AN EXAMINATION OF BULLYING FROM A GROUP-DYNAMIC PERSPECTIVE: THE THIRD PARTY ROLE OF PEERS IN BULLYING INCIDENTS

by

Jo-Anne Elizabeth McKinnon

A thesis

presented to the University of Waterloo

in fulfilment of the

thesis requirement for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

Waterloo, Ontario, Canada, 2001

The University of Waterloo requires the signatures of all persons using or photocopying this thesis. Please sign below, and give address and date.

ABSTRACT

The main objective of this study was to demonstrate that there are multiple roles involved in bullying episodes. It was hypothesized that a bully/victim episode comprises of five distinct groups of children: *bullies*, *victims*, *guardians*, *henchmen* or *accomplices*, and *active bystanders*. The second objective of the present research was to examine children's social alliances within the classroom by investigating the classroom social networks and to explain how these social networks are related to bullying. It was hypothesized that bullies will belong to social groups and *victims* will not. In addition, bullies are hypothesized to have nuclear centrality (very prominent) within their respective social groups, whereas, active bystanders and henchmen will have secondary or peripheral social centrality within the same social group. A final objective of this study was to analyze children's episodic account of an actual bully/victim incident. One hundred and fifty-three children (82 females, 71 males; M= 11.1 years and M= 11.2 years, respectively) participated in a structured child-researcher interview. During this interview children were asked to nominate classmates who were *bullies*, *victims*, *guardians*, *henchmen*, and *active bystanders*. Furthermore, children were asked to describe the classroom social network. Finally, children were asked to narrate their personal experiences with bullying by describing a specific bully-victim episode. Descriptive analyses of the peer nominations revealed that 92% of the children identified *bullies*, 97% identified *victims*, 92% nominated *henchmen*, and 97% nominated *active bystanders*. Moreover, the quality

of the bully/victim episode was modified by peer participation, children reported more negativity surrounding the bullying incident when *henchmen* were involved. Social network analyses revealed that *nuclear-nuclear* children (children who belong to prominent classroom social groups and were prominent members of their respective groups) received significantly more Bully and Guardian nominations compared to *secondary* children (e.g., children who did not belong to prominent classroom social groups and were prominent members of their respective social groups). Furthermore, *nuclear-secondary* children (children who belong to prominent classroom groups and possessed a less prominent membership to their respective groups) received significantly more Active Bystander peer nominations compared to other children. In contrast, *isolates* (children who did not belong to a classroom social group) received more Victim peer nominations compared to other children. These research findings provide evidence that classroom social groups and children's respective social network centrality play a role in abetting the power imbalance inherent in bullying episodes. Finally, the examination of children's bullying narratives contributed to the validity and the necessity of examining particular roles children assume when confronted with bullying in their environments. The results reported herein highlight the social nature of bullying and the examination of children's narratives provided an alternate method of studying bully/victim incidents.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I wish to express my sincere gratitude to Dr. Hildy Ross and Dr. Al Cheyne who served as my co-advisors throughout the writing of this dissertation. Thanks are extended for their patience, guidance and advice. Additionally, I would like to thank Dr. Mark Zanna for his insightful comments when editing this dissertation. Moreover, a special thanks to the children and parents who consented to participate in this research study. Without their support, the creation of this dissertation would not be possible. The teachers and staff at the three schools in the Waterloo County Board of Education also deserve positive recognition.

In addition, I would like to thank my research assistants, Alice Rushing, Tonya Beveridge, and Michelle Mahaffy, for their significant involvement in the transcribing and of the coding of the children's narratives. Their hours of commitment and their helpful suggestions throughout the reliability process were important in the production of this dissertation.

I would also like to thank Dr. Deb Pepler for her presentation at the graduate Developmental Seminar. Dr. Pepler's scholarly research on children's bullying and peer victimization inspired the research ideas necessary for the development and completion of this dissertation.

Furthermore, I wish to thank my mom and my sisters, Carolyn and Charlene, who taught me to never to give up on my dreams and never settle for second-best. I

would like to thank Donald for his encouragement and financial support. Finally, and most importantly, I would like to express my gratitude to James, my son, for his optimism, smiles, positive affirmations and hugs just when I needed them. James provided an invaluable *child's eye* view throughout the completion of my developmental research studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

AN EXAMINATION OF BULLYING FROM A GROUP-DYNAMIC PERSPECTIVE: THE THIRD PARTY ROLE OF PEERS IN BULLYING INCIDENTS

"...Human beings by changing the inner attitudes of their minds, can change the outer aspects of their lives."

William James

Aggressive habits learned early in life create the foundations of later maladaptive behaviour (Coie & Dodge, 1998). Children's experiences within their families, peer groups, schools, and the broader community influence in the development and maintenance of aggressive behaviour patterns. One form of childhood aggression that has become an increasing concern is the phenomenon of *bullying*. Studies in the US, Australia, England, Canada, and Scandinavia found that 10% - 23% of children are involved as bullies or victims or both in bullying episodes (Olweus, 1993a; Pepler, Craig, Ziegler, & Charach, 1993; Perry, Kusel, & Perry, 1988; Rigby & Slee, 1991; Sharp & Smith, 1993; Slee, 1993; Whitney & Smith, 1993). Researchers have reported that victims suffer physical and psychological abuse (Craig, 1995; Crick & Bigbee, 1995; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Hodges, Malone, & Perry, 1995; Olweus, 1993b; Slee & Rigby, 1993). Bullying can erode the victim's confidence and destroy all enjoyment in life. In fact, many adolescent suicides and violent deaths are presumed to have occurred as a direct result of severe

victimization (Olweus, 1993b). Moreover, bullies are 'at risk' for later maladjustment: longitudinal studies have consistently documented that childhood aggression is associated with adult antisocial behaviour (Huesmann, Eron, Lefkowitz, & Walder, 1984; Pepler & Rubin, 1991). Finally, bullying may have a negative impact on the peer group. Researchers have reported that observing conflict or witnessing bullying can increase children's anxiety and distress (El-Sheik, Cummings, & Goethch, 1989; Pepler, et al., 1993).

Given the important and detrimental effects peer victimization can have on children's socioemotional development, the present research study was designed to examine children's bullying behaviours within the peer context. This study will examine children's bullying behaviours using a group-oriented perspective, which takes into consideration the underlying peer processes that are involved in bully/victim episodes. That is, this study will examine the multiple roles involved in bullying and peer victimization. It is hypothesized that a bully/victim episode is comprised of five distinct groups of children: *bullies, henchmen or accomplices, guardians, active bystanders,* and *victims*. Consequently, the primary objective of this study is to examine the peer dynamics (e.g., the alliances and interactions between children) of bully/victim episodes. In addition, an examination of how children function as elicitors and reinforcers of bullying behaviour will contribute to, and extend, current knowledge and understanding of children's bullying and socioemotional development.

Recently, a Bullying Survey conducted in the Toronto schools, indicated that bullying is a pervasive problem: 15% of the students acknowledged bullying others more than once or twice during the school term (Pepler, et al., 1993). Furthermore, naturalistic observations of children on the school playground have indicated that bullying occurs frequently. Despite the fact that bullying was found to be a problem, teachers and other children intervene very infrequently to help victims (in 4% and 11% of the episodes, respectively, Craig & Pepler, 1995). Therefore, it appears that the behaviours of bullies, victims, and their peers exist within the wider system of the school context in which teachers are unaware of the extent of the bullying problems and children are unsure about whether or how to intervene. Therefore, given the negative consequences associated with childhood bullying, it is important to examine children's ideas, attitudes, and experiences of bullying and victimization.

It is evident that children's peer relationships continue to play an integral role in healthy social and emotional development (Parker, Rubin, Price, & DeRosier, 1995). Experiences with peers directly promote, extend, discourage, and distort children's interpersonal and intrapersonal growth and adjustment. Thus, in recent years, there has been increased research interest in understanding bullying and peer victimization (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Olweus, 1991, 1993; Pepler, et al, 1993; Perry, et al., 1988; Rigby & Slee, 1991; Sharp & Smith, 1993). This reflects the belief that children who experience peer difficulties, such as bullying and peer victimization, are "at risk" for maladaptive outcomes. Accordingly, the study of

bullying and peer victimization during the middle childhood years can contribute to, and extend, current knowledge and understanding of children's socioemotional development.

Researchers have considered the period of middle to late childhood (6 years to 13 or 14 years) as a time marked by many changes in the development of children's interpersonal skills and in the context and quality of children's peer relationships (Hartup, 1983; Parker, et al., 1995). There is an increase in children's exposure to peers (e.g., entry into the formal school system). Children are likely to have interactions with many new children who have diverse characteristics, personalities, and social backgrounds (e.g., race, ethnicity, and religion). Furthermore, during middle childhood, children's peer interactions become more sex-segregated and established around formal organized activities (e.g., sports, Cubs/Scouts) compared to the preschool years (Hartup, 1996; Higgins & Parsons, 1983). These peer activities entail greater divisions of social roles, cooperation, and leadership. Hence, these developmental changes that occur within the peer context during the middle childhood years provide children with many social opportunities to bully and victimize others.

Moreover, children's aggressive behaviour changes during the middle childhood years. Relative to early childhood, direct physical forms of aggression decrease and are replaced by verbal forms of aggression (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992; Rivers & Smith, 1994; Olweus, 1993a; Parke & Slaby, 1983). At

the same time, children's aggression becomes less instrumental in nature (directed toward possessing desired objects) and more hostile toward others. Given that bullying is considered to be a form of person-oriented aggression (Price & Dodge, 1989), one would expect that bullying would be a common social problem for children during the middle childhood years.

Friendship and Peer Relations

Changes in children's social-cognitive abilities occur during the middle childhood years (e.g., perspective-taking skills) and these increased abilities enable children to build intimate relationships with their peers (Selman, 1980; Selman & Schultz, 1990). With the development of advanced perspective-taking skills, children develop reciprocated friendships with peers and begin to appreciate thoughts and feelings of other children (Berndt, 1986; Epstein, 1989). Sullivan (1953) proposed that friendships are the source from which children develop a sense of equality, interpersonal sensitivity, intimacy, and mutual understanding. Children's friendships offer them the opportunity to participate in mutual, intimate, personal relationships. For example, children's friendships have been found to: (1) foster guidance and instrumental aid; (2) offer important sources of reliable alliance; (3) provide companionship and excitement; (4) influence the development of social perspective-taking skills and the acquisition of skills for cooperative exchange; and (5) offer a forum for the transmission of social norms and knowledge (Berndt, 1983; Berndt &

Perry, 1986; Bukowski & Hoza, 1989; Duck, 1983; Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; Hartup, 1996; Selman, 1981; Selman & Schultz, 1990). Thus, children's friendships are viewed as an extra-familial system that strengthens an individual's emotional security, companionship, and affection that can enhance children's socioemotional development from early childhood to late adolescence. However, experiences with bullying and peer victimization would disrupt the development of healthy children's peer relationships and may have an adverse effect on children's interpersonal success in future social relations.

Likewise, changes in social-cognitive skills may contribute to children's increased insecurity about their social position and acceptance among peers (Coie, Dodge, & Kupersmidt, 1990; Fine, 1987; Parker & Gottman, 1989). Parker and Gottman (1989) proposed that peer group acceptance is a salient social concern during middle childhood. Hence, some children may become involved in bullying and peer victimization in order to solidify their social status among their friends and remain members of the "*in*" peer group. Moreover, children may not intervene or prevent bully/victim episodes because of their increased concerns of social rejection. Finally, some children become the targets of peer bullying because they are disliked by their peers, they do not possess extensive social networks, and/or they do not have stable friendships.

Despite the fact that peers have significant impact on children's cognitive and emotional development, and the growth of interpersonal skills, little research has

investigated the influence of peer group on children's bullying behaviour. This is surprising considering that peers clearly influence children's aggressive behaviour (Bandura, 1973; Hall, 1973). Accordingly, one of the primary objectives of the present research study is to examine bullying from a group-oriented perspective. Thus, this study will investigate the peer processes (e.g., friendship status, group membership) involved in bullying and peer victimization episodes in order to examine if the presence of peers influences bullying behaviour.

Transactional theorists argue that children's socioemotional adjustment is influenced, in part, by children's interactions with their peers, problems in peer relationships, and children's negative self- and other-cognitions (Coie, 1990; Crick & Dodge, 1994; Rubin, LeMare, & Lollis, 1990; Rubin, Hymel, Mills, & Rose-Krasnor, 1991). Therefore, the child and the peer group are viewed as a dynamic, interactive system that changes over time. Important elements of the peer system have a reciprocal influence on children's thoughts of the self and others, the child's behaviour toward peers, and the peer group's collective appraisal of and behaviour toward the child. Hence, the present study will contribute to the literature by examining the dynamic peer processes involved in children's bullying behaviours.

Theoretical Models of Childhood Aggression

Given the fact that bullying behaviours are considered a subclass of aggressive behaviours, it is important to discuss the various theoretical explanations for the

etiology and maintenance of aggression in children. Specifically, this study will focus on social-cognitive models of aggression.

Social-Cognitive Perspectives. Social-cognitive theorists have investigated the various ways in which cognitive factors relate to childhood social interaction and hence, aggression (Dodge, 1986; Parker & Gottman, 1989; Price & Dodge, 1989; Rubin & Krasnor, 1986; Rubin & Rose-Krasnor, 1992). Children and their friends develop ideas about and perceptions of one another that influence their behavioural responses toward each other. Furthermore, these ideas about and perceptions of one another determine the direction of their relationships. Cognitive factors relating to aggression are hypothesized to: (a) influence children's cognitions about themselves and their social situations (Harter, 1982; Hymel & Franke, 1985; Ladd & Price, 1986; Rubin & Krasnor, 1986), (b) influence the children's characteristic behaviours toward peers (Dodge, 1986; Rubin & Daniels-Bierness, 1983), (c) mediate children's aggressive responses to particular social experiences (Dodge, 1980, 1986; Rubin, Bream, & Rose-Krasnor, 1991), (d) influence peer group attitudes and behaviours toward aggressive children (Dodge, 1986) and (e) account for individual continuities and consistencies in patterns of aggression, victimization, and bystander support for aggression. Though sharing a common set of principles, overlapping social-cognitive models have not yet been integrated into a single theory.

Social-cognitive models have been informative in understanding children's aggressive behaviour. The following paragraphs contain brief descriptions of the

various social-cognitive models that have been used to investigate children's aggression. Hence, these models provide a theoretical basis for examining and understanding the social-cognitive factors that contribute to children's bullying and peer victimization behaviours.

Social information-processing model. The social information-processing model of aggression proposed by Dodge (1980, 1986, 1991) states that cognitive deficiencies and/or hostile biases are shown by aggressive children in social problem-solving situations. There is a five-stage sequence of information-processing involved in social problem-solving situations: (a) the *encoding* of social cues, (b) the *mental representation* of encoded cues, (c) the *assessing the present dilemma and generation* of potential responses, (d) the *evaluation and selection* of responses, and (e) the *enactment* of the chosen response. For example, at the encoding stage aggressive children have been found to: (a) attend to fewer and/or inappropriate cues than do nonaggressive children, (b) attend primarily to hostile social cues within their environment, and (c) misinterpret the intentions and thoughts of others in their social environment (Dodge, 1980, 1986; 1991).

At the stage of mental representation, aggressive children may have difficulty with affective and social perspective-taking. For example, researchers have demonstrated that when children are confronted with negative circumstances and the perpetrators' intentions are ambiguous, aggressive children are more likely to believe that ambiguously motivated provocations as acts of deliberate hostility (Dodge, 1986;

Dodge, 1991). One consequence of aggressive children's biased perceptions is the fact they are more likely to react to ambiguous social situations with anger and hostility. Similarly, nonaggressive children attribute hostile intentions to aggressive children, even if the intent of the perpetrator is ambiguous (Dodge & Frame, 1982; Dodge, 1991). Similar differences between aggressive and nonaggressive children have been hypothesized and empirically supported at each of the remaining steps (Dodge, 1986; Crick & Dodge, 1994).

