in the XXXXXXX. Do you know where that is?

If no: explain location and then proceed with below.

If yes: Ok, I'll see you then. If you need to cancel or reschedule just give me a call. Let me give you my number, 914-674-7664. Thanks, I'll see you then.

Appendix E

Consent Form

STUDENT CONSENT FORM - INTERVIEW

My name is Irene R. Delgado and I am a student in the Educational Psychology Ph.D. Program at the Graduate Center of the City University of New York (CUNY). Together with Faculty Advisor, Professor Helen Johnson, we are conducting a research study entitled "The unstudied transition: The impact of relational aggression on college students' academic achievement." Previous research has focused on bullying and its impact on younger children. I would like you to participate in an interview to help identify and understand how you see bullying/relational aggression happening on the college level

The interview will last approximately one hour. During the interview I am going to give you a small survey about why you think students bully one another; I am going to ask you about your experiences with bullying in elementary school and high school; I am going to ask your permission to access your transcript and early alerts; and, I am going to show you two video clips and ask you about what you saw.

With your permission, I would like to audio-tape the interview so I can record the details accurately. The tapes will only be heard by me and my advisor. All information I gather will be kept strictly confidential, and will be stored in a locked file cabinet, to which only I and my advisor, will have access. Twelve (12) months after the completion of the study, the audiotapes will be destroyed by shredding the tape ribbon. At any time you can refuse to answer any question(s) or leave the interview.

- I agree to have the interview audio taped: **YES** **NO**

_____
Participant's signature Date

I request your permission to access your academic transcript and retrieve any early alerts. All information I gather will be kept strictly confidential, and will be stored in a locked file cabinet, to which only I and my advisor, will have access. Twelve (12) months after the completion of the study, the transcript and any early alerts will be shredded.

- I agree to allow the researcher access my academic transcript and early alerts: **YES** **NO**

_____
Participant's signature Date

There is minimal risk involved in this study. Your participation may aid in the identification and understanding of the dynamics of bullying on the college level. There may be some discomfort in recalling unpleasant experiences; however this may be neutralized by the benefit of sharing your experiences. In addition, you can contact Mercy College's clinical psychologist, Dr. Ori Shinar, to discuss any feelings that might surface from this discussion. Dr. Shinar can be reached at 914-674-7233. Dr. Shinar's services are free and completely confidential.

I may publish results of the study, but names of people, or any identifying characteristics, will not be used in any of the publications. If you would like a copy of the study, please provide me with your address and I will send you a copy in the future.

If you have any questions about this research, you can contact me at 914-674-7664, idelgado@mercy.edu or my faculty advisor Professor Johnson (718) 997-5312, hjohnson@gc.cuny.edu. If you have questions about your rights as a participant in this study, you can contact Kathleen Golisz, Chairperson IRB, Mercy College, at 914-674-7814, mcirb@mercy.edu, or Kay Powell, IRB Administrator, The Graduate Center/City University of New York, (212) 817-7525, kpowell@gc.cuny.edu.

Thank you for your participation in the study. At the end of the interview I will give you a copy of this form for your records.

- I agree to participate in this interview: **YES** **NO**

_____
Participant's signature

_____
Participant's name – please print Date

_____ _____
Irene R. Delgado Date
Investigator

Appendix F

Interview Script

- Hi, thank you for coming. *Shake their hand*. Did you find the room OK? Please sit down.
- Let me introduce myself, I'm the one who called you, my name is Irene Delgado. I am a student at CUNY's Graduate Center and I am working on my dissertation. My research is about bullying and its effects on academic achievement in college students.
- This is a consent form for participating in this interview. *Hand them consent form*. Let me read it aloud. *Read consent form. When the tape recording signature line is reached:*
  - So is taping this interview OK with you?
  - *If yes: have student sign on signature line and turn on tape recorder.*
  - *If no*: OK, that's no problem. *Put tape recorder away*. You can still participate in the interview without my taping it. Is that OK?
    - *If yes*: Great, let's continue with the consent form.
    - *If no*: Alright then, thank you for coming. *Shake hands and escort out.*
  - *Continue reading consent form. When the permission to access transcripts and early alerts signature line is reached:*
    - So I can access your transcripts and early alerts?
    - *If yes: Have student sign on signature line.*
    - *If no*: That's OK, I want to thank you for coming. *Shake hands and escort out.*

- *Continue reading consent form*. *When the end of the form is reached*: So, do you still want to participate?
  - *If yes*: Great, please sign at the bottom. *Point to location for signing.*
  - *If no*: Ok, thank you for coming in anyway. *Shake their hand and escort them out*.
- Just make sure we understand each other, tell me your understanding of what we are going to do in the next hour.
  - *Correct any incorrect notions/facts.*
- By the way, please help yourself to some water or juice, or the snacks. *Beverages and snacks will already be on the table.*
- *Conduct actual interview*
- Ok, that's it. Is there anything you want to ask me? *Answer their question(s).*
- If this interview brought up any unpleasant memories for you, or if you feel you want to talk to someone, this is Dr. Shinar's business card. *Hand them business card*. He's the clinical psychologist for the college. If you want to see him, all you have to do is call him and make an appointment. His visits are free and totally confidential.
- Well, I want to thank you for taking the time to meet with me. It was great talking to you. *Shake their hand and escort them out*.

Appendix G

Interview Question Set

1) Please rank the following possible reasons for bullying behavior in college in order of relevance. With "1" being the most relevant reason and "7" being the least relevant reason.

____ **It's something to do (alleviate boredom/create excitement)**

____ **To gain attention**

____ **Jealousy**

____ **Indicates that you are in the "right" group**

____ **To avoid being a target by a bully (self protection)**

____ **To get revenge/ to retaliate**

____ **To gain acceptance (I'm *in*, you're *out*)**

2) What other reasons can you think of that explain bullying behavior in college?

a. _____

b. _____

c. _____

3) Do you think some victims bring it on themselves? ____ **YES** ____**NO**

4) How come/In what way?

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

_____

~ Thank you for your participation ~

Appendix H

"Friends" Script

Friends
Episode: The One with the Two Bullies
Writer: Sebastian Jones and Brian Buckner
Director: Michael Lembeck
Producers: Kevin S. Bright, Marta Kauffman and David Crane
California: Warner Brothers Television
Air date: April 25, 1996

[Scene: Central Perk. Chandler and Ross are sitting at the couch.]

CHANDLER: Hey.

ROSS: What?

CHANDLER: Do you have to be a Century 21 real-estate agent to get to wear those really cool jackets?

ROSS: Do you say this stuff to girls?

BIG BULLY: Hehehehey, isn't that the guy who used to wear your hat?

LITTLE BULLY: And look where they're sitting.

ROSS: You're joking, right? You guys just walked through the door.

BIG BULLY: Maybe we didn't make it clear enough.

LITTLE BULLY: Yeah.

BIG BULLY: This couch belongs to us.

CHANDLER: Alright, I'll tell you what, you call the couch and then, and then we'll call the couch, and we'll see who it comes to.

LITTLE BULLY: You know what I don't like about you? You always have something to say.

BIG BULLY: You know what I keep wondering? Why you two are still sitting here.

ROSS: Alright, that's it. I've had enough of this, alright. Gunther, these guys are trying to take our seat.

GUNTHER: Fellas, these guys were here first.

BIG BULLY: Oh, sorry, I didn't realize.

LITTLE BULLY: Sorry.

GUNTHER: There you go.

ROSS: Thank you Gunther. We didn't want to have to go and do that.

LITTLE BULLY: He told on us?

BIG BULLY: You told on us?

ROSS: Well pal, you didn't give me much of a choice. [flicks the ends of the big bully's tie]

CHANDLER: Don't play with his things.