In addition, Dodge (1991) proposed that there are two types of aggression: *reactive* and *proactive*. Thus, researchers can differentiate between aggressive children who react to others in an angry, volatile manner (reactive) from aggressive children who use aggression proactively against other children to achieve their social goals (proactive). Research has shown that misinterpretations of the others' intent are more likely to occur among boys who display reactive aggression in their interaction with their peers. In contrast, proactively aggressive boys (e.g., bullies) are less likely to misread a partner's social intentions (Dodge & Coie, 1987). Hence, social-skills programs based on this model have been aimed at reducing or preventing aggression by enhancing aggressive children's social information-processing skills and challenging aggressive children's hostile biases (Pepler, King, & Byrd, 1991).

Social problem-solving model. The social problem-solving paradigm (Spivack & Shure, 1974; Rubin & Krasnor, 1983, 1986; Rubin & Rose-Krasnor, 1992) provides a framework for assessing the various cognitive processes children use when

they are in a problem-solving situation. Children's increased social understanding during middle childhood enhances their social problem-solving skills that, in turn, makes their peer relationships become more intimate and sophisticated. Rubin and Krasnor (1986) postulate that most peer social interchanges are automatic. Given this fact, these researchers have incorporated information-processing notions of *automaticity* and *scripts* into their processing model of social competence (Rubin & Coplan, 1992). Accordingly, when children are faced with a social dilemma (e.g., making new friends or acquiring a desired object), their patterns of thought follow a particular information-processing sequence. First, children select a particular *social goal*. These goals may include gaining attention from another child, acquiring information from another child, defense from others, acquiring possession of an object, and/or initiating social play. The social goal should reflect the children's mental representation of the desired social outcome of the problem-solving situation.

Second, children examine the *task environment* (i.e., the social context). Children's social goals and the strategies to achieve these goals are constrained somewhat by information the child integrates about the immediate environment. Children retrieve different strategies to meet given goals in different social contexts (Rubin & Krasnor, 1983). For example, boys and girls produce different strategic responses to a social dilemma when in the company of same-sex as opposed to opposite-sex peers.

Third, children *access and select strategies* that help them to attain their social goals. Rubin and Krasnor (1986) indicated that there are several ways that strategies to social problems are chosen. If a social script is available in the child's cognitive repertoire, strategy retrieval and selection are relatively automatic processes. However, if a social script if not available, children begin a conscious process of generating and evaluating each available social problem-solving strategy stored in their long-term memory.

Fourth, given that an appropriate strategy has been selected, children must *implement the strategy* in the social problem-solving process. Hence, in a given problem-solving situation, children implement the selected social strategy to attain their desired social goals.

Finally, children *evaluate the outcome of the chosen strategy*. Children assess the task environment in order to assess the relative success of the problem-solving situation. Children examine whether or not the original social goal was achieved. If the social strategy and outcome are judged by children to be successful, children stop the problem-solving process.

However, if children judge the social interchange to have failed, there are three general options that may be available to them. First, children may stop the social problem-solving sequence and the social goal remains unattained. A new or modified social goal may be chosen and the sequence of information processing will start again. Second, children may choose to repeat the original strategy. Third,

children may choose to modify the original strategy while maintaining the same social goal.

Empirical evidence suggests that aggressive children exhibit cognitive deficits in their ability to solve hypothetical social-problem dilemmas (Rubin & Coplan, 1992). Aggressive children are capable of generating the same number of strategies as social peers; however, aggressive children's strategies were more agonistic in nature (Rubin & Daniels-Bierness, 1983). For example, aggressive children are less likely than nonaggressive peers to suggest prosocial strategies to solve their social problems and more likely to suggest bribery as resolutions to object acquisition dilemmas. Furthermore, aggressive children are more likely than nonaggressive children: (a) to choose inappropriate social goals, (b) to misinterpret the intentions of other children, (c) to suggest aggressive or unskilled social strategies to deal with their interpersonal dilemmas, and (d) demonstrate inflexibility when confronted with initial failure (Rubin & Krasnor, 1986).

Cognitive mediators model. The cognitive mediators paradigm (Slaby & Guerra, 1988), also known as the *"habits of thought"* model, has presented a framework for assessing and changing: (a) children's content of thought (in the form of generalized beliefs that support the use of aggression), (b) children's processes of thought (social problem-solving skills), and (c) children's style of thought (impulsive or reflective processing of content). For example, research has indicated that changing incarcerated adolescent offenders' *habits of thought* concerning violence

was conducive in reducing future aggressive behaviours (Guerra & Slaby, 1990). In addition, this type of intervention has been practiced to alter positive aggressive patterns of thought that place individuals at risk for involvement with violence and criminal activity (Slaby, 1989).

Cognitive social learning mediators model. The cognitive social learning mediators paradigm (Perry, Perry, & Ramussen, 1986) is an extension of earlier social learning theory (see Bandura, 1973, 1986) to include assessment of children's expectations and reliance that their own aggressive behaviour will lead to favorable outcomes. Perry and his colleagues (1986) have found that aggressive children were more likely than nonaggressive children to report that aggression leads to substantial rewards and is successful in terminating others' abusive behaviour. Therefore, aggressive children believe that the use of aggression is very effective and successful way to solve social problems. Compared to nonaggressive children, aggressive children place more importance on achieving control over their victim and place less value on suffering by the victims of aggression, retaliation by the victim, peer rejection, and negative self-evaluation (Boldizar, Perry, & Perry, 1989; Perry, Williard, & Perry, 1990; Slaby & Guerra, 1988). Slaby and Guerra (1988) found that aggressive adolescents were more likely than nonaggressive peers to believe that aggression bolsters one's self-esteem. This research suggests that aggressive children minimize the harmful and punitive consequences of aggression compared to nonaggressive peers.

Cognitive mediators help aggressive children to perceive their social world as hostile and uncaring; thus, enabling them to react with angry, aggressive thoughts. Such antagonistic perceptions influence children's antisocial behaviour and over time, become entrenched within their thoughts (Slaby & Roedell, 1982). Children who possess aggressive social-cognitive thoughts may actively evoke coercive and aggressive interactions from the individuals within their social environment (Dishion, Patterson, & Griesler, 1994; Patterson, Capaldi, & Bank, 1991).

Interpersonal understanding. Current knowledge of interpersonal understanding (Selman, 1980; Selman & Schultz, 1990) provides a developmental framework by which we can explain the ways children's *perspective-taking abilities* influence their understanding of friendship and conflict. Interpersonal negotiation strategies are characterized corresponding to the perspective-taking level they reflect, beginning with an egocentric and undifferentiated perspective and maturing to a highly differentiated and integrated organization of social perspectives. For example, the individual messages that children apply to aggressive behaviour have been characterized as maturing through several developmental levels of interpersonal understanding: *impulsive*, *impersonal rule-based*, *personal rule-based*, *impersonal need-based* (isolated), *personal need-based* (integrated), and *insightful*. Research has indicated that aggressive children's strategies were more represented at lower developmental levels (impulsive, impersonal rule-based) compared to nonaggressive children.

Summary. At birth, children have a particular set of traits and abilities that develop and change within the family and peer surroundings. Through their personal experiences within these environments, children develop fundamental cognitive mediators for social interactions. As described above, these cognitive mediators include: (a) strategies for solving social problems, (b) beliefs that support aggression, (c) hostile attributional biases, and (d) social scripts (e.g., Dodge, 1986; Huesmann, 1988; Huesmann & Eron, 1984; Perry, Willard, et al., 1990; Rubin & Krasnor, 1986; Slaby & Guerra, 1988). If aggressive children view their world as hostile, they are more likely to react with anger and aggression. Peers from their social worlds may respond in kind, thereby establishing coercive peer interaction patterns that persist across contexts and over time.

What is Bullying?

It has been suggested that, "a person is being bullied when he or she is exposed, repeatedly, and over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other persons" (Olweus, 1991, p.411). Negative actions may be physical or verbal behaviours with the intent to inflict injury or discomfort. It is not bullying when two children of about the same physical and psychological strength have the odd fight or quarrel. There has to be an imbalance of power and the victim finds it very difficult to defend himself or herself.

In addition, bullying has been described by researchers as a discrete subclass of aggressive behaviour, therefore not all aggressive acts can be classified as bullying behaviours (Craig & Pepler, 1995; Dodge & Coie, 1989; Schwartz, Dodge, & Coie, 1993). Dodge and Coie (1989) defined bullying as a person-directed subtype of aggression that is an *unprovoked aversive means of influencing or coercing another person*. According to these theorists, bullying can be distinguished from other forms of aggression (e.g., hostile or reactive aggression) by its coercive nature and by the absence of anger or frustration.

However, the present author would argue that the critical component of bullying is the *imbalance of power* (Olweus, 1993; Sharp & Smith, 1993). The child doing the bullying is generally thought of as being stronger; at least, the victim is not in a position to retaliate effectively. Furthermore, as mentioned previously, peers are involved in 85% of the bully/victim episodes (Pepler & Craig, 1995). Therefore, it is important to examine and explain the peer process involved in bullying episodes in order to enhance our understanding of why bullying occurs. Power imbalances can stem from alliance processes—i.e., bullies could have henchmen; or power imbalances can be disrupted if victims have guardians. That is, power imbalance can be created and power balance can be restored through the group and that is what makes it especially important to examine peer processes because there is more than one way to establish differential power, and having a peer on your side could be central to bullying.

Overt and Relational Bullying. There are two kinds of bullying: direct (overt) and indirect (relational). Direct bullying is easily observed and is characterized by overt physical or verbal attacks against the victim (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992). For example, direct bullying can involve physically hurting another child, teasing a child, or calling a child bad names. The second kind of bullying is indirect or relational and is not as easy to observe. Relational bullying involves using behaviours that harmfully manipulate a child's relationships with others and the result is social isolation and exclusion (Craig, 1995; Crick & Bigbee, 1995; Crick, Bigbee, & Howes, 1996; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995).

Social Cognitive Perspectives on Bullying

Despite the important influence of cognitive mediators on children's aggression, there has been very little study of the relation between children's social cognitive skills and bullying. Slee (1993) investigated the social-problem skills of *bullies* and *victims* (identified using self-report measures). Results from this study indicated bullies are more likely than other children to attribute aggressive behaviour in others to situational factors (something outside the child such as peer pressure). In contrast, victims attribute aggressive behaviour in others more equally to dispositional and situational factors. Bullies and victims produced fewer solutions to a hypothetical bullying story compared to other children. Finally, bullies were more concerned

about getting in trouble if they responded to aggression with aggression whereas victims feared retaliation from the aggressor.

One reason for this limitation is that the majority of research investigations on bullying have utilized children's self-reports (modified versions of the Bully/victim Questionnaire developed by Olweus, 1991) as the primary method of data collection (Boulton & Underwood, 1992; Olweus, 1991, 1993; Pepler, et al., 1993; Rigby & Slee, 1991; Sharp & Smith, 1991; Whitney & Smith, 1993). Also, researchers have focused on peer victimization and ignored the possibility that peer processes may have influenced children's bullying behaviours (Crick & Bigbee, 1995, Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Perry, et al., 1988; Perry, et al., 1990). Although these research studies have contributed significantly to our understanding of childhood bullying, research studies that provide more detailed analysis of bullying and its relation to broader peer relationships are warranted.

In several studies, researchers have conducted individual interviews to investigate the reasons why children engage in bullying and the psychological effects of being bullied (Boulton & Underwood, 1992; Madsen & Smith, 1994; Slee, 1993). Individual interviews can provide the researcher with valuable, *qualitative* information about bullying and peer victimization. The results from these investigations indicated that bullies (identified by peer ratings) were more likely than victims to report that children bully others because the bullies were provoked by other children (Boulton & Underwood, 1992). In contrast, most victims indicated that bullies pick on other

children because the victims are smaller than the bully and therefore, are unable to defend themselves.

Additionally, children, in general, indicated that the primary reasons for engaging in bullying and peer victimization were: (a) to seek pleasure, (b) to seek power, (c) to enhance self-esteem, (d) to gain respect from their peers, and (e) to express dislike for the victim (Madsen & Smith, 1994; Olweus, 1993a). Furthermore, older children reported that people bully other people in order to demonstrate and/or gain power over the victim, to raise their own self-esteem, and to increase their own social status (Madsen & Smith, 1994). These researchers did not distinguish between bullies, victims, and active bystanders. Finally, Gottheil (1995), investigated if bullies and victims (identified by peer ratings) differed in their patterns of use and receipt of physical aggression . Specifically, it was found that bullies were significantly more likely than victims to use aggression to solve their social conflicts. While on the contrary, victims were significantly more likely than control children to be the recipients of aggression during their conflict situations.

Given the limited research evidence on the reasons why children bully others, the present research study will extend this body of research by examining children's narratives about their personal experiences with bullying and peer victimization. Specifically, children's perceptions concerning *why children bully other children* and their *personal* bully/victim experiences will be investigated. Furthermore, children's self-reports of bullying (modified version of the Bully/Victim Questionnaire, Olweus,

1989), peer-nominated reports of bullying, and children's narratives will be utilized in the present research investigation. The present study will investigate children's (*bullies*, *henchmen or accomplices*, *victims*, *guardians,* and *active bystanders*) perceptions and attitudes concerning bullying and victimization.

Peer Influences and Aggression

Given that children's interactions with their peers play an important role in the development, maintenance, and modification of behaviour, it is important to examine the relation between peers and aggression. Peers are influential in the development of aggression by reinforcing aggressiveness, eliciting aggression, serving as targets of hostility, and serving as social models of aggression.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the impact of *peer models* on aggressive behaviours (see Parke & Slaby, 1983, for a review). For example, Bandura (1973) showed that children will imitate film-mediated aggressive peer and adult models. Furthermore, Hall (1973) demonstrated that boys will increase their aggressive behaviour when paired with an aggressive boy.

Peers can also serve as *reinforcing agents* for aggressive behaviour in others. Patterson, Littman, and Bricker (1967) investigated preschoolers' reactions to aggressive acts. These researchers indicated that one set of reactions made by children was thought to positively reinforce aggressiveness (e.g., passivity, crying, making defensive postures) and a second set of reactions made by children was

thought to be punishing (e.g., tattling, recovering property, and retaliation). Results demonstrated that when victims of aggression counterattacked, the aggressors changed their actions, their victims, or both. However, when victims reacted with defensiveness and crying, aggressors maintained or increased their aggression toward their victims in ensuing observations. In a recent study, Schwartz and his colleagues (1993) reported that boys who demonstrated submissive behaviours during initial interactions with peers were more likely to become frequent targets of peer aggression. The research studies illustrate that the victim's behavioural responses (e.g., retaliation, submissiveness) to peer aggressive acts will increase the occurrence of peer aggressive acts.

Peers not only reinforce aggressive behaviour but there is evidence indicating that nonaggressive children may learn to behave aggressively within the peer context, particularly if they are frequently attacked. In the Patterson et al. (1967) study, children who were victimized by peers were provided with many opportunities to counterattack their aggressors. After experiencing frequent attacks, nonaggressors often counterattacked. As a result, the number of future attacks against them decreased. However, if nonaggressors did not counterattack, the attacks made by others increased. These studies suggest that peer or victim reactions are important mediators of children's aggressive attacks and children may use aggressive behaviour as a protective means from being further victimized.

Peers can function to either maintain, increase, or inhibit aggressive behaviour, not only through direct interaction but also by setting standards that relate to the acceptability of aggressive behaviour. Numerous studies have demonstrated that aggressive behaviour is positively associated with social rejection by peers (Coie & Kupersmidt, 1983; Dodge, 1983; Dodge, Coie, & Brakke, 1982; Rubin, Chen, & Hymel, 1993; Rubin, Hymel, LeMare, & Rowden, 1989; Rubin & Coplan, 1992). Furthermore, aggressive children who are rejected from the broader peer group, begin to associate with other aggressive or rejected children (Cairns, Cairns, Neckerman, Gest, & Gariepy, 1989). Therefore, these children may develop bullying behaviours and attitudes and hence, become allied with bullies. Interactions with deviant peer groups maintain and reinforce children's aggressive behaviours. Furthermore, children's involvement in deviant peer groups limits their opportunities to acquire nondeviant, prosocial behaviours.

Peer Influences and Bullying. As described earlier, bullying can be conceptualized as dyadic- or group-oriented peer aggression (Coie & Christopoulos, 1990; Dodge, Price, Coie, & Christopoulos, 1990; Olweus, 1993a; Schwartz, et al., 1993). Early researchers who examined *mobbing* (i.e., group-oriented peer aggression directed at specific children) considered bullying to be an activity that involved multiple antagonists (Bjorkqvist, Ekman, & Lagerspetz, 1982; Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Berts, & King, 1982).