ROSS: I know.

BIG BULLY: Alright, let's take this outside.

ROSS: Let's, let's, take this outside? Who talks like that?

BIG BULLY: The guy that's about to kick your ass, talks like that.

CHANDLER: You had to ask.

ROSS: Yeah.

[the bullies grab the back of the couch that Ross and Chandler are sitting in and tip back]

ROSS: Ok, ok look, see, the thing is we're, we're not gonna fight you guys.

LITTLE BULLY: Well then here's the deal, you won't have to so long as never ever show your faces in this coffee house ever again.

Appendix I

"Cruel Intentions" Script

Cruel Intentions – Script of Scene
Producer: Neal Moritz
Screenplay: Roger Kumble
Director: Roger Kumble
Columbia Picture Corporation
Released: 1999

---

12 INT. VALMONT TOWNHOUSE - LIVING ROOM - DAY

KATHRYN - What's wrong with you today? Therapy not going well?

SEBASTIAN – It was fine. Clarissa, ppppfh, 'call me.' I am sick of sleeping with these insipid Manhattan debutantes. Nothing shocks them anymore.

KATHRYN – Well you can relax. I have a mission for you**.**

SEBASTIAN – What?

KATHRYN – Do you remember Court Reynolds? Son of Garret Reynolds?

SEBASTIAN – Oh you mean the Nazi who dumped you over 4th of July weekend?

KATHRYN – I went to great lengths to please Court. Huge sacrifices were made on my part to make him happy.

SEBASTIAN – Sorry.

KATHRYN - In any event, my feelings were hurt when I learned that he had fallen for someone else.

SEBASTIAN - You don't mean?

13 EXT. PARK - DAY

Cecile turns toward the camera, while eating a double scoop ice cream cone and wearing a Mickey Mouse Club hat.

KATHRYN (V.O.) - None other than Cecile Caldwell.

She takes a lick of the ice cream, which falls off the cone.

14 INT. VALMONT TOWNHOUSE - LIVING ROOM - DAY

Sebastian snickers.

Sebastian - So that's what this is all about. (Imitating Kathryn)**.**

KATHRYN - Keep your friends close and your enemies closer. When I get through with Cecile she'll be premier tramp of the New York area. And poor Court's little princess will be damaged goods.

SEBASTIAN -Why go through Cecile? Why not just attack Court?

KATHRYN - Because if there's an attack made on Court it could be traced back to me. I can't allow that to happen. Everybody loves me and I intend to keep it that way.

SEBASTIAN - I see your point... why should I care?

KATHRYN – because I need you to seduce our young Cecile.

References

Archer, J., & Coyne, s. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational and social aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 9,* 212-230.

Baron, R., & Neuman, J. (1996). Workplace violence and workplace aggression: Evidence on their relative frequency and potential causes. *Aggressive Behavior, 22,* 161-173.

Bettencourt, B., & Kernahan, C. (1997). A meta-analysis of aggression in the presence of violent cues: Effects of gender differences and aversive provocation. *Aggressive Behavior, 23,* 447-456.

Björkqvist, K. (1994). Sex differences in physical, verbal and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles, 30,* 177-188.

Björkqvist, K., Österman K., & Lagerspetz (1994). Sex differences in covert aggression among adults. *Aggressive Behavior, 20,* 27-33.

Björkqvist, K., Österman K., & Hjelt-Back, M. (1994). Aggression among university employees. *Aggressive Behavior, 20,* 173 184..

Bond, L., Wolfe, S., Tollit, M., Butler, H., & Patton, G. (2007). A comparison of the Gate House Bullying Scale and the Peer Relations Questionnaire for students in secondary school. *Journal of School Health, 77,* 75 – 79.

Bonica, C., Arnold, D., Fisher, P., Zeljo, A., & Yershova, K. (2003). Relational aggression, relational victimization and language development in preschoolers. *Social Development, 12,* 551-562.

Bowling, N., & Beehr, T. (2006). Workplace harassment from the victim's perspective: A theoretical model and meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 91,* 998-1012.

Butler, R. (1998). Determinants of help seeking: Relations between perceived reasons for classroom help-avoidance and help-seeking behaviors in an experimental context. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90,* 630-643.

Carney, A., & Merrell, K. (2001). Bullying in schools. *School Psychology International, 22,* 364-383.

Cathcart, R. (2008, January 10). MySpace is said to draw subpoena in hoax case. *New York Times.* Retrieved April 20, 2008, from http://www.nytimes.com/2008/01/10/us/10myspace.html?_r=1&ref=us&oref=slogin

Chappell, M., Casey, D., De La Cruz, C., Ferrell, J., Forman, J., Lipkin, R., et al. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. *Adolescence, 39*, 53-64.

Cole, J., Cornell, D., & Sheras, P. (2006). Identification of school bullies by survey method. *Professional School Counseling, 9*, 305 – 313

Colvin, G., Tobin, T., Beard, K., Hagan, S., & Sprague, J. (1998). The school bully: Assessing the program, developing interventions and future research directions. *Journal of Behavioral Education, 8*, 293-319.

Cowie, H., Naylor, Rivers, Smith, P., & Pereira. (2001). Measuring workplace bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 7*, 33-51.

Coyne, I., Craig, J., & Chong, P. (2004). Workplace bullying in a group context. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 32*, 301-317.

Coyne, S., Archer, J., & Elsea, M. (2006). We're not friends aymore! Unless… The frequency and harmfulness of indirect, relational and social aggression, 32, 294-307.

Crick, N. (1995). Relational aggression: The role of intent attribution, feelings of distress and provocation type. *Development and Psychopathology, 7*, 313-322.

Crick, N. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression and pro-social behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child Development 67*, 2317-2327.

Crick, N., & Bigbee, M. A. (1998) Relational and overt forms of peer victimization: A multi-informant approach. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 66*, 337-347.

Crick, N., Bigbee, M., & Howes, C. (1996). Gender differences in children's normative beliefs about aggression: How do I hurt thee? Let me count the ways. *Child Development, 67*, 1003 – 1014.

Crick, N., Casa, J., & Ku, H. (1999). Relational and physical forms of peer victimization in preschool. *Developmental Psychology, 35*, 376-385.

Crick, N., Casa, J., & Mosher, M. (1997). Relational and overt aggression in preschool. *Developmental Psychology, 33*, 579-588.

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

Crick, N. & Grotpeter, J. (1996). Children's treatment by peers: Victims of relational and overt aggression. *Development and Psychopathology, 8*, 367-380.

Crick, N. R., Grotpeter, J. K., Bigbee, M. A. (2002). Relationally and Physically Aggressive Children's Intent Attributions and Feelings of Distress for Relational and Instrument Peer Provocations. *Child Development, 73(4),* 1134-1142.

Crick, N., Nelson, D., Morales, J., Cullerton-Sen, C., Casas, J., & Hickman, S. (2001). Relational victimization in childhood and adolescence: I hurt you though the grapevine. In J. Jovones & S. Grahman (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: the plight of the vulnerable and victimized.* (pp. 106 - 214). New York, NY: Guiford Press.

Crick, N. R. & Werner, N. E. (1998). Response Decision Processes in Relational and Overt Aggression. *Child Development, 69(6),* 1630-1639**.**

Crothers, L., Field, J., & Kolbert, J. (2005). Navigating power, control and being nice: Aggression in adolescent girls' friendships. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 83*, 349 – 354.

Crothers, L., & Levinson, E. (2004). Assessment of bullying: A review of methods and instruments. *Journal of Counseling and Development, 82*, 496 – 503.

Cummings, E., Iannotti, R., & Zahn-Waxler, C. (1989). Aggression between peers in early childhood: Individual continuity and developmental change. *Child Development, 60*, 887-895.