Contrary to the perspective of the present study, earlier researchers have viewed bullying from a strictly dyadic perspective. For example, Dodge and Coie (1989) suggested that bullying and victimization occur primarily within a particular dyadic relationship (i.e., bullying takes place between a dominant child and a subservient child). In addition, Schwartz and his colleagues (1993) concluded that peer victimization is generally dyadic although the individual bully/victim relationships may be influenced by the attitudes of the peer group as a whole. However, these researchers failed to investigate how the attitudes of the peer group influenced the bullying behaviour.

Researchers who conceptualize bullying only from a dyadic perspective and their research investigations represent important contributions to the literature on peer victimization. However, if we view bullying from a dyadic perspective, how can we distinguish these research studies from the multitude of research that have been conducted on children's aggression? The present author would argue that we can not. For example, researchers who use the dyadic perspective typically have peers identify *bullies* as children who "fight a lot or say mean things to other children or kick them" (Kupersmidt & Coie, 1990; Perry, et al., 1988; Perry, et al., 1990; Schwartz, et al., 1993). Albeit, these children may be nominated by their peers as bullies, however, using the dyadic-perspective neglects the fact that children's bullying behaviours typically occur within the larger peer context (Pepler & Craig, 1995). Thus, these researchers have failed to account for the underlying peer

processes that involved in bully/victim episodes. A detailed analysis of the various roles children play beyond the dominant bully and the subservient victim in bullying episodes is warranted.

Given the important peer influences on the development and maintenance of aggression it becomes equally important to understand the peer dynamics of bullying and victimization episodes. The group-oriented perspective led to the identification of five distinct active groups of children involved in bullying: (a) *bullies* - children who pick on, tease, and ridicule other children, (b) *henchmen or accomplices* - children who become allied with the bullies and victimize other children, (c) *guardians* - children who help the victim, (d) *active bystanders* - children who observe the bully/victim episode, and (e) *victims* - children who are bullied by other children. These labels refer to roles that children may frequently or habitually occupy. This does not imply that these roles are permanent and static. Children may in fact occupy different roles at different times depending upon local circumstances. Other investigators have identified similar, though not always identical bullying roles.

Recently, Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Osterman, and Kaukiainen (1996) investigated the participant roles in the bullying process among children aged 12-13 years old. These researchers developed a 49-item peer assessment questionnaire that depicts six participant roles inherent within a bullying episode: *victim*, *bully*, *assistant*, *reinforcer*, *outsider*, and *defender*. Children were asked to nominate classmates who behave in accordance to the behavioural descriptions

hypothesized for each bullying role. Their results indicated that children nominated twenty-three percent of the their classmates as *outsiders*, viewed nineteen percent of their classmates as *reinforcers*, and categorized seven percent of their classmates as *assistants* in grade six. In the eighth grade, children nominated thirty-two percent of their classmates as *outsiders*, viewed fifteen percent of their peers as the bully's *reinforcers*, and categorized eleven percent of the classmates as *assistants*. Only thirteen percent of children in the sixth grade and eight percent of children from the eighth grade did not possess a defined participant role in the bullying process. These researchers suggested that the majority of the children within the classroom behaved in ways that inflate the bullies' power and hence, contribute to the maintenance of the bullying problems within their school environment.

Similar distinctions among bullying roles were hypothesized in the present study. There were, however, important methodological differences between the current study and that of Salmivalli, et al. (1996). First, the present procedure was carried out as an individual interview rather than as a class-administered questionnaire. This allowed the researcher to assist the children if they were confused by the behavioural descriptions depicting each bullying role. Second, the children were presented with a class list and to nominate at least one classmate to each potential active role inherent with the bullying process. Third, single statement behavioural descriptions were used to identify the roles of children who participate in bully/victim episodes.

At a conceptual level it is argued that the role of the *outsider* (e.g., children who stay away and not take sides with anyone) is not an active participant role contained within the bullying process. Salmivalli et al. (1996) argued that these children silently condone the bullying behaviour by not instigating actions to counter or discourage the bullying. However, these children are not actively involved in the victimization of another child. It is important to distinguish between children who are simply uninvolved and children who are in the role of the *active bystander* (e.g., children who like to stand around and watch when someone is picking on another child; that is, when bullying is happening). These children silently give approval to the bullying behaviour of another child by watching and serving as an audience. Thus, the present study investigated this more active participation rather than the uninvolved *outsider*. Furthermore, in the present study children were asked to recall and describe an actual bully/victim episode between the nominated bully and the nominated victim. This was implemented to investigate the feelings, motivations, and experiences associated with each individual bullying role.

To date, there is no available research study that has examined the alliances and/or differences among these five groups of children. Consequently, the present study also placed the bullying process and participant roles in the larger context of peer groups. Given that peers contribute significantly to socialization of children's aggression (e.g., bullying), the second objective of this study is to investigate the role of more general peer processes and group structures in the bullying process. To this

end, the present research study investigated the alliances and interactions beyond the bullying context among the *bullies*, *henchmen*, *active bystanders*, *victims*, and *guardians* and examined their perceptions concerning bully/victim problems within their school environment. Furthermore, the examination of how peers function as elicitors and maintainers of bullying behaviour and the associations between bullying roles in the larger social network of peers will contribute to, and extend, current understanding of children's bullying and socioemotional development.

Social Networks

There are three dimensions of peer relations: group social status or popularity, friendships, and social networks or peer clique membership (Cairns & Cairns, 1994). Bukowski and Hoza (1989) pointed out that group membership is not the same as extended mutual friendship because some social groups include pairs of children that do not like each other. Moreover, one can be generally disliked by peers (rejected) and still have a mutual friendship (Parker & Asher, 1993). Likewise, Cairns, Cairns, Neckerman, Gest, and Gariepy (1988) have suggested, one can be rejected by some peers and still be a member of a peer clique or group. Such social groups may provide peer support for either prosocial or antisocial behaviours. Cairns and his colleagues (1988) found that aggressive children and adolescents were as likely to belong to a peer clique as nonaggressive peers were. Moreover, these researchers suggested the same might be said for rejected children.

Social groups can be defined as aggregates of individuals who form a relatively stable relationships in the context of a larger social network (Cairns, & Cairns, 1994). Whether these social groups are called *cliques, crowds, gangs, or social clusters*, children's informal peer groups are of theoretical interest. Investigators are converging on the idea that behavioural similarities among group members play a major role in children's socialization. Cairns and Cairns, et al. (1988) suggested that social groups in adolescence provide mutual support for both prosocial and antisocial behaviours and values. A similar argument was made by Patterson, Capaldi, and Bank (1991) when they hypothesized that deviant peer groups provide training in antisocial behaviour for children already disposed toward deviance by early experiences in coercive family systems. In addition, highly aggressive elementary boys with behavioural disorders tend to be members of peer groups characterized by high levels of antisocial behaviour and low levels of prosocial behaviour (Farmer & Hollowell, 1994). Therefore, it is hypothesized that *henchmen or accomplices* are likely to be aggressive and are provided with the opportunity to act on their aggressive tendencies when confronted with an ongoing bullying episode.

The term social network centrality refers to a students' prominence within the classroom or school social structure (Cairns, et al., 1988). Children who are highly prominent members of highly prominent groups are considered to be nuclear in the social structure. Children who have average prominence in the peer group and social structure are considered to be secondary, children who have low prominence are

considered to be peripheral, and finally, children who are not members of groups are considered to be socially isolated. Social network centrality has been operationalized in two distinct ways. Ethnographic studies of social structure have used informal interviews and participant observation techniques to identify hierarchies of prominence or centrality in the classroom (Alder & Alder, 1996). Quantitative investigations of classroom social structures have used social cognitive mapping procedures to determine children's social network centrality (Cairns, Cairns et al., 1988; Cairns & Cairns, 1994).

Robert Cairns and his colleagues proposed a strategy based on peer nominations for identifying the social groups existing within classrooms. It was based on the assumption that children observe and understand more in their social world than they directly experience. When given the opportunity, every child in the class was capable of describing the basic social structures within their classrooms. Using this technique, children are asked to name all of the groups of boys and girls: *"Are there kids who hang around together a lot?" "Who are they?* (If only same-sex groups were named, children can be asked) *"Are there any groups of boys and girls?"* (If the subject does not mention him or herself, they can be asked) *"What about yourself? Do you have a group you hang around with in school? What about outside of school? Do you have a group to hang around with outside of school? Are there children who do not belong to a social group?* Reports are combined across informants to arrive at a *"social cognitive map (SCM)"* of the social groups in each

classroom. Among older school-aged children, self-reported groups show greater than chance correspondence with groups identified by peer reports, but self-reported groups are smaller than peer-identified groups. Ordinarily, only 5 to 10% of all children are not named to any social group.

Several findings attest to the validity and stability of these social network procedures: a) children interact more with members of their SCM-identified groups than with other classmates; b) aggressive boys tend to be in groups with other aggressive boys; c) network centrality (that is, total number of nominations to a social group) is relatively stable over a period of three weeks for both 10- and 13-year-olds; and d) despite significant membership changes, 50% of all groups can be identified after three weeks, with an additional 45%, appearing to have merged or split memberships. Cairns' technique also has been successful with 8-and 9-year-olds (Gest, Graham-Bermann, & Hartup, 1989). Most children belonged to social groups composed of 2 to 5 children, with 3-4% of all children being effectively excluded from the social network. About one-fifth of all children were joint members of two or more groups. Boys who have joint membership tend to be more sociable and to have greater network centrality than their peers with only single group membership. Boys and girls with similar sociability and sensitivity scores tended to be in the same consensus social groups. This trend was not found for aggression scores. However, contrasting previous findings for 10- and 13-year-old boys, the researchers postulated

that younger children may not use aggression as a basis for selective affiliations; this trend may develop later.

Recent work by Salmivalli, Huttunen, and Lagerspetz (1997) indicated that some social structures exist in the classroom that include members who behaved similarly in bullying situations. These researchers used peer evaluation questionnaires to examine the peer networks of bullies in sixth grade classrooms. These researchers asked children to draw a social map of their classroom in which they indicated who belonged to the same friendship groups or pairs. Each child in the classroom could only be mentioned once and therefore the participants in their study were asked to think carefully about how they assigned each classmate. The chi-square results from their study suggested that youth who affiliated together in the classroom were perceived by their peers as behaving in similar or complementary ways during bullying situations. Children who were nominated as bullies associated with peers who assisted or reinforced their anti-social behaviour. In addition, bullies were members of significantly larger social networks within the classroom compared to victims, defenders, or outsiders.

Given the research findings reported by Salmivalli and her colleagues (1997), another purpose of the present research study is to examine children's social networks and how social networks are related to bullying and peer victimization. There were, however, two important methodological differences between the current study and that of Salmivalli , et al. (1997). First, and importantly, the present study was carried

out using the methodology used by Cairns and Cairns (1994). This permitted the examination and determination of each child's social network centrality within each social group within the classroom. Given that social network centrality levels are based on the number of times that children and their associates are named as members of social groups, these measures indicate the prominence of the children within the classroom hierarchy. Previous research has demonstrated that highly aggressive children were nuclear in the social network centrality (Cairns, et al., 1988; Farmer & Rodkin, 1996). Salmivalli and Huttunen, et al. (1997) did not investigate the social network centrality associated with each participant role in the bullying situation. Second, children in the present study were allowed to nominate children to an unlimited number of social groups within the classroom allowing children the freedom to describe the more complex and more valid social structures of their classroom. In contrast, in Salmivalli, et al.'s study participants were allowed to nominate a classmate only once to a social group; thus, possibly providing an incomplete or limited description of the social structure within their classroom.

Accordingly, it is hypothesized that *bullies* in the present study will belong to social groups and *victims* will not. Children who become potential targets of bullying behaviour tend to be isolated from the peer group and thus, they do not have the social support of a peer group to protect them from aggressive overtures given by bullies and their followers. Also, bullies are hypothesized to have high centrality (very salient) within the social group. Furthermore, examining children's social cognitive

maps will provide information on the alliances and similarities/differences that exist between bullies, guardians, henchmen, active bystanders, and victims.

Gender Differences in Aggression

Although no specific hypotheses concerning gender and children's active role in bullying incidents were made in the present study, it is important to investigate the role of gender in determining children's demonstrations of and responses to aggression. Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) concluded that the most consistently documented psychological gender difference in children was aggression. However, the magnitude of this gender difference and the biological basis have been called into question (Hyde, 1984). Previous research studies on aggression have been limited by the presumption that aggression is predominately a male domain. As a consequence, most research studies on children's aggression have been conducted exclusively with males; therefore, there is limited research evidence available on the development and nature of females' aggression. Research studies on children's bullying are plagued by the same limitation. Previous empirical evidence has indicated that many psychosocial factors (peer activities, social context, social attitudes) influence the nature of aggression expressed by males and females.

Types of Aggression. Research studies have demonstrated that gender differences are more pronounced in physical, overt aggression than in other types of aggression (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992; Hyde, 1984). The gender

difference in physical aggression is apparent in early childhood through to adulthood, when more violent crimes are committed by males (Maccoby, 1990). Maccoby and Jacklin (1980) reported that gender differences in the frequency of aggression emerge when children are three-years-old and increase until the children's eighth year of age. Moreover, gender differences in the styles of aggression develop over the same period. Females between the ages of three and five are more verbally than physically aggressive whereas males are more physically than verbally aggressive. However, males displayed more aggression than females, both physical and verbal. Furthermore, observations of physical aggression on the school playground indicate that males aggress at twice the rate of females (Serbin, Marchessault, McAffer, Peters, & Schwartzman, 1993). These researchers reported that the majority of the males' physical aggression on the playground was amiable and carried out within the context of rough-and-tumble play.

Empirical evidence suggests that when other forms of aggression (indirect or verbal aggression) are examined, gender differences in children's aggression become less pronounced (Bjorkqvist, et al., 1992). Indirect aggression, which is covert (e.g., not delivered face to face) is reported to be more typical of females than males (Cairns, Cairns, Neckerman, Ferguson, Gariepy, 1989; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, & Peltonen, 1988). This type of aggression is characterized by intentional exclusion from peer activities and character defamation (Cairns, et al., 1989).

Researchers have suggested that the type of aggression expressed by males and females may also be related to structural differences in their social contexts (Smith & Boulton, 1990). For example, males' peer interactions are characterized by higher levels of sport and more rough-and-tumble play than those of females. Often aggressive interactions occur between males because some males when engaging in the rough-and-tumble play tend to escalate their levels of play fighting to the level of aggression against others (Boulton, 1996; Smith & Boulton, 1990). Furthermore, males play in large, hierarchically structured groups whereas females belong to small, reciprocal peer groups. Thus, indirect aggression may be instrumental and more damaging within the females' peer groups because of the intimate nature of their play groups compared to males' extended peer groups (Crick et al, 1996; Boulton, 1996).

As males and females move from predominately physical forms of aggression to more elaborate strategies of injurious behaviours, gender differences in aggression may be less pronounced. Researchers have suggested that there is a developmental shift in children's aggressive strategies from physical to verbal to indirect (Bjorkqvist, et al., 1992). These researchers indicated that young children exhibit physical aggression, followed by verbal aggression, and finally, preadolescents are more likely to use indirect aggression. The developmental changes in aggressive strategies occur as a result of cognitive, verbal, and social maturation. Hence, the apparent decreases in gender differences in aggression with age (Hyde, 1984) may reflect that males and

females are becoming more similar in types of aggression they engage in (e.g., covert, indirect aggression).

Children's social attitudes may also affect gender differences in aggression. Peers view females who are physically aggressive more negatively in childhood compared to males who are physically aggressive (Serbin, Marchessault, et al., 1993). Moreover, recent research demonstrated that boys attach more importance to the rewarding outcomes of aggression (e.g., achieving control over the victim) and attach less value to the negative consequences of aggression (e.g., suffering by the victim, retaliation by the victim, peer rejection, negative self-evaluation) than do girls (Boldizar, et al., 1989). In addition, research studies have shown that adult male's aggression may be viewed as a means of assuming power and control, whereas women's aggression may be viewed less positively, as a failure of self-control (Campbell, 1993).