Edwards, R. (2000). An investigation of upper primary students' understanding and use of anti-bullying strategies. Paper presented at the Australian Association for Research in Education, Sidney, Australia, July.

Erdley, C., & Asher, S. (1996). Children's social goals and self-efficacy perceptions as influences on their responses to ambiguous provocation. *Child Development, 67*, 1329-1344.

Eslea, M. (2001, March). School bullying: Severity, distress and coping. Paper presented at the British Psychological Society Centenary Annual Conference, SECC, Glasgow, 28-31 March.

Eslea, M. & Rees, J. (2001). At what age are children most likely to be bullied at school? *Aggressive Behavior, 27*, 419-429.

Eslea, M., & Smith, P. (1994, June). Developmental trends in attitudes to bullying. Poster session presented to the thirteenth biennial meetings of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Free University, Amsterdam.

Fagot, B., & Hagan, R. (1985). Aggression in toddlers: Responses to the assertive acts of boys and girls. *Sex Roles, 12*, 341-351.

Forrest, S., Eatough, V., & Shevlin, M. (2005). Measuring adult indirect aggression: the development and psychometric assessment of the indirect aggression scales. *Aggressive Behavior, 31,* 84-97.

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

Fox, S., & Stallworth, L. (2005). Racial/ethnic bullying: Exploring links between bullying and racism in the US workplace. *Journal of Vocational Behavior, 66,* 438-456.

French, D., Jansen, E., & Pidada, S. (2002). United States and Indonesian children's and adolescents' reports of relational aggression by disliked peers. *Child Development, 73*(2), 1143-1150.

Galen, B., & Underwood, M. (1997). A developmental investigation of social aggression among children. *Developmental Psychology, 33,* 589-601.

Gardner, H. (2006). *Multiple intelligences: New horizons in theory and practice.* New York, NY: Basic Books.

Glendinning, P. (2001). Workplace bullying: Curing the cancer of the American workplace. *Public Personnel Management, 30,* 269-286

Glover, D., Gough, G., Johnson, M., & Cartwright, N. (2000). Bullying in secondary schools. *Educational Research, 42,* 141-156.

Gould, M., Munfakh, J., Lubell, K., Klienman, M., & Parker, S. (2002). Seeking help from the Internet during adolescence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 41,* 1182-1190.

Greene, R., & Ollendick, T. (1993). Evaluation of a multidimensional program for sixth graders in transition from elementary to middle school. *Journal of Community Psychology, 21,* 162-176.

Gropper, N., & Froschl, M. (2000). The role of gender in young children's teasing and bullying behavior. *Equity and Excellence in Education, 33,* 48-56.

Grotpeter, J., & Crick, N. (1996). Relational aggression, overt aggression and friendship. *Child Development, 67,* 2328-2338.

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

Hawkins, L., & Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer interventions in Bullying. *Social Development, 10,* 512-527.

Hazler, R., Miller, D., Carney, J., & Green, S. (2001). Adult recognition of school bullying situations. *Educational Research, 43*, 133-146.

Herrmann, D., & McWhirter, J. (2003). Anger and aggression management on young adolescents: An experimental validation of the SCARE program. *Education and Treatment of Children, 26*, 273-302.

Hunter, S., & Boyle, J. (2004). Appraisal and coping strategy use in victims of school bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychological, 74*, 83-107.

Hunter, S., Boyle, J., & Warden, D. (2004). Help seeking amongst child and adolescent victims of peer-aggression and bullying: The influence of school stage, gender, victimization appraisal and emotion. *British Journal of Educational Psychological, 74*, 375-390.

Jahnke, K. (1998.) Anger management programs for children and teens: A review of eleven anger management programs. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the National Association of School Psychologist, Orlando, Florida, 14-18 April.

Jennifer, D., Cowie, H., & Ananiadou, K. (2003). Perceptions and experience of workplace bullying in five different working populations. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 489-496.

Jones, S., Buckner, B., & Lembeck, M. (1996). The one with the two bullies. In K. Bright, M. Kauffman & D. Crane, *Friends*. California: Warner Brothers Televsion.

Kauiainen, A., Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., Österman, K., Salmivalli, C., Rothberg, S., et al. (1999). The relationships between social intelligence, empathy and three types of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 25*, 81-89.

Kauiainen, A., Salmivalli, C., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., Lahtinen, A., Kostasmo, A., et al. (2001). Overt and covert aggression in work settings in relation to the Subjective well-being of employees. *Aggressive Behavior, 27*, 360-371.

Kochenderfer, B. J., & Ladd, G. W. (1996). Peer victimization: cause or consequence of school maladjustment. *Child Development, 67*, 1305-1317.

Kochenderfer-Ladd, B., & Skinner, K. (2002). Children's coping strategies: Moderators of the effects of peer victimization? *Developmental Psychology, 38*, 267-279.

Komives, S. R., & Woodward, D. B., Jr. (1996). *Student services: A handbook for the profession* (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Kristensin, S., & Smith, P. (2003). The use of coping strategies by Danish children classed as bullies, victims, bully/victims, and not involving, in response to different (hypothetical) types of bulling. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 44*, 479 – 488.

Lewis, S. (2006). Recognition of workplace bullying: A Qualitative study of women as targets in the public sector. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 16*, 119-135.

Loudin, J., Loukas, L., & Robinson, S. (2003). Relational aggression in college students: Examining the roles of social anxiety and empathy. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 430-439.

Martsh, M. (2005). A comparison of two group interventions for adolescent aggression: High process versus low process. *Research on Social Work, 15*, 8-18.

McEvoy, M., Estrem, T., Rodriguez, M. & Olson, M. (2003). Assessing relational and physical aggression among preschool children: Inter-method agreement. *Topics in Early Childhood Special Education 23*(2), 53-63.

McNeilly-Choque, M., Hart, C., Robinson, C. Nelson, L., & Olsen, M. (1996). Overt and relational aggression on the playground: Correspondence among different informants. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 11*, 47-67.

Mercy College. (2006, September). *2006 Annual report.* Dobbs Ferry, NY.

Moretti, M., Holland, R., & McKay, S. (2001). Self-other representations and relational and overt aggression in adolescent girls and boys. *Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 19*, 109-126.

Moritz, N., & Kumble, J. (1999). *Cruel intentions*. Unites States: Columbia Picture Corporation.

Namie, G. (2003, October). *2003 Report on Abusive Workplaces*. Retrieved October 20, 2006, from the Workplace Bullying and Trauma Institute site: http://www.bullyinginstitute.org/res/2003results.pdf

Namie, G. (2007, September). U.S. Workplace Bullying Survey. Retrieved March 17, 2008, from the Workplace Bullying Institute site: http://bullyinginstitute.org/zogby2007/wbi-zogby2007.html

National Center for Education Statistics. (2006). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2006.* (NCES 2007-003). Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Education.

National Institute of Health. (2001, April). *Bullying widespread in U.S. schools, survey finds*. Retrieved March 17, 2008, from http://www.nih.gov/news/pr/apr2001/nichd-24.htm

Newman, R. (2003). When elementary school students are harassed by peers: A self-regulative perspective on help seeking. *The Elementary School Journal, 4*, 339-355.

Newman, R., Murray, B., & Lussier, C. (2001). Confrontation with aggressive peers at school: Students' reluctance to seek help from the teacher. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 93*, 398-410.

Nicholas, J., Oliver, K., Lee, K., & O'Brien, M. (2004). Help-seeking behavior and the Internet: An investigation among Australian adolescents. *Australian e-Journal for the Advancement of Mental Health, 3,* 1-7.