Peer Acceptance and Expressions of Aggression. Peer group norms associated with the appropriateness of aggressive behaviour may play a important role in the development and expression of aggression by males and females. For example, Serbin and her colleagues (1993) reported that aggressive males (i.e., rated by their peers as aggressive) exhibited more aggressive behaviour on the playground and these aggressive males were highly involved with peers. In contrast, females identified as aggressive were disliked by their peers and did not carry out their aggression within the peer group. These researchers suggested that males are likely to perceive

aggressive behaviour as normative and merely an extension of rough-and-tumble play. Females, on the other hand, are likely to perceive females' expressions of aggression as deviant; hence, a symptom underlying greater internalizing and externalizing problems.

More importantly, females perceived as aggressive spent more time in mixed-sex groups than in same-sex groups (Serbin, et al., 1993). It is plausible that the aggressive females may want to affiliate with male peers because other females may have excluded and alienated them (Serbin, et al., 1993). Or it may be the case that females who belong to mixed-sex peer groups may exhibit more instrumental aggression than females in same-sex peer groups as a function of the social context. Recent research has indicated that males and females are more likely to have physical conflicts with males than with females (Cairns, et al., 1989; Serbin, et al., 1993). These research studies emphasize the pitfalls of identifying the existent gender differences in aggression and the expression of aggressive from the social context in which they are measured.

Gender and Bullying. Previous research on bullying behaviour has mainly focused on maltreatment through overt forms of aggression (i.e., instrumental and verbal) (Olweus, 1993a; Perry et al., 1988). Studies of this form of peer bullying or victimization are important; however, as previously mentioned it does not capture the full range of harmful behaviours (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). As a consequence, the majority of research studies on bullying are conducted with male subjects and the

research that has examined female bullying and peer victimization is virtually nonexistent (Dodge, Coie, Petit, & Price, 1990; Olweus, 1993a; Schwartz, et al., 1993). The examination of indirect or relational-oriented forms of victimization has been shown to provide unique information about children's adjustment beyond what is provided by the study of overt bullying only (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). At a recent symposium titled *Recent Trends in the Study of Peer Victimization: Who is at Risk and What are the Consequences?* researchers claimed that children who were victims of overt and relational bullying were more isolated, submissive, depressed, and experience more loneliness, insecurity, and anxiety compared to other children (Crick & Bigbee, 1995; Craig, 1995).

Crick and Grotpeter (1995) examined gender differences between overt aggression (e.g., direct physical and verbal aggression) and relational aggression. The researchers indicated that females were significantly more likely to use relational aggression compared to males. Furthermore, relationally aggressive children compared to nonrelationally aggressive children were more rejected by their peers, reported greater loneliness, depression, and isolation. However, these researchers did not investigate the difference between relational aggression and overt verbal aggression.

O'Connell, Pepler and Kent (1995) investigated the relations between gender, age, and children's aggressive behaviours. The results from their investigation indicated that peers nominated males more frequently for all types of aggression

(physical, direct verbal, relational) compared to females. Furthermore, males were rated highest on physical aggression, next highest on direct verbal aggression, and lowest on relational aggression. The inverse pattern of aggression emerged for females. Females were nominated by peers as highest on relational aggression, next highest on direct verbal aggression, and lowest on physical aggression.

Objectives and Hypotheses of the Present Study

In summary, it was argued that examining bullying episodes from a group-oriented perspective might enhance the current understanding of bullying and peer victimization. That is, an investigation of the specific peer processes (e.g., friendship, social network centrality) involved in bullying and peer victimization episodes may contribute to, and extend our current knowledge of children's socioemotional development. Accordingly, the present study was designed to accomplish the following goals:

1) To examine and explain bullying episodes from a group-oriented perspective; that is, to examine children's involvement in bullying (e.g., the third party involved in bullying incidents). It is hypothesized that a bully/victim episode can include five distinct active groups of children: *bullies*, *guardian, active bystanders*, *henchmen/accomplices*, and *victims*. A further goal is to describe the specific roles and their significance for the nature of bullying incidents.

2) To examine children's social alliances within the classroom by investigating the classroom social networks and to explain how these social networks are related to bullying and peer victimization. It is hypothesized that *bullies, henchmen, guardians,* and *active bystanders* will belong to at least one classroom social group and *victims* will not. Also, *bullies* are hypothesized to have nuclear social centrality (be very prominent) within the social group, whereas, *henchmen* and *active bystanders* will have secondary or peripheral social centrality within the same social group. Likewise, it is hypothesized that *guardians* will have nuclear social centrality with their classroom social groups. Examining children's social cognitive maps will provide information on the alliances and/or noninvolvement that exist between bullies, guardians, henchmen, active bystanders, and victims.

3) To examine and describe children's feelings about bullying, their motivations involved in bullying, their personal responsibility for initiating, maintaining, and ending bullying episodes, and the strategies children use to prevent or end bullying episodes.

4) To examine and explain the similarities and/or differences among bullies, victims, guardians, active bystanders, and henchmen/accomplices in their perceptions and episodic descriptions of bullying incidents. Specifically, the present study will examine children's feelings about bullying, their motivations involved in bullying, their personal responsibility for initiating, maintaining, and ending bullying episodes, and the strategies children use to prevent or end bullying episodes.

METHOD

Summary of Interview Procedures

Children participated in a structured one-hour child-researcher interview. At the beginning of the interview the researcher discussed the importance of confidentiality with the participants. The participants were asked not to talk about the task during or following the administration of the interview. Coie and Kupersmidt (1983) have reported that these instructions are effective in ensuring that children do not discuss their responses to the questions posed during the interview. Prior to the administration of the questionnaires, the researcher read these instructions to each child (see Appendix B).

First children were asked to describe the social groups that existed within their classroom. Following the social network questions, the children were asked the following question *"What is bullying?"* Next the researcher read the following definition of bullying—

"We say that a student is being bullied or picked on when another student, or a group of students, say nasty or unpleasant things to him or her. It is also bullying when a student is hit, kicked, threatened, locked inside a room, sent nasty notes, when no one ever talks to them, and things like that. It is also bullying when a student is teased repeatedly in a nasty way or is purposely left out of group activities. But it is not bullying when two children of the same strength have the odd fight or quarrel."

Next children were provided with a class list and asked to nominate classmates whom they felt fit the behavioural characteristics of each bullying role—*bullies, victims, guardians, henchmen,* and *active bystanders*. In addition, children were asked to provide positive peer nominations and nominate three classmates with *whom they liked to play with*. Following the peer nomination procedure, children were asked to provide a narrative that described their personal experiences with bullying.

At the end of the interview, children were reminded of the importance of confidentiality and thanked for their participation. In addition, children were given a demographic survey to give to their parents to complete. Parents were asked to answer questions concerning parental occupational status, parental educational level, family composition, and ethnic background.

Participants

The *classroom sample* consisted of 269 children (140 females, 129 males) in grades four, five, or six selected from ten classrooms located in three Elementary schools within the Waterloo County (see Table 1). The *names* of these children were used for the social network assessment and peer nomination procedure.

A subset of the *classroom sample* consisted of the *focal sample* comprised of children who received parental permission to participate in the study. The *focal sample* children were interviewed by the researcher. The *focal sample* included 153

children (82 females, 71 males; M=11.1 and 11.2 years, respectively, see Table 2). The overall participation consent rate was approximately sixty-five percent (N=173). The remaining twenty children were not interviewed because they had transferred schools, their knowledge of the English language was minimal, or they were absent from school at the time of the interviews. Eighty-nine percent of *focal* children were Caucasian, three percent were Black, four percent were Asian, and four percent were East Indian. Approximately, eight percent of the Caucasian *focal* children were first generation Canadians (e.g., they had emigrated to Canada from Kosovo, Bosnia, and Iran). The *focal* children were primarily from middle and lower-middle class backgrounds (see specifics below). These *focal* children participated in the semi-structured interview and provided the following information: the classroom social network data, bullying role peer nominations, and personal bully/victim narratives.

Seventy-nine percent (N=121) of the parents completed a short demographic survey (see Appendix A). With reference to educational attainment, six percent of parents completed elementary school, approximately fifty-three percent completed at least three years of high school, twenty-two percent had a college education, and finally, eighteen percent completed a university degree.

With reference to occupational status, most of the parents (59.5%) were employed as blue-collar workers (e.g., factory workers, labourers, truck drivers), twenty-four percent as semi-professionals (e.g., program analysts, sales people, police officers), ten percent as professionals (e.g., engineers, doctors, accountants) and four

percent of the parents were unemployed. Finally, regarding marital status, seventy-six percent of the parents were married, twelve percent were divorced and had remarried, and twelve percent were single-parents.

Table 1

Number of Females and Males in the Classroom Sample (N=269).

Grade	*Females*	*Males*	*Total*
Four/Five	17	9	26
Five	29	20	49
Five/Six	26	26	52
Six	68	74	142
Total	140	129	269

Table 2

Number of Females and Males in the Focal Sample (N=153).

Grade	*Females*	*Males*	*Total*
Four	1	3	4
Five	37	23	60
Six	44	45	89
Total	82	71	153

Measures

Social Network Assessment. A semistructured protocol was followed by the interviewer (see Appendix G). The social networks in which each member of the *classroom sample* was involved were plotted on the basis of information obtained from the *focal* subjects and their peers.

During the interview, *focal* children were provided with a class list and were asked, *"Now tell me about your class. Are there some kids here in your class who play with or hang around together a lot?"* and were prompted to name groups of boys and girls in their own classes. Furthermore, *focal* children were asked to describe their own social group within their class and to provide information on children who did not belong a social group. Utilizing the methodology and a statistical program (see Cairns, Leung, Buchanan, & Cairns, 1995), children's reports were combined to create two matrices. First, a *raw recall matrix* was constructed based on the information gained from the *focal* children's free recall of social groups in the classroom: each *focal* subject indicated which persons in the class belonged to which groups. A column represents a different respondent and the children to be clustered are listed down the rows.

Second, each raw recall matrix was transformed to a cluster *co-occurrence matrix* (i.e., a symmetrical matrix that summarizes the frequency with which each person was named to the same group as each other person in the class and where the cells indicate the number of times two individuals "co-occurred" in the same social

group). The rows of the co-occurrence matrix consist of the entire *classroom* children-to-be-clustered (including the *focal* subjects themselves), and the columns of the matrix are the same as the rows. Each cell on the diagonal contains the total number of times a child was named to a social group. A social group consisted of three or more children otherwise the children were classified as *isolates*. The matrix as a whole is a *social cognitive map* (SCM) of the classroom, with each column representing the pattern of group nominations for a given child (see Appendix G). The cut-off criterion for the presence of a social group was established that at least forty percent of the *focal* children who were interviewed within each classroom concurred on the identifications of the classroom social groups. Data that was utilized for the identification of bullies' social groups (e.g., members of a groups that contain at least one bully) and guardians' social groups (e.g., members of a group that contain at least one guardian) was based on the co-occurrence matrix for each classroom.

After the social groups were identified in each classroom, the relative centrality of each group and of each member of the separate group was determined. The index of group centrality was computed by counting the number of times a person was named to a social group. Using the average of two children in the group who receive the highest number of peer nominations, the rank of the group was determined (i.e., high-, medium, and low-salient clusters). Similarly, peer nomination frequency was utilized to determine the status of the individuals within their group:

nuclear, secondary, or peripheral. Cairns et al. (2000) created a statistical program (SCM 4.1) which categorizes social groups (or children) into three levels of saliency within the classroom: nuclear, secondary, and peripheral. Social groups (or children) in the upper 30% rank of nominations were considered to be high salient (or nuclear rank), those in the lowest 30% were considered to be low salient (or peripheral rank), and those in the mid-range 40% were considered to be medium salient (or secondary rank). In sum, the method is a quantitative technique that yielded information about (a) the social groups within the classroom, (b) the identity of children who are members of each group, (c) the relative centrality of each group, and (d) the relative centrality of each person within the social group.

Given the children's relative social group centrality and relative group membership, all children in the *classroom sample* were classified into four groups according to their respective social standing within the classroom indicated by the social network analysis of the children's social cognitive maps: (1) *Nuclear-nuclear*—these children were members of a nuclear social group within the classroom and maintained a prominent social rank within that group (N=118); (2) *Nuclear-secondary*—these children were members of a prominent social group within the classroom and maintained a secondary or less salient position within that group (N=66); (3) *Secondary*—these children were members of a less visible social group within the classroom and maintained a high social rank within that group (N=49); (4) *Isolates*—these children did not belong to a classroom social group (N=36). Given

that only four children received *secondary-secondary* rank, these children were placed in the *Secondary* group. In addition, there was an absence of the *peripheral* social rank within the present data. This anomaly from procedure may be explained by the fact that children had access to a class list of names from the peer nomination assessment (see below).

Peer Nominations of Bullying Roles. *Focal* children were given a class list and asked to nominate three classmates who best fit the following five behavioural descriptions: "who *picks on* other children" (*Bullies*); "who are *picked on* by other children" (*Victims*); "who help other kids when they are being picked on by someone" (*Guardians*); "who likes to stand around and watch but doesn't do anything" (*Active Bystanders*); and, "who will join in and help pick on the other kid" (*Henchmen*) (see Appendix D). Next, given that the peer nominations were unlimited, *focal* children were provided with the opportunity to nominate additional classmates that fit the five behavioural descriptions. Following a procedure to identify children's social status (Coie, Dodge, & Coppotelli, 1982), the total number of nominations received from all *focal* children was calculated for each child in the *classroom sample*. These scores were standardized within each class. Children were classified as bullies, victims, guardians, active bystanders, and henchmen if they received a standardized score that placed them beyond the 85th percentile of the class distribution ($Z>1.0$) for each behavioural description depicting each bullying role.

Identification of Roles within a Bullying Episode. The researcher asked *focal* children about a specific bully/victim episode that they had witnessed. Using a modified interview protocol developed by Liwag and Stein (1995) children were asked to remember past emotions, thoughts, strategies, and motivations associated with their personal bullying experiences. Liwag and Stein (1995) suggested that emotion reinstatement could lead to better memory of the incident. The researcher followed a modified structured interview format that has been used in previous studies conducted by Ross, Ross, Wilson, and Smith (1999) (see Appendix E). *Focal* children were asked to think about the time when a nominated bully from their class picked on a nominated victim in their class (i.e., a specific bully/victim relationship). Three children were unable to think of a time when the nominated bully was picking on the nominated victim and therefore, they could not provide a narrative. Next the *focal* children were asked *about how they were feeling* when they witnessed the bully/victim episode. The children were asked to provide a narrative concerning the specific bullying incident. Furthermore, children were asked specific questions pertaining to: a) the number of peers involved in the bullying incident *(e.g., "Who was present during the bully/victim episode?")*, b) the presence of children behaving in the different roles in the bullying incident *(e.g., children mentioned in the bullying incident were classified into each bullying role by the researcher)*, c) the location and time of the bully/victim incident *(e.g., "Where did this happen? When?)*, d) the type of bullying (e.g., physical, verbal or relational), e) the emotions experienced by

each participant depicted within the bullying incident *(e.g., "What was the bully feeling during the bully/victim episode?")*, f) their motivations and goals behind the bullying episode *(e.g., "What did the bully want to happen? Why?")*, g) actions that concluded the bullying incident *(e.g., "How did it end?")*, h) peer support of bullying behaviour (*e.g. reasons for henchmen involvement*), i) relationships between the children involved in the bullying incident, and j) strategies they would use for intervening in the bullying incident *(e.g., "What can you do to help the victim?")*. A coding scheme developed by Madsen and Smith (1994) was modified for the present study and was used to analyze the children's bullying narratives (see Appendix F). Intercoder reliability completed for the entire sample of children's narratives revealed that concordance ranged between 83% and 100%. Furthermore, all disagreements were discussed until 100% agreement was established.

Table 3

Summary of Measures Administered to the *Focal* Children (N=153).

Measure	*Description*
Social Network Assessment	"Are there some kids in your class who play with or play together a lot?"
Positive Peer Nomination	"Name three classmates who you like to play with or hang out with"

Bullying Role Peer Nomination	Name three classmates— "Who picks on other children"—Bullies "Who is picked on by other children"—Victims "Who help children when they are being picked on by someone"—Guardians "Who like to stand around and watch but doesn't do anything when someone is picking on someone, that is, when bullying is happening"—Active Bystanders "Who will join in and help pick on the other kid"—Henchmen
Bullying Narratives:	
Focal subject's feelings	"How were you feeling when _____ (nominated bully) was picking on _____ (nominated victim)?
Location and Time	"Where did this happen?" "When did it happen?"
The number of children involved in the bullying incident	"Who was there? Did anybody do or say anything? What did they do or say?"
Actions that concluded that bullying incident	"How did it end?"
Feelings of each participant included in the bullying incident	"How was _____ feeling? (ask about each child involved in bullying incident)"
Goals and motivations involved in the bullying incident	"What did you (focal subject) want to happen? Why? What did ____ (bully within the incident) want to happen? Why? Etc.
Negative or Positive Aspects of the Bullying incident	"Did any good things happen? Did any bad things happen?"
Strategies to intervene and help the victim	"If you were the victim, what could you do?" "If you were watching the bullying incident, what would you do?" "What could you do to help out _____ (the victim in the bullying incident?"
Relationships between the children involved in the bullying incident	"How does ___ (1st child) feel about _____ (2nd child)—a friend, acquaintance, or not a friend?" Ask about each child indicated in the bully/victim incident.

RESULTS

Peer Involvement in Bullying Incidents

As hypothesized, children were nominated to each of the five roles inherent in a bully/victim episode. Descriptive analyses of the peer nomination data indicated the 92% of the *focal* children identified *bullies*, 97% identified *victims*, 93% identified *guardians*, 97% identified *active bystanders*, and 92% identified *henchmen*.

Classroom Sample Role Classifications. Of particular interest were the number of children of the *classroom sample* who were classified as *bullies, victims, guardians, active bystanders, and henchmen*. By utilizing the following selection criterion of an obtained peer nomination *Z* score greater than 1.0, one hundred and twenty-one children of the *classroom sample* were selected as fitting at least one of the five *Bullying Role* groups. Given that the peer nominations to each *Bullying Role* were not mutually exclusive, some children received nominations for multiple roles (e.g., they were nominated as a *bully* and as an *active bystander*). Therefore, the one hundred and twenty-one *classroom* children were categorized as belonging to a single *Bullying Role* group if their standardized score was above the class mean and higher on that peer nomination than any of the other peer nominations. Using this selection procedure, twenty-one *classroom* children were categorized as *Bullies*, twenty-nine were categorized as *Victims*, thirty-seven children were classified as *Guardians*, twenty children were categorized as *Active Bystanders*, and fourteen

males were identified as *Henchmen*. The remaining one hundred and forty-eight *classroom* children were identified as having *No Role* because they received a *Z score* less than 1.0 in each of the five B*ullying Role* peer nominations (see Table 4).

Table 4

Number of Children in the *Classroom Sample* Nominated to Mutually Exclusive Bullying Roles (N=269).

Bullying Roles	*Females*	*Males*	*Total*
Bullies	2	19	21
Victims	13	16	29
Guardians	30	7	37
Active Bystanders	2	18	20
Henchmen	0	14	14
No Role	93	55	148
Total	140	129	269

Focal Sample Role Classifications. In addition, the classification of children who were members of the *focal sample* as *bullies, victims, guardians, active bystanders, and henchmen* was analyzed. By utilizing the selection criterion described in the previous section, sixty-seven children who were members of the *focal sample* were selected as fitting at least one of the five *Bullying Role* groups. Once again, given that the peer nominations to each *Bullying Role* were not mutually exclusive, some children received nominations for multiple roles (e.g., they were nominated as a *bully* and as *henchmen*). Therefore, the sixty-seven *focal* children were classified as belonging to a single *Bullying Role* group if their standardized

score was greater than one and higher on that role peer nomination than any of the other role peer nominations. Using this selection procedure, ten *focal* children were categorized as *Bullies*, fourteen were categorized as *Victims*, twenty-five children were classified as *Guardians*, eight children were nominated as *Active Bystanders*, and ten males were categorized as *Henchmen*. The remaining eighty-six *focal* children were identified as having *No Role* because they received a *Z score* less than 1.0 in each of the five B*ullying Role* peer nominations (see Table 5).

Table 5

Number of Children in the *Focal Sample* Nominated to Mutually Exclusive Bullying Roles (N=153).

Bullying Roles	*Females*	*Males*	*Total*
Bullies	1	9	10
Victims	5	9	14
Guardians	22	3	25
Active Bystanders	1	7	8
Henchmen	0	10	10
No Role	53	33	86
Total	82	71	153

Peer Nomination Results

Bullying Role by Child chi-square analyses were performed to assess if the peer nomination data produced a pattern significantly different from a random

distribution of *classroom* children between the bullying roles (e.g., Did a child receive more peer nominations than expected for each bullying role?). Results demonstrated that *focal* children were able to identify certain classmates as fitting the behavioural characteristics of *Bullies* (χ^2 (269) = 43.08, p < .001), *Victims* (χ^2 (269) = 36.3, p < .001), *Guardians* (χ^2 (259) = 6.58, p < .023), *Active Bystanders* (χ^2 (269) = 8.31, p < .017), and *Henchmen* (χ^2 (269) = 32. 37, p < .001).

A series of Pearson product-moment correlations was computed in order to examine the interrelations between the peer nominations for the *classroom sample* for each bullying role. As mentioned in the Method section, the total number of nominations received for each *bullying role* from *focal* child was calculated for each *classroom* child. These scores were standardized within each class. The correlations of the standardized peer nomination scores are presented in Table 6. *Bully*, *Active Bystander*, and *Henchmen* peer nominations were significantly and positively correlated with each other. Furthermore, the analysis of *Guardian* peer nominations revealed that they were significantly and negatively associated with *Bully*, *Victim*, *Active Bystander,* and *Henchmen* peer nominations.

Additionally, *focal* children were asked to provide *positive* peer nominations for each classmate (e.g., "Who do you like to play with?"). The zero-order correlations between standardized *Positive* peer nomination scores and standardized *Bullying Role* peer nomination scores were examined. Results indicated that *Guardian* peer nominations were significantly and positively correlated with *Positive*

peer nominations. In contrast, *Victim* peer nominations were significantly and negatively correlated with *Positive* peer nominations.

In addition, a series of Pearson product-moment correlations was computed to examine the interrelations between the standardized peer nomination scores for each bullying role for the *focal sample* and are presented in Table 6. The results exactly mirror the significant interrelations found for the *classroom sample* of which the *focal sample* is a part. The *Bully*, *Active Bystander*, and *Henchmen* peer nominations were significantly and positively correlated with each other. Furthermore, the analysis of *Guardian* peer nominations revealed that they were significantly and negatively associated with *Bully*, *Victim*, *Active Bystander*, and *Henchmen* peer nominations. There was one exception with the *classroom sample* intercorrelations, *Victim* peer nominations were significantly and positively correlated with *Active Bystander* peer nominations in the *focal sample*.

Finally, the zero-order correlations between standardized *Positive* peer nomination scores and standardized *Bullying Role* peer nomination scores were examined. Results indicated that *Guardian* peer nominations were significantly and positively correlated with *Positive* peer nominations. In contrast, *Victim* peer nominations were significantly and negatively correlated with *Positive* peer nominations.

Table 6

Intercorrelations Between Bullying Role Peer Nominations for the *Classroom Sample* (N=269) and *Focal Sample* (N=153).

Peer Nominations	*Sample*	*Bully*	*Victim*	*Guardian*	*Active Bystander*	*Henchmen*	*Positive*
Bully							
	Classroom	----	.009	-.201***	.569***	.896***	-.098
	Focal	----	.057	-.207***	.619***	.878***	-.073
Victim							
	Classroom		----	-.312***	.094	.038	-.394***
	Focal		----	-.266***	.147*	.085	-.457***
Guardian							
	Classroom			----	-.240**	-.193***	.470***
	Focal			----	-.237**	-.214**	.518***
Active Bystander							
	Classroom				----	.607***	.043
	Focal				----	.664***	-.025
Henchmen							
	Classroom					----	-.037
	Focal						-.045
Positive							
	Classroom						----
	Focal						----

Note: All correlational tests of significance are one-tailed.

*** $p < .001$
** $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Social Network Assessment

The second goal of the present study was to examine how children's social networks are related to bullying and peer victimization. It was postulated that that bullies, guardians, henchmen, and active bystanders would belong to at least one social group. In contrast, victims would not be included in a social group. Secondly, it was hypothesized that their peers would regard bullies as having a salient ranking within their respective social groups whereas, henchmen and active bystanders would possess medium or low saliency within the same social groups. Finally, it was expected that guardians would belong to multiple social groups. In order to examine these hypotheses, a series of one-way analyses of variance was computed for each social group of the *Bullying Role* (e.g., *Bully, Victim, Guardian, Active Bystander,* and *Henchmen)* peer nominations. All post-hoc comparisons were completed utilizing the Tukey HSD method (Hays, 1988).

The social group means and standard deviations for each bullying role peer nomination are presented in Table 7. As expected, results indicated there were significant group differences in Bully nominations received from their classmates, $F(3,265) = 3.09$, $p < .028$. Post-hoc analyses indicated that *nuclear-nuclear* children received significantly more Bully nominations compared to *secondary* children, $p < .02$. No differences in Bully nominations received were found between the other groups of children.

Table 7

Mean Standard Peer Nomination Score for Each Bullying Role (N=269).

Social Groups	*Bully*	*Victim*	*Guardian*	*Active Bystander*	*Henchmen*
Nuclear-Nuclear					
M	$.14_a$	$-.37_b$	$.36_b$	-.00	$.17_a$
SD	1.08	.43	1.01	.98	1.09
Nuclear-Secondary					
M	.01	$-.00_a$	$-.14_a$	$.27_a$	.01
SD	1.07	.84	.90	1.09	1.0
Secondary					
M	$-.34_b$	$.01_a$	$-.17_a$	$-.34_b$	$-.36_b$
SD	.64	.82	.95	.81	.65
Isolates					
M	-.13	1.19_c	$-.68_c$	.00	-.17
SD	.73	1.62	.50	.90	.82

Note: The higher the standard score, the greater the number of peer nominations received. The means in the same column sharing the different subscripts are significantly different at the $p < .05$ in the Tukey honestly significantly comparison.

As expected, results indicated that there were significant group differences in Victim peer nominations, $F(3,265) = 30.86$, $p < .0001$. *Isolates* received significantly more Victim nominations compared to the other groups of children, $p < .0001$. Furthermore, *secondary* children received significantly more Victim peer nominations compared to *nuclear-nuclear* children, $p < .017$.

As postulated, results demonstrated that there were significant group differences in Guardian nominations, $F(3, 265) = 13.49$, $p < .0001$. Post-hoc analyses revealed that *nuclear-nuclear* children received significantly more Guardian peer nominations compared to *nuclear-secondary* ($p < .002$), *secondary* ($p < .004$), and *isolates* ($p < .0001$). *Nuclear-secondary* children received significantly more Guardian peer nominations than *isolates*, $p < .026$.

As predicted, significant group differences were found in Active Bystander peer nominations, $F(3, 265) = 3.81$, $p < .011$. Post-hoc group comparisons indicated that *nuclear-secondary* children received significantly more Active Bystander nominations compared to *secondary*. No significant differences were found among the rest of the children.

Finally, as hypothesized, results revealed a significant group membership difference regarding Henchmen peer nominations, $F(3, 265) = 3.85$, $p < .01$. It was found that *nuclear-nuclear* children received significantly more Henchmen peer nominations compared to *secondary* children, $p < 0.007$. No significant differences were found among the remaining groups.

Same Group Membership Amongst the *Classroom Sample.* In addition, separate t-test analyses were performed to examine the extent of same group membership among the children who were classified as Bullies with other classmates. Bullies' group membership with Victims, Guardians, Active Bystanders and Henchmen (e.g., children who play an active role in bullying incidents) was compared to Bullies' group membership with children who did not play an active role in bullying. Specifically, were Bullies more likely to be members of the same group with Active Bystanders and Henchmen than to belong to the same group as Victims, Guardians, and No Role children (children who were not nominated by their peers as having an active role in bullying)? The proportion means and standard deviations are presented in Table 8. As predicted, results indicated that Henchmen were more likely to belong to the same social group as Bullies compared to children who did not play an active role in bullying episodes, t (21) = 8.93, p <0.0001. Likewise, Active Bystanders were more likely to be members of the Bullies' social group compared to children who did not play an active role in bullying incidents, t (21) = 5.99, p < 0.0001. In contrast, no differences were found between Victims, Guardians, and children who did not play an active role in bullying episodes and group membership with Bullies.

Table 8

Proportion of Same Group Membership Between Bullies and Children in Other Roles (N=269).

	No Role Children & Bullies	*Victims & Bullies*	*Guardians & Bullies*	*Bystanders & Bullies*	*Henchmen & Bullies*
Yes— Members of the Same Social Group					
M	$.21_b$	$.14_b$	$.36_b$	$.66_a$	$.82_a$
SD	.12	.21	.45	.37	.29

Note: Values represent mean proportions. Means with the different subscripts differ significantly at $p < .0001$.

Similarly, separate t-test analyses were conducted to examine the extent of same group membership with *Guardians* and other classmates. Guardians' group membership with Bullies, Victims, Active Bystanders, and Henchmen was compared to Guardians' group membership with No Role children. The proportion means and standard deviations are presented in Table 9. Results indicated that Victims were significantly less likely to be members of the Guardians' social group compared to No Role children, $t(37) = -2.75$, $p < .009$. In addition, other Guardians were more likely

to be members of Guardians' social groups (i.e., Guardians tend to hang out in groups with other Guardians) compared to children who do not play an active role in bullying incidents), t (37) = 5.66, p < .001. In contrast, no differences were found between, Bullies, Active Bystanders, Henchmen, and No Role children and group membership with Guardians.

Table 9

Proportion of Same Group Membership Between Guardians and Children in Other Roles (N=269).

	No Role Children & Guardians	*Bullies & Guardians*	*Victims & Guardians*	*Guardians & Guardians*	*Bystanders & Guardians*	*Henchmen & Guardians*
Yes—Members of the Same Social Group						
M	$.24_b$	$.21_b$	$.11_a$	$.66_c$	$.32_{ab}$	$.26_{ab}$
SD	.19	.40	.21	.41	.34	.41

Note: Values represent mean proportions. Means with the different subscripts differ significantly at p < .01.

Children's Descriptions and Opinions of Bullying Incidents

Recall the third objective of the present study was to investigate children's perceptions or episodic descriptions of specific bullying episodes. The children who were members of the *focal sample* (N=150) provided the bullying narratives. Descriptive analyses were employed to examine specific questions pertaining to: a) the number of peers involved in the bullying incident, b) the presence of children behaving in the different roles in the bullying incident, c) the location and time of the bully/victim incident, d) the type of bullying, e) the emotions experienced by each participant depicted within the bullying incident, f) their motivations and goals behind the bullying episode, g) actions that concluded the bullying incident, h) peer support of bullying behaviour, i) relationships between the children involved in the bullying incident, and j) strategies they would use for intervening in the bullying incident.

Peer Involvement in Bully/Victim Incidents. Descriptive analyses of the *focal* children's narratives dealing with specific bully/victim relationships indicated that the total of number of children in each bullying incident ranged from 2 to 17 (M=5.7, SD=2.6). Forty-four percent of the children provided narratives that included at least one *guardian*. *Henchmen* were mentioned by thirty-nine percent of the children and *active bystanders* were included in thirty-one percent of the children's narratives. Finally, seventy-eight percent of *focal* children's bullying narratives occurred in locations in which other children were within the vicinity of the bullying incident.

Location and Time of Bullying. Descriptive analyses of the children's bullying narratives revealed that thirty-three percent of the time bullying occurred during class time. Approximately twenty-four percent of the children described a bully/victim episode that took place during morning or afternoon recess. Twenty-four percent of the children described bullying incidents that occurred during lunch. Finally, eighteen percent of the children related a bullying narrative that occurred before or after school.

When asked about the location of the bully/victim episode, approximately 45% of the children indicated that the bullying incident had occurred in the playground and 21% reported that the bullying incident took place in the homeroom class (see Table 10 for the common locations of bullying). Limited supervision settings within the school environment (e.g., playgrounds, hallways, coatrooms, and change rooms) were cited by two-thirds of the children as the locale for bullying compared to supervised settings (e.g., the homeroom class, another class like French or Music).

Table 10

Common Locations for Bullying (N=150).

Location	
Playground	45.3
Homeroom Class	20.7
Another Class—French, Music	12.0
Coatroom	9.3
Hallway/Line Up	7.3
Change Room	5.3

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses

Types of Bullying Incidents. Each bullying narrative was examined to determine the nature of the bully/victim episode described by the *focal* children. Results indicated that the majority of children (45.3%) described direct verbal bullying incidents (e.g., name-calling, malicious teasing). A bully/victim episode that contained the combination of physical and verbal bullying was reported by 24.7% of the children. These incidents began with the name-calling behaviour and the bullying escalated to include physical brutality against the victim. Twenty percent of the children reported on bullying incidents in which the bully solely physically victimized the child. Finally, ten percent of the children described relational bullying situations.

Children's Feelings Associated with the Bully/Victim Episode.

Focal Children's Feelings. When asked to describe their personal feelings associated with the bullying incident, 26.7% of the children reported that *anger* (e.g., they were angry with the bully or victim, their anger was directed at the teacher) was their primary feeling associated with the bully/victim episode. Sixteen percent of the children reported that they did not experience any feeling or were feeling *neutral*. Whereas, 15.3% of the children experienced feelings of *sympathy/empathy* toward the victim's plight (e.g., feeling sorry for the victim, wished the teacher had intervened). Children expressed *disgust* when describing the bullies' treatment of the victim (12%). Some children reported that they simultaneously felt *anger* and *sadness* (10%). They were disturbed or angered by the bullies' behaviour while at the same time they were feeling sadness when they thought of the victim. Finally, approximately seven percent of the children indicated that *sadness* was the primary feeling associated with the bullying incident, 6% reported that they felt *surprised*, some children reported that they were *fearful* (4.7%) and finally, and 2% of the children claimed that they were *happy* when they thought about the bully/victim episode.

Bullies' Feelings. Not surprisingly, when the researcher inquired about the bully's feelings, the majority of children reported that the bully was feeling *happiness* throughout the bullying incident (56%). Other children indicated that the bully was feeling *angry* (26.7%) or *neutral* (12.7%) when involved in the bullying episode.

Finally, some children (4.7%) mentioned that the bully was feeling one of *fear* (e.g., afraid of the consequences—receiving punishment from teachers), *surprise* (e.g., surprised that the victim told the teacher), and *disgust* (e.g., disgusted with the victim's behaviour).

Victims' Feelings. When children were asked about the victims' feelings, thirty-two percent of the children indicated that the victim was *angry* with the bully's negative behavioural overtures, 25.3% reported that the victim was feeling *sadness*, and 22.7% indicated that the victim was experiencing both *sadness* and *anger* when they were being victimized by the bully. Finally, twenty percent of the children felt the victim was fearful throughout the bully/victim episode.

Guardians' Feelings. When children were asked about the guardian's feelings, twenty-five percent of the participants reported the guardian was *angry* about the peer victimization. Approximately twenty-two percent of the children felt the guardian experienced *empathy* for the victim, 14.7% of the children indicated that the guardian was *surprised* by the bully's negative treatment of the victim and 11.8% of the children felt the guardian felt *fear* when they were involved in the bullying episode. Furthermore, 10.3% of the children reported that the guardian experienced *sadness* and *anger*. Finally, the guardian's *neutrality* was mentioned by 8.8% of the children and 7.4% of the children reported that the guardian was experiencing feelings of *disgust*.

Henchmen' and Active Bystanders' Feelings. When children were asked about how the henchmen were feeling throughout the bullying incident, children indicated the henchmen were experiencing *happiness* (55.7%). Similar to the bully, 29.5% of the children reported that the henchmen were feeling *neutral* and 14% reported that henchmen were *angry* during the bully/victim incident. Finally, children indicated that the active bystanders mentioned in the bullying narratives were feeling *happiness* (68%) or *neutrality* (32%). These results demonstrate the enjoyment and pleasure henchmen and active bystanders receive while participating in a bully/victim episode.

Children's Goals in Bullying Incidents

Focal Children's Goals. When children were asked what they wanted to happen when they witnessed the bullying incident (goal), almost half of the children interviewed (42.7%) expressed that they were disturbed by the bullying incident and they desired the bullying to end (e.g., the bully would walk away and leave the victim alone). The two principal motivations associated with the *focal* children's primary goal were that they thought the bullying was unfair (33%) or that the bully was mean and destructive (20%).

The second goal indicated by the children interviewed (17.3%) wanted the bully to be punished for his/her negative actions whereas other children indicated that they wanted the victim to physically or verbally retaliate against the bully (10.7%). In contrast, 10% of the children replied that *that they wanted nothing to happen or*

forget about the bullying and continue with the play activity (see Table 11 for common goals reported by the children).

Table 11

Focal Children's Goals in Bullying Incidents (N=150).

Goals	
Bullying to stop/Bully to walk away	42.7
Bully to receive a detention or to be expelled from school	17.3
Victim to physically or verbally retaliate against the bully	10.7
Nothing to happen/Continue with the activity	10.0
Wished to teacher had intervened/Wanted to help the victim	8.7
Victim not to do anything/Victim to get in trouble	5.3
Bully and victim to talk with each other and settle their differences	5.3

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Focal Children's Motivations. Children were asked to explain the reasons or motivations for their goals in bully/victim incidents [e.g., 'What did you want to happen? (Goals) Why did you want that to happen? (Motivations)']. One third of the participants (33.3%) reported on motivations characterized by justice and fairness to the victim (e.g., it's not fair or right to pick on other kids). Twenty percent of the

children indicated that the personality of the bully (e.g., the bully is bad, the bully likes to pick on kids) as the primary motivation for bullying incidents. Furthermore, 16.7% children expressed that they did not want to engage in bullying behaviour (see Table 11 for common bullying motivations).

Table 12

Focal Children's' Motivations in Bullying Incidents (N=150).

Motivations	
Justice—it's not fair to bully or pick on kids	33.3
Bully personality issues—bully is bad; bully likes to pick on kids	20.0
Did not want to engage in bullying behaviour	16.7
Did not care about the bullying situation	7.3
It's exciting and fun/Wanted to continue with the activity	6.7
Peer relations—friends with the victim	6.0
Does not like the bully/Can't stand the bullying incident	5.3
Victim/Active Bystander did not want to get in trouble	4.7

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Bullies' Goals in Bullying Incidents. In response to the question "What do you think the bully wanted to happen?" the majority of *focal* children (54.7%)

reported the bully wanted to hurt or bother the victim as presented in Table 12. The primary motivations dictating the children's thoughts associated with the bullies' primary goal: 1) the bullies' feeling of power and control (30.5%), 2) the bullies' anger or dislike for the victim (29.3%), and 3) bullies personality problem—bullies enjoy picking on other kids (22%). Children's perceptions of the Bullies' common goals and associated motivations are listed in Appendix H.

In addition, twenty-four percent of the children indicated that the bullies' second goal centered on gained feelings of power and coolness when victimizing another child. Fourteen percent of the children felt the bully wanted the victim not to do anything and endure the bully's abuse. Finally, children (7.3%) expressed that the bully's goal was to get the victim in trouble.

Table 13

Bullies' Goals in Bullying Incidents (N=150).

Bullies Goals	
Bother the victim/Hurt the victim	54.7
To gain power and control over the victim/To feel cool	24.0
Victim not to do anything/Victim to retaliate	14.0
Victim to get in trouble	7.3

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Victims' Goals in Bullying Incidents. When children were asked about the victims' goals, 46% of the children responded that the victim wanted the bully to leave the victim alone and stop the bullying behaviours as presented in Table 13. Children stated that the associated motivations with the victims' primary goal include the bullies personality predisposition of enjoying the bullying activity (34.8%), the victims' dislike for the bully (26.1%), and the victims' aversion to conflict situations (23.2%).

Twenty percent of the children reported the victim wanted the bully to receive punishment from the teacher or principal. Approximately, eighteen percent of the children indicated the victim wanted to physically or verbally retaliate against the bully. Finally, children stated the victim possessed goals that centered on peer inclusion and peer relationships (8.7%) and the victim wished the teacher had intervened to stop the bullying incident (6.5%). The Victims' goals and corresponding motivations reported by the children are presented in Appendix I.

Table 14

Victims' Goals in Bullying Incidents (N=150).

Victims' Goals	
Bullying to stop/Bully to walk away	46.0
Bully to receive a detention or to be expelled from school	20.0
Victim to physically or verbally retaliate against the bully	18.7
To be included/To have friends	8.7
Wished to teacher had intervened	6.7

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Guardians' Goals in Bullying Incidents. Approximately half of the children (49.2%) reported that the guardian's primary goal was for the cessation of the bullying incident as presented in Table 14. Children stated that injustice of bullying (40.6%) and not wanting to be in trouble (20%) as the two main reasons for motivating guardians' primary goal.

In addition, children reported that guardians possessed altruistic goals by wanting to help the victim (15.4%) and communication develop between the bully and victim so they could solve their social conflict (10.8%). Children indicated the guardians wanted the bully to receive a detention or be expelled from school (10.8%). Children expressed that the guardians wanted the victim to defend himself or herself (7.7%) by verbally or physically retaliating against the bully. Finally, a minor

percentage of the children (6.2%) stated that guardians wanted nothing to happen (see Appendix J for a complete listing of Guardians' goals and the associated motivations).

Table 15

Guardians' Goals in Bullying Incidents (N=150).

Guardians' Goals	
Bullying to stop/Bully to walk away	49.2
Wanted to help the victim	15.4
Bully and victim to talk with each other and settle their differences	10.8
Bully to receive a detention or be expelled from school	10.8
Victim to physically or verbally retaliate against the bully	7.7
Nothing to happen/Forget about the bullying incident	6.2

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Henchmen' Goals in Bullying Incidents. Children reported that henchmen's primary goal was to victimize and hurt the victim (48.4%) as presented in Table 15. Children indicated that the primary motivating factors for this goal were the henchmen were friends with the bully (33.3%), the henchmen were mad at the victim (23.3%) or the henchmen found the peer victimization activity exciting and fun.

In addition, *focal* children indicated that it was important for the henchmen to join with the bully enabling the child to feel more powerful (22.6%). Some children reported that henchmen wanted nothing to happen and the victim to walk away from the bully (16.1%). Finally, the henchmen goal was to be included in the activity by the bully and enjoy the bullying incident (12.9%). A complete description of the *focal* children's reports of Henchmen goals and corresponding motivations are located in Appendix K.

Table 16

Henchmen' Goals in Bullying Incidents (N=150).

Henchmen' Goals	
Bother the victim/Hurt the victim	48.4
To gain power and control over the victim/To join the bully	22.6
Nothing to happen	16.1
To have fun/To have friends	12.9

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Active Bystanders' Goals in Bullying Incidents. When children were asked about the active bystander's goal, 52% of the children reported that active bystanders wanted to have fun and join in with the bullying incident as presented in Table 16. The majority of children (76.9%) indicated that the excitement and fun feeling and

active bystander receives by participating in bullying as the main motivating factor for their involvement in bully/victim episodes.

In addition, thirty-two percent of children felt that victimizing the child was the active bystander's primary goal. Finally, sixteen percent of the children indicated the active bystander wanted nothing to happen or to forget about the whole bullying incident. Children's perceptions of Active Bystanders' goals and associated motivations are presented in Appendix L.

Table 17

Active Bystanders' Goals in Bullying Incidents (N=150).

Active Bystanders' Goals	
To join the bully/Have fun with the bully	52.0
Bother the victim/Hurt the victim	32.0
Nothing to happen	16.0

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Strategies Children Employ in Bully/Victim Episodes.

Victims' Strategies. The *focal* children's episodic descriptions of bully/victim situations were examined for the kinds of prevalent behavioural strategies that were implemented by the victim. Children reported that victims reacted in an aggressive

manner by retaliating either physically or verbally in 32.7% of the bully/victim incidents. In approximately twenty-three percent of the bullying situations (23.3%), the victim endured the bullies' physical and verbal abuse because they were afraid of the bully (e.g., the victim did nothing). In 19.3% of the episodes, the victim employed passive strategies (e.g., walked away or ignored the bully) when confronted with bullying overtures of another child. Almost fifteen percent of the victims (14.7%) asked the teacher or the principal for help. A smaller proportion of the victims (5.3%) spoke with a parent or a friend about the bullying incident. Finally, 4.7% of the victims spoke with the bully and asked the bully to discontinue the bullying behaviour.

Focal Children's Strategies. *Focal* children were asked what would they do if they were the victims in the bully/victim incident. A plurality of the children (29.4%) responded that they would employ passive strategies (e.g., ignore or walk away from the bully) when confronted with children's bullying behaviour. Furthermore, approximately twenty-eight percent of the children (27.3%) would request adult intervention by asking the teacher or the principal for assistance with the bullying situation. Also, some children (24.7%) indicated that they would try to resolve the bullying incident by talking with the bullies and stating that the bullying behaviour is inappropriate. Ten percent of the children reported they would employ aggressive strategies (e.g., physically or verbally retaliate) to diffuse the bullying incident. A small proportion of the children (5.3%) felt that they would endure the bullies' abuse

because they feared the bullies' future behaviour. Finally, children stated that they would talk with a friend or a parent if they were victimized (3.3%).

In addition, children were asked what strategies would they use if they witnessed the bully/victim incident. A plurality of the children (28.7%) reported that they would talk with the bully and tell the bully to stop the victimizing behaviour. Approximately twenty-seven percent of the children (26.7%) indicated that they would seek adult intervention to help terminate the bullying situation. Moreover, some children (25.4%) felt that they would not intervene and assist the victim (e.g., nothing—they regarded the bullying situation as none of business, they didn't want to be involved, they are afraid they will be bullied in the future, or bullies will continue with their negative behaviour). Some children (10%) offered strategies that centered on the victims' emotional well-being (e.g., join with the victim or talk with the victim about the negative experience). Finally, children (9.3%) reported that they would try to stop the bully/victim incident by physically restraining the bully or the victim.

Finally, children were asked what could they do to help the victim in the bullying situation. A plurality of children (25.3%) reported that they would talk with bullies about their inappropriate behaviours (e.g., tell the bully to stop). Moreover, children (23.3%) indicated that they would befriend the victim and ask if the victim was suffering. Twenty percent of the children responded that they would inquire about adult assistance in the bullying situation (e.g., ask a teacher for help). Children (12.7%) expressed that the best strategy to assist a victim in a bullying situation was

to join with the victim and confront the bully as a dyad. Similarly, children (9.3%) reported that they would actively become involved and attempt to break up the fight. Finally, children (6%) expressed the opinion that they would not become involved because they were afraid they would be bullied next or they feel they have no lasting impact on bullies' behaviour.

Concluding Factors of Bully/Victim Episodes. *Focal* children were asked why someone helped the victim in the bullying incident. The majority of children (57.3%) indicated that no intervention (e.g., no one helped the victim) occurred to assist the victim in the bully/victim episode. When someone intervened in the bully/victim episode, a plurality of children (19.3%) reported that the intervention was the result of friendship relations (e.g., friends with the victim). Sixteen percent of the children responded that someone intervened to help the victim because they do not like to watch a child being victimized. Other children (7.3%) felt that victim intervention occurred because the guardians were friends of the bully and were trying to prevent any negative sanctions toward the bully.

Children were asked why no one helped out the victim. First of all, approximately forty-three percent of the children (42.7%) indicated that there was peer or adult intervention in the bullying incident. In the absence of intervention, the primary reason reported by children (17.3%) centered on the fact that children do not like the victim or they had better peer relations with the bully. Fourteen percent of the children responded that they were afraid that future bullying behaviour would be

directed at them or their peer relations will suffer as a negative consequence of helping out the victim (e.g., afraid other kids won't like them). Some children (11.3%) expressed the opinion that the bullying situation was none of their business and frankly, nothing will happen if they intervene. Specifically, children reported an apathetic attitude toward the victim's plight and feel the bullies' future victimizing behaviour will not cease even if they do intervene to help the victim. Approximately nine percent of the children (8.7%) indicated that the lack of peer or adult intervention in the bullying incident resulted from the fact that no one was present to intervene and help the victim. Finally, six percent of the children mentioned that they were afraid they would received a negative sanction from the teacher for being involved in a situation like bullying.

Focal children's bullying narratives were examined to assess how often the bullies' negative behaviour was indirectly reinforced and the victims' behaviour was supported following the bullying incident. The children's narratives indicated that children were of the opinion that bullies were supported in approximately seventy percent of the bullying incidents (69.3%). Children reported that the bullying behaviour was reinforced in a number of ways: 1) bullies were not reprimanded by the teacher, 2) bullies received peer validation through children's laughing behaviour and/or children actively engaging and joining the peer victimization, 3) the victim was reprimanded by the teacher, 4) bullies were not ostracized by their classmates for their bullying behaviours, and 5) the bully/victim incident ended without any negative

sanctions to the bully. In contrast, children reported victims were validated or supported in 30.7% bully/victim incidents. The victims' behaviour and self-worth was validated in the following ways: 1) guardian intervention in the bullying incident, 2) a friend talked with victims about feelings, 3) the teacher reprimanded the bully, and 4) the victims' parents intervened and called the school personnel.

Peer Support of Bullying Behaviour. *Focal* children's bullying narratives were analyzed to examine the reason children give for joining the bully to victimize the child (e.g., reason for henchmen involvement in bully/victim incidents). Approximately fifty percent of the children reported that there was no henchmen activity in the bullying incidents (see Table 17 for the common reasons for peer support in bully/victim incidents). Fourteen percent of the children expressed the opinion that the primary reason for henchmen involvement in bullying and peer victimization was the experience of excitement and enjoyment they receive when they join in bully/victim episodes. Similarly, children (11.3%) mentioned that the henchmen were friends with the bully. Another reason for henchmen involvement, children (11.3%) indicated that henchmen dislike the victim and the victim deserved the negative bullying behaviour. Some children reported that peer pressure was the significant reason for children joining in with the bully (e.g., they were scared they would lose friends). In addition, children indicated that henchmen' behaviour was driven by power (e.g., they are more powerful when they join the bully).

Table 18

Motivating Factors for Peer Support of Bullying Behaviour (N=150).

Motivating Factors	*Frequency*
No henchmen activity	48.4
It's exciting and fun	14.0
Friends with the bully	11.3
Don't like the victim	11.3
Peer pressure—scared they will lose friends	7.0
To gain power/To feel cool	7.0

Negative and Positive Aspects of Bullying Incidents. Children were asked if any positive or negative experiences occurred as the direct result of the bullying incident (e.g., Did any good things/bad things happen as the result of the bully/victim incident?). The majority of the children (64.7%) felt that nothing positive was associated with the bullying episode. Moreover, 12.7% of the children indicated the fact that the bullying incident was terminated was the only positive aspect of the episode. Some children (7.3%) reported that the bully/victim incident contributed to the cessation of future bullying behaviours directed toward the victim. Six percent of the children expressed the opinion that the bullying incident was handled appropriately by the teacher—the bully was sanctioned for his/her negative behaviour. Finally, children (4.7%) claimed the victims gained new self-awareness and engaged in new behaviour (e.g., not to associated with the bully) and children (4.7%) reported that the teacher reprimanding the bully was a positive aspect of the bullying situation.

A plurality of the children (36.7%) expressed the opinion that no negative aspects were associated with the bullying incident. In contrast, thirty percent of the children claimed that the victims' suffering and pain was a negative aspect of the bully/victim incident. Approximately thirteen percent (12.7%) of the children reported that the bully continues to victimize the child was a negative consequence of the bully/victim incident. Eight percent of the children indicated that a physical fight between the bully and the victim created unpleasant feelings. Some children (4.7%) claimed that victims engage in bullying behaviour against others (e.g., the victim picks on kids now) as a direct result of being constantly victimized. Some children (4.7%) reported that negativity was associated with the bully/victim episode because the teacher reprimanded the victim. Finally, a few children (3.3%) were feeling negative about the bully receiving punishment from the principal because the children felt the victim deserved the peer abuse.

Relationships Among Children Involved in Bullying Incidents.

Focal children were asked about the quality of the relationships among Bullies, Victims, Guardians, Active Bystanders, and Henchmen. Specifically, *focal* children were asked about each child indicated in the bullying incident and how they felt about one another (*"How does ___ (nominated bully) feel about the (nominated victim)? Would they consider them a friend, an acquaintance or not a friend?"*). Descriptive results (see Table 18) indicated that the *focal* children possessed stronger friendship relations with Guardians ($\underline{M} = 1.61$, $\underline{SD} = 1.04$) and felt

the least positive about their relationship with Bullies ($\underline{M}$ = 3.85, $\underline{SD}$ = 1.46) as presented in Table 18. Furthermore, *focal* children felt that Bullies did not have positive relationship feelings toward the Victims ($\underline{M}$ = 4.55, $\underline{SD}$ = .95). These antagonistic feelings were mutually reciprocated by the Victims toward the Bullies ($\underline{M}$ = 4.61, $\underline{SD}$ = .89).

In addition, t-test analyses demonstrated that children reported henchmen were more likely to have stronger friendships relations with the bullies compared to other children ($\underline{t}$ (150)=8.37, $\underline{p} < .001$). Finally, t-test analyses indicated that children reported that guardians possessed stronger friendship relations with the victims compared to other children ($\underline{t}$ (150) =-7.89, $\underline{p} < .001$).

Table 19

Closeness of Relationships Among Children Involved in Bullying Incidents.

Relationship	*Mean*	*Standard Deviation*
Focal Child-Bully	1.15	1.46
Focal Child-Victim	2.21	1.53
Focal Child-Guardian	3.39	1.04
Focal Child-Active Bystander	1.75	1.26
Focal Child-Henchmen	1.80	1.53
Bully-Victim	0.45	0.96
Bully-Guardian	1.72	1.61
Bully-Active Bystander	3.00	1.30
Bully-Henchmen	3.15	1.31
Victim-Bully	0.39	0.89
Victim-Guardian	3.16	1.17
Victim-Active Bystander	1.08	1.12
Victim-Henchmen	0.98	1.32

Note: Numbers reflect mean rating of closeness of relationship based on a five-point scale. Higher numbers indicate greater closeness of the relationship (1 = not a friend, 2 = between not a friend and an acquaintance, 3 = acquaintance, 4 = between an acquaintance and a friend, 5 = a friend).

Bullying Role Differences in Children's Narratives

Recall the fourth objective of the present study was to examine and explain the similarities and/or differences among bullies, victims, guardians, active bystanders,

and henchmen/accomplices in their perceptions or episodic descriptions of bullying incidents. Specifically, the present study examined each bullying role in relation to children's feelings about bullying, their motivations involved in bullying, their personal responsibility for initiating, maintaining, and ending bullying episodes, and the strategies children use to prevent or end bullying episodes. Chi-Square analyses were employed to examine the differences among bullies, victims, guardians, active bystanders, and henchmen in their perceptions or episodic descriptions of bullying incidents. Recall that of the one hundred and fifty-three children interviewed, sixty-seven children were categorized to a specific *Bullying Role* group: ten *Bullies*, fourteen *Victims*, twenty-five *Guardians*, eight *Active Bystanders*, and ten *Henchmen.* Given that three children refused to provide an episodic description of a bully/victim episode (one Victim, one Guardian and one No Role child), one hundred and fifty narratives were analyzed. Adopting similar methodology implemented by Smith and Sutton (1999) and guided by the high positive correlations between Bully, Henchmen, and Active Bystander peer nomination standard scores, children who were classified as *bullies*, *henchmen*, and *active bystanders* were placed into one group identified as the *Pro-bullying* Group (N=28, 2 females, 26 males). The four groups of children: *Pro-bullying*, *Victims*, *Guardians*, and *No Role* were compared to examine differences in children's episodic descriptions of bullying incidents. Specifically, group differences in children's feelings about bullying, their motivations involved in bullying, their personal responsibility for initiating, maintaining, and

ending bullying episodes and the strategies children use to prevent or end bullying episodes were analyzed. The tables in this section include the number, frequency of occurrence and the adjusted residual (e.g., standard scores of 1.96 or greater represents a statistical significant finding).

Location of Peer Involvement in Bullying Incidents. Children's narratives were examined if situational factors (e.g., location of the bullying incident, presence of homeroom teacher) influenced peer involvement in bullying incidents. Chi-square analyses demonstrated that *Henchmen* were more likely to be involved in bullying when the homeroom teacher was not present, χ^2 (5, N=150) =13.32, $p < .021$ (see Table 19). Finally, bullying incidents containing *Bullies, Victims,* and *Active Bystanders* were more likely to occur in locations when the Homeroom teacher was present (54.5%) as presented in Table 19.

Table 20

Group Composition of Bullying Incident and Presence of Homeroom Teacher (N=150).

Group Composition of Bullying Incident		*Homeroom Teacher Present*	*Homeroom Teacher Absent*	*Total*
Bully and Victim	***N***	9	30	39
	%	23.1	76.9	100
	Adj. Residual	0.4	-0.4	
Bully, Victim, and Henchmen	***N***	3	31	35
	%	8.8	91.2	100
	Adj. Residual	-2.0	2.0	

Bully, Victim, and Guardian	***N***	7	25	32
	%	21.9	78.1	100
	Adj. Residual	0.2	-.0.2	
Bully, Victim, and Active Bystander	***N***	6	5	11
	%	54.5	45.5	100
	Adj. Residual	2.9	-2.9	
Bully, Victim, Guardian and Active Bystander	***N***	1	9	10
	%	10.0	90.0	100
	Adj. Residual	-0.9	0.9	
All Active Roles—Bully, Victim, Guardian, Active Bystander and Henchmen	***N***	5	19	23
	%	20.8	79.2	100
	Adj. Residual	.1	-0.1	
Total	***N***	31	119	150
	%	20.7	79.3	100

Children's Feelings about Bullying. As expected, results indicated there were significant group differences in children's feelings about bully/victim episodes. A significant proportion of the *Victims* reported that they felt *sadness* when asked to recall a specific bully/victim episode compared to the other groups of children, χ^2 (3, N=150) = 11.66, $p < .009$. In contrast, *Guardians* were more likely to experience a different emotion instead of *sadness* as presented in Table 20.

Table 21

Differences in Bullying Roles and Children's Feelings of Sadness Concerning Specific Bully/Victim Incidents (N=150).

Participant Role in Bullying Incidents		*Sadness*	*Other Emotions*	*Total*
Pro-Bullying	***N***	3	25	28
	%	10.7	89.3	18.7
	Adj. Residual	-1.0	1.0	

Victims	***N***	6	7	13
	%	46.2	53.8	8.7
	Adj. Residual	2.9	-2.9	
Guardians	***N***	1	24	25
	%	4	96	16.7
	Adj. Residual	-1.9	1.9	
No Role	***N***	16	68	84
	%	19	81	56
	Adj. Residual	0.6	-0.6	
Total	***N***	26	124	150
	%	17.3	82.7	100

Furthermore, significantly more *Victims* responded that they were feeling angry when asked to describe a specific bully/victim situation compared to other children, χ^2 (3, N=150) = 14.96, p < .002 as presented in Table 21.

Table 22

Differences in Bullying Roles and Children's Feelings of Anger Concerning Specific Bully/Victim Incidents (N=150).

Participant Role in Bullying Incidents		*Anger*	*Other Emotions*	*Total*
Pro-Bullying	***N***	10	18	28
	%	35.7	64.3	18.7
	Adj. Residual	.0	.0	
Victims	***N***	11	2	13
	%	84.6	15.4	8.7
	Adj. Residual	3.8	-3.8	
Guardians	***N***	7	18	25
	%	28	72	16.7
	Adj. Residual	-.9	.9	
No Role	***N***	26	58	84
	%	31	69	56
	Adj. Residual	-1.5	1.5	

Total	***N***	54	96	150
	%	36	64	100

In addition, significantly more *Guardians* expressed feelings of *empathy or sympathy* for the victim compared to other groups of children, χ^2 (3, N=150) = 10.8, $p < .013$. In contrast, *Pro-Bullying* children and *Victims* were less likely to indicate that they had feelings of *empathy/sympathy* are summarized in Table 22.

Table 23

Differences in Bullying Roles and Children's Feelings of Empathy/Sympathy Concerning Specific Bully/Victim Incidents (N=150).

Participant Role in Bullying Incidents		*Empathy/ Sympathy*	*Other Emotions*	*Total*
Pro-Bullying	***N***	1	27	28
	%	3.6	96.4	18.7
	Adj. Residual	-1.9	1.9	
Victims	***N***	0	13	13
	%	0	100	8.7
	Adj. Residual	-1.6	1.6	
Guardians	***N***	8	17	25
	%	32	68	16.7
	Adj. Residual	2.5	-2.5	
No Role	***N***	14	70	84
	%	16.7	83.3	56
	Adj. Residual	0.5	-0.5	
Total	***N***	23	127	150
	%	15.3	84.7	100

Finally, when children were asked about the feelings of the victim depicted in the bullying incident, *No Role* children responded that *sadness* was the most common

feeling attributed to the victims compared to other groups of children, χ^2 (9, N=150) = 21.6, $p < .012$ (see Table 23). In contrast, a significant proportion of the *Pro-Bullying* children reported that the victim's were feeling *fear* throughout the bullying incident compared to other groups of children. Finally, *Victims* were unlikely to report that the victims within the bullying situation were feeling fear compared to other groups of children.

Table 24

Differences in Bullying Roles and Victims' Feelings During Specific Bully/Victim Incidents (N=150).

Participant Role in Bullying Incidents		*Victim's Feelings Sadness*	*Victim's Feelings Anger*	*Victim's Feelings Fear*	*Victim's Feelings Sadness and Anger*	*Total*
Pro-Bullying	***N***	3	8	12	5	28
	%	10.7	28.6	42.9	17.9	18.7
	Adj. Residual	-2.0	-0.4	3.4	-0.7	
Victims	***N***	2	7	0	4	13
	%	15.4	53.8	0	30.8	8.7
	z-score	-0.9	1.8	-1.9	0.7	
Guardians	***N***	5	7	4	9	25
	%	20	28	16	36	16.7
	z-score	-0.7	-0.5	-0.5	1.7	
No Role	***N***	28	26	14	16	84
	%	33.3	31	16.7	19	56
	z-score	2.5	-0.3	-1.2	-1.2	
Total	***N***	38	48	30	34	150
	%	25.3	32	20	22.7	100

Motivations in Bullying Incidents. Results indicated that there were significant differences among the groups of children regarding their personal motivations about bully/victim episodes, χ^2 (15, N=150) = 31.6, p < .007 (see Table 24). *Victims* (76.9%) reported that the *bullies' personality* (e.g., bully enjoys picking on kids, bully likes being powerful) *or the bully's dislike for the victim* as the primary reason for the occurrence of bully/victim situations compared to other children. Finally, approaching statistical significance, children who were in the *Pro-bullying* group (25%) reported neutrality in the fact that they *did not care what was happening or they wanted to continue with the activity and forget the bullying occurred* compared to other children.

Table 25

Differences in Bullying Roles and Motivations Involved in Bullying Incidents (N=150).

Motivations		*Pro-Bullying*	*Victims*	*Guardians*	*No Role*	*Total*
Justice	***N***	7	1	9	33	50
	%	25	7.7	36	39.3	33.3
	Adj. Residual	-1.0	0.5	0.3	1.7	
Did not want to be in trouble	***N***	1	1	1	4	7
	%	3.6	7.7	4	4.8	4.7
	Adj. Residual	-0.3	0.5	-0.2	0.1	
Friends with Victim	***N***	2	0	2	5	9
	%	7.1	0	8	6	6
	Adj. Residual	0.3	-1.0	0.5	.0	
Did not want to fight/Be part of	***N***	3	1	5	16	25
	%	10.7	7.7	20	19	16.7

group	***Adj. Residual***	-0.9	-0.9	.5	.9	
Bully issues—	***N***	8	10	2	18	38
Bully enjoys the	***%***	28.6	76.9	8	21.4	25.3
bullying	***Adj. Residual***	.4	4.5	-2.2	-1.2	
The kid did not	***N***	7	0	6	8	21
care what was	***%***	25	0	24	9.5	14
happening	***Adj. Residual***	1.9	-1.5	1.6	-1.8	
	N	28	13	25	84	150
Total	***%***	18.7	8.7	16.7	56	100

Strategies Children Employ in Bully/Victim Situations. When children were asked, *'what would you do if you were the victim within the bullying episode?'* statistically significant group differences were found, χ^2 (15, N=150) = 34.35, p < .003 (see Table 25). As expected, *Pro-bullying* children (46.7%) indicated that they would employ verbal or physical retaliation strategies to help them with the bullying situation compared to other children. Moreover, *No Role* children (33.3%) expressed the opinion that talking with the bully (e.g., telling the bully to stop) is the best strategy to use in a bullying situation compared to other children. Finally, *Victims* (69.2%) reported that passive strategies (e.g., ignore bully, walk away from the bully) as the primary strategy to use in a bully/victim situation.

Results indicated that significant group differences were found when children were asked about the strategies they would employ if they were a bystander or witness to the bully/victim incident, χ^2 (12, N=150) = 22.94, p < .028 (see Table 26). *Guardians* reported that they would talk with the bully (e.g., tell the bully to stop) compared to other children. In contrast, *Pro-bullying* children (50%) indicated that

they would try and break up the fight by physically restraining the victim or the bully as the primary strategy to use in bullying situations.

Table 26

Differences in Bullying Roles and Strategies Children Could Employ if Victimized By Another Child (N=150).

Strategies		*Pro-Bullying*	*Victims*	*Guardians*	*No Role*	*Total*
Nothing—Afraid they will be bullied next	***N***	0	0	1	7	8
	%	0	0	4	8.3	5.3
	Adj. Residual	-1.4	-.9	-.3	1.8	
Talk with the bully—Tell bully to stop	***N***	3	0	6	28	37
	%	10.7	0	24	33.3	24.7
	Adj. Residual	-1.9	-2.2	-0.1	2.8	
Talk with a friend, parent, or victim	***N***	1	0	1	3	5
	%	3.6	0	4	3.6	3.3
	Adj. Residual	0.1	-0.7	0.2	.2	
Verbally or physically retaliate against the bully	***N***	7	0	1	7	15
	%	25	0	8.3	8.3	10
	Adj. Residual	2.9	-1.3	-0.8	-.8	
Tell the teacher or principal—ask for help	***N***	12	4	6	19	41
	%	42.9	30.8	24	27.3	27.3
	Adj. Residual	2.0	0.3	-0.4	-1.5	
Nothing—Ignore the bully/Walk away from bully	***N***	5	9	10	20	44
	%	17.9	69.2	40	23.8	29.3
	Adj. Residual	-1.5	3.3	1.3	-1.7	
Total	***N***	28	13	25	84	150
	%	18.7	8.7	16.7	56	100

Table 27

Differences in Bullying Roles and Strategies Children Could Employ if They Witnessed a Bully/Victim Incident (N=150).

Strategies		*Pro-Bullying*	*Victims*	*Guardians*	*No Role*	*Total*
Talk with the bully—Tell bully to stop	***N***	5	4	11	23	43
	%	17.9	30.8	44	27.4	28.7
	Adj. Residual	-1.4	0.1	1.9	-0.4	
Physically restrain the bully or victim	***N***	7	3	1	3	14
	%	25	23.1	4	3.6	9.3
	Adj. Residual	3.2	1.8	-1.0	-2.7	
Join victim/Talk with victim	***N***	1	0	3	11	15
	%	3.6	0	12	13.1	10
	Adj. Residual	-1.3	-1.3	0.4	1.4	
Tell the teacher or principal—ask for help	***N***	6	4	6	24	40
	%	21.4	30.8	24	28.6	26.7
	Adj. Residual	-0.7	0.3	-0.3	0.6	
Nothing—Ignore the bully/Walk away from bully	***N***	9	2	4	23	38
	%	32.1	15.4	16	25.3	25.3
	Adj. Residual	0.9	-0.9	-1.2	0.7	
Total	***N***	28	13	25	84	150
	%	18.7	8.7	16.7	56	100

In addition, statistically significant group differences were found in children's responses to the following question, *'What could you do to help the victim within the bully/victim incident?*, χ^2 (15, N=150) = 37.67, p < .001 (see Table 27). As expected, children within the *Pro-bullying* group were more likely to suggest confrontational strategies (e.g., break up the fight physically or verbally) compared to other children, whereas, *Victims* stated that informing the teacher of the bullying situation was the best strategy to employ to help the victim depicted in the bullying

situation. Also, *Victims* were less likely to suggest becoming allied with the victim or offer support to the victim as the best strategy *to help the victim within the bully/victim episode* compared to other children.

Table 28

Differences in Bullying Roles and Strategies Children Would Employ to Assist Victims in Bully/Victim Incidents (N=150).

Strategies		*Pro-Bullying*	*Victims*	*Guardians*	*No Role*	*Total*
Talk with the bully—Tell bully to stop	***N***	3	4	6	25	38
	%	10.7	30.8	24	29.8	25.3
	Adj. Residual	-2.0	0.5	-0.2	1.4	
Tell the teacher	***N***	8	7	4	11	30
	%	28.6	53.8	16	13.1	20
	Adj. Residual	1.3	3.2	-0.5	-2.4	
Ask a friend for help/Have bully and victim talk	***N***	0	1	2	2	5
	%	0	7.7	8	2.4	3.3
	Adj. Residual	-1.1	0.9	1.4	-0.7	
Physically restrain bully or victim	***N***	7	0	0	7	14
	%	25	0	0	8.3	9.3
	Adj. Residual	3.2	-1.2	-1.8	-0.5	
Nothing—Afraid of being bullied/It won't do anything	***N***	1	1	0	7	9
	%	3.6	7.7	0	8.3	6
	Adj. Residual	-0.6	0.3	-1.4	1.4	
Join the victim/Talk with victim	***N***	9	0	13	32	54
	%	32.1	0	52	38.1	36
	Adj. Residual	-0.1	-2.8	1.8	0.6	
Total	***N***	28	13	25	84	150
	%	18.7	8.7	16.7	56	100

Interventions in Bully/Victim Episodes. Results indicated that there were significant group differences in children's narratives with the regards to victim intervention, χ^2 (3, N=150) = 8.13, p <.043 (see Table 28). As expected, significantly more *Pro-bullying* children (64.3%) reported that the victims received peer or adult intervention in the bully/victim incident compared to other children.

Table 29

Differences in Bullying Roles and Victim Intervention (N=150).

		Help Victim No	*Help Victim Yes*	*Total*
Pro-Bullying	***N***	10	18	28
	%	35.7	64.3	18.7
	Adj. Residual	-2.6	2.6	
Victims	***N***	10	3	13
	%	76.9	23.1	8.7
	Adj. Residual	1.5	-1.5	
Guardians	***N***	14	11	25
	%	56	44	16.7
	Adj. Residual	-0.1	0.1	
No Role	***N***	52	32	84
	%	61.9	38.1	56
	Adj. Residual	1.3	-1.3	
	N	86	64	150
Total	***%***	57.3	42.7	100

Finally, when children were asked why did someone intervene to help the victim, results indicated that group differences existed and approached statistical significance, χ^2 (9, N=150) = 15.98, p < .067 (see Table 29). Significantly more *Pro-*

bullying children indicated that victim intervention occurred because the individuals were friends with the bully and were less likely to suggest that no one helped the victim compared to other children. In contrast, *No Role* children were less likely to suggest that friendship relations with bully as a reason for guardian participation within the bullying situation.

Table 30

Differences in Bullying Roles and Children's Reasons for Victim Intervention (N=150).

Reasons for Victim Intervention		*Pro-Bullying*	*Victims*	*Guardians*	*No Role*	*Total*
Friends with Victim	***N***	6	1	5	17	29
	%	21.4	7.7	20	20.2	19.3
	Adj. Residual	0.3	-1.1	0.1	0.3	
Don't like to see the bullying	***N***	6	1	4	13	24
	%	21.4	7.7	16	15.5	16
	Adj. Residual	0.9	-0.9	.0	-0.2	
No one helped the victim	***N***	10	10	14	52	86
	%	35.7	76.9	56.0	61.9	57.3
	Adj. Residual	-2.6	1.5	-0.1	1.3	
Other—Friends with the bully	***N***	6	1	2	2	11
	%	21.4	7.7	8	2.4	7.3
	Adj. Residual	3.2	0.1	0.1	-2.6	
Total	***N***	28	13	25	84	150
	%	18.7	8.7	16.7	56	100

Peer Support of Bullying Behaviour. Results demonstrated that significant group differences were found in children's perceptions of peer involvement in bullying

episodes, χ^2 (3, N=150) = 7.62, p < .055 (see Table 30). When children were asked '*did anyone join the bully?*', not surprisingly, significantly more *Pro-bullying* children (71.4%) reported that the bully/victim situation was dyadic than other children (e.g., *pro-bullying* children felt that there was no henchmen or active bystander participation).

Table 31

Differences in Bullying Roles and Henchmen Participation (N=150).

		Join Bully No	*Join Bully Yes*	*Total*
Pro-Bullying	***N***	20	8	28
	%	71.4	28.6	18.7
	Adj. Residual	2.5	-2.5	
Victims	***N***	4	9	13
	%	30.8	69.2	8.7
	Adj. Residual	-1.5	1.5	
Guardians	***N***	11	14	25
	%	44	56	16.7
	Adj. Residual	-0.7	0.7	
No Role	***N***	40	44	84
	%	47.6	52.4	56
	Adj. Residual	-0.7	0.7	
	N	75	75	150
Total	**%**	50	50	100

DISCUSSION

The present study demonstrated that bullying may be productively viewed as a group process. Children actively participate in bullying episodes in one of the following five roles: *bullies*, *victims*, *guardians*, *active bystanders*, and *henchmen*. The findings of the peer nomination analyses indicated that the majority of children conceptualize their social worlds as containing children who behave on a regular basis as active participants in the bullying process. These present findings demonstrating that bullying involves more than a dominant child persecuting a subservient child contribute to a recent body of research that has documented peers' widespread involvement in bullying and victimization (Salmivalli, et al., 1996). Furthermore, the research findings reported herein elaborate and extend previous research on children's participant roles, peer group structure, and the social ecology of bullying. In addition, an examination of children's episodic descriptions of bully/victim incidents places the process of bullying in the larger peer context and represents an alternative method of analyzing bullying situations. Most specifically, it was shown that bully/victim episodes could include five distinct participant roles: *bullies, victims, guardians, active bystanders,* and *henchmen*.

Peer Involvement in Bullying Incidents

The first objective of the present study was to examine and describe bullying episodes from a group-oriented perspective; hence, I investigated children's

awareness of the diverse roles in bullying episodes. Several lines of reasoning and evidence suggest that group processes and group membership might be related to bullying as a group process. First, peer relationships are generally perceived to be an important dimension of children's interpersonal and intrapersonal development (Parker, et al., 1995), and hence may be influential in the dynamics of the bullying. More specifically, given that peers are influential in the development of aggression by eliciting and reinforcing aggressiveness, as well as serving as targets of hostility and social models of aggression (Hall, 1973; Parke & Slaby, 1983; Rubin & Pepler, 1991, Schwartz & et al., 1993) it was expected that bullying might be related to peer group membership.

Consistent with research on the relation between peers and aggression, the present findings demonstrate that most children in a classroom environment are cognizant of bullying and of the particular roles that specific children enact when confronted with a bully/victim incident. Moreover, children concurred on the particular individuals in their classes who frequently occupied particular bullying roles. These findings are congruent with the recent research on the participant role approach to school bullying (Salmivalli, et al., 1996; Sutton & Smith, 1999). Specifically, the results from the present study illustrated that children participate in bullying by acting in one of five distinct roles. In the most elementary form of bullying an episode can include the extensively researched dyad *bullies* (children who initiate the peer abuse) and *victims* (children who are frequently and systematically

tormented by other children). A bully/victim incident can however, also involve children who act as *guardians* (children who sympathize with and assist the victim), *henchmen* (children who become allied with the bully and actively participate in the peer abuse), and *active bystanders* (children who silently give approval to the bully by watching the peer abusive situation). The present study confirmed earlier findings that the majority of children are capable of conceptualizing bullying episodes as dynamic and containing multiple participant roles beyond the bully and victim. Remarkably, the peer nomination results demonstrated the readiness of children to nominate classmates to all of the roles postulated to exist in the bullying process. Moreover, the general agreement among children as to which of their classmates occupy each of the third party roles means that individual children may adopt these roles with some regularity. Additionally, the present data are unique in demonstrating how these distinct bullying roles are associated with one another by placing the bullying process and bullying roles in the larger social context of peers.

A comparison of the scoring methods utilized by other researchers who have investigated *participant roles* in bullying episodes and the methods used in the present study highlights important differences in the distribution of children nominated to each bullying role (Salmivalli, et al., 1996; Sutton & Smith, 1999). Other researchers who have implemented the *participant role* approach in the investigation of the bullying process have used a relatively lenient scoring method to identify participants in the bullying process. Specifically, children were required to score highest on a single

participant role (e.g., bully) compared to alternate *participant roles* (e.g., reinforcer, assistant, defender, outsider) and their particular standard participant role score had to be greater than the class mean score (Salmivalli, et al, 1996; Sutton & Smith, 1999). Thus, these researchers classified children as occupying a distinct role in the bullying process if their standard participant role score was in the upper fiftieth percentile of the classroom distribution. This procedure did not necessarily place children in the eighty-fifth percentile of the class distribution as the criterion peer nomination Z score greater than 1.0 as guaranteed in the present study. Given that a more stringent criterion for each bullying role was utilized in the present study, it is not surprising that the present findings indicated that there were substantially fewer children nominated to each bullying role than in other similar research (as presented in Tables 31 and 32). To examine the effects of the differing criteria, a reexamination of the peer nomination data in the present study was completed using the more lenient inclusion criterion used in the previous participant role research. The results from this methodological exercise increased the overall number of children nominated to each bullying role (as shown in Table 33) as expected and closer to those reported in previous research. These findings demonstrate that more children were included in all the bullying roles with dramatic increases occurring in the roles of *guardians* and *active bystanders* and hence, a substantial decrease in the percentage of children who play a non active role in the bullying process.

Craig and Pepler (1995) provided observational evidence of bullying incidents and reported that 11% of the time children intervened to assist the victims of bullying incidents (e.g., children who behaved as *guardians*). Therefore, using a stringent criterion for inclusion in bullying roles is more consistent with observational estimates of peer victimization incidents (16.3%) compared to Samlmivalli, Lagetspetz, et al's more generous criterion for involvement in the bullying process (32.0%).

Table 32

Percentages of Children in each Participant Role.

Participant Role	*Salmivalli et al. (1996) Sixth Grade*	*Salmivalli et al. (1996) Eighth Grade*	*Sutton & Smith (1999) M age=9.0 years*
Bullies	11.7	5.7	14.0
Reinforcers	8.2	8.5	5.7
Assistants	6.8	10.8	7.3
Defenders	19.5	15.2	27.5
Outsiders	23.7	32.0	11.9
Victims	17.3	19.6	18.1
No Role	12.7	8.2	15.5

Table 33

Percentages of Children Nominated to each Bullying Role.

Bullying Role	*McKinnon (present study) Classroom Sample Mage=11.1 years N=269*	*McKinnon (present study) Focal Sample Mage=11.2 years N=153*
Bullies	7.8	6.5
Victims	10.8	9.2
Guardians	13.8	16.3
Active Bystanders	7.4	5.3
Henchmen	5.2	6.5
No Role	55.0	56.2

Table 34

Percentages of Children Nominated to each Bullying using McKinnon's Inclusion Criterion and Salmivalli's Inclusion Criterion.

Bullying Role	*McKinnon Classroom Sample N=269*	*McKinnon Focal Sample N=153*	*Salmivalli's Method Classroom Sample N=269*	*Salmivalli's Method Focal Sample N=153*
Bullies	7.8	6.5	8.6	7.8
Victims	10.8	9.2	16.4	17.6
Guardians	13.8	16.3	28.6	32.0
Active Bystanders	7.4	5.3	17.5	12.4
Henchmen	5.2	6.5	9.7	11.1
No Role	55.0	56.2	19.3	18.9

Moreover, the elimination of the *outsider role* from the present investigation