Ólafsson, R., & Jóhannsdóttir, H. (2004). Coping with bullying in the workplace: The effect of gender, age and type of bullying. *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 32,* 319-333.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school*. Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bullying/Victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In D. Pepler & K. Rubin (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression* (pp. 411-448). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Österman, K., Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., Kauiainen, A., Landau, S., Frączek, A., et al. (1998). Cross-cultural evidence of female indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behavior, 24,* 1-8.

Ostrov, J., & Keating, C. (2004). Gender differences in preschool aggression during free play and structured interactions: An observational study. *Social Development, 13,* 255-278.

Ostrov, J., Woods, K., Jansen, E., Casas, J., & Crick, N. (2004). An observational study of delivered and received aggression, gender and social-psychological adjustment in preschool: "This white crayon doesn't work…" *Early Childhood Research Quarterly, 19,* 355-371.

Owens, L., Shute, R., & Slee, P. (2000a). "Guess what I just Heard?": Indirect aggression among teenage girls in Australia. *Aggressive Behavior, 26,* 67-83.

Owens, L., Shute, R., & Slee, P. (2000b). "I'm in and you're out": Explanations for teenage girls' indirect aggression. *Psychology, Evolution & Gender, 2.1,* 19-46.

Owens, L., Slee, P., & Shute, R. (2000). "It hurts a hell of a lot'": The effects if indirect aggression on teenage girls. *School Psychology International, 21,* 359 – 376.

Pellegrini, A. (2001). Sampling instances of victimization in middle school: A methodological comparison. In J. Jovones & S. Grahman (Eds.), *Peer harassment in school: the plight of the vulnerable and victimized.* (pp. 125-144). New York, NY: Guiford Press

Pellegrini, A., & Bartini, M. (2000). An empirical comparison of methods of sampling aggression and victimization in school settings. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 92,* 360-366.

Petrie, D, & Contner, J. (1991). The initiative. In J. Whedon, *Buffy the vampire slayer*. California: Twentieth Century Fox Corporation.

Phelps, C. (2001). Children's response to overt and relational aggression. *Journal of Clinical Psychology, 30*(1), 240-252.

Pressley, M., & McCormick, C. (1995). Advanced educational psychology for educators, researchers and policymakers. New York, NY: Harper Collins College Publishers

Prinstein. M., Boergers, J., & Vernberg, E. (2001). Overt and relational aggression in adolescents: Social-psychological adjustments of aggressors and victims. *Journal of Clinical Child Psychology, 30*(4), 479-491.

Raskauskas, J., & Stoltz, A. (2004). Identifying and intervening in relational aggression. *The Journal of School Nursing, 20*, 209 – 215.

Rayner, C. (1997). The incidence of workplace bullying. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 7*, 199-208.

Rayner, C., & Hoel, H. (1997). A summary review of literature relating to workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology, 7*, 181-191.

Reid, P., Monsen, J., & Rivers, I. (2004). Psychology's contribution to understanding and managing bullying within schools. *Educational Psychology in Practice, 20*, 241-258.

Remillard, A., & Lamb, S. (2005). Adolescent girls' coping with relational aggression. *Sex Roles, 53*, 221-229.

Russell, A., & Owens, L. (1999). Peer estimates of school aged boys' and girls' aggression to same and cross sex targets. *Social Development, 8*(3), 364-379.

Ryan, A., Gheen, M., Midgley, C. (1998). Why do some students avoid asking for help? An examination of the interplay among students' academic efficacy, teachers' social-emotional role and the classroom goal structure. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 90*, 528-535.

Salin, D. (2001). Prevalence and forms of bully gin among business professionals: A comparison of two different strategies for measuring bullying. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 10*, 425-441.

Schacter, D. L. (1999). The seven sins of memory: Insights from psychology and cognitive neuroscience. *American Psychology, 54*, 182-203

Schuster, B. (1996). Rejection, exclusion and harassment at work and in schools: An integration of results from research on mobbing, bullying and peer rejection. *European Psychologist, 1*, 293-317.

Shariff, S., & Gouin, R. (2005). Cyber-dilemmas: Gendered hierarchies, free expressions and cyber safety in schools. Paper presented at Oxford Internet Institute, Oxford University, U.K. International Conference on Cyber-Safety.

Simmons, R. (2002). *Odd girl out: The hidden culture of aggression in girls*. New York, NY: Harcourt.

Smith, P. (2004). Bullying: Recent developments. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health, 9*, 98-103.

Smith, P., Singer, M., Hoel, H, & Cooper, C. (2003). Victimization in the school and the workplace: Are there any links? *British Journal of Psychology, 94*, 175-188.

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

Soutter, A., & McKenzie, A. (2000). The use and effects of anti-bullying and anti-harassment policies in Australian schools, 21, 96-106.

Stevens, V., Bourdeaudhuij, I., & Van Oost, P. (2001). Anti-bullying interventions at school: Aspects of programme adaptation and critical issues for further programme development. *Health Promotion International, 16,* 155-167.

Storch, E., Bagner, D., Geffken, G., & Baumeister, A. (2004). Association between overt and relational aggression and psychosocial adjustment in undergraduate college students. *Violence and Victims, 19*, 689-700.

Storch, E., Werner, N., & Storch, J. (2003). Relational aggression and psychosocial adjustment in intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior, 26*, 155-168.

Swearer, S., Grills, A., Haye, K., & Cary, P. (2004). Internalizing problems in students involved in bullying and victimization: Implications for intervention. In D. Espelage & S. Swearer, (Eds.), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention.* (pp. 63-83). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Tehrani, N. (2004). Bullying: A source of chronic post traumatic stress? *British Journal of Guidance & Counseling, 32*, 357 – 366

Thompson, R., & Bridges, J. (1973). *The paper chase*. United States: Twentieth Century Fox.

Tomada, G., & Schneider, B. (1997). Relational aggression, gender and peer acceptance: Invariance across culture, stability over time and concordance among informants. *Developmental Psychology, 33*(4), 601-609.

Tremblay, R., Japel, C., Perusse, D., McDuff, P., Boivin, M., Zoccolillo, M., et. al. (1999). The search for the age of 'onset' of physical aggression: Rousseau and Bandura revisited. *Criminal Behavior & Mental Health, 9*, 8-23.

Underwood, M., Galen, B., & Pauette J. (2001). Top ten challenges for understanding gender and aggression in children: Why can't we all just get along? *Social Development, 10*, 248-266.

U.S. National Institute of Health, National Institute of Mental Health. (2010). *Effectiveness of treatment for relational aggression in urban African American girls*. (Clinicaltrials.gov Identifier No. NCT00510094). Retrieved from http://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00510094?recr=Open&cond=%22Aggression%22&rank=3

Unnever, J., & Cornall, D. (2004). Middle school victims of bullying: Who reports being bullied? *Aggressive Behavior, 30*, 373-388.

Werner, N., & Crick, N. (1999). Relational aggression and social-psychological adjustment in a college sample. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 108*, 615-624.

Westchester.com. (2006, March 9). *County to Hold Summit on Youth Violence and Gangs.* Retrieved August 22, 2006 from http://westchester.com/Westchester_News/Westchester_Government_and_Politics/County_To_Hold_Summit_On_Youth_Violence_%26_Gangs_200603096334.html

Westchester Government. (n.d.) *Youth violence summit.* Retrieved August 22, 2006, from http://www.westchestergov.com/gangprevention/

White, J. (2001). Aggression and gender. In J. Worell (Ed.), *Sex similarities and differences and the impact of society on gender* (pp. 81-93). New York, NY: Academic Press.

Young, E., Boye, A., & Nelson, D. (2006). Relational aggression: Understanding, identifying and responding in schools. *Psychology in the Schools, 43*, 297 – 312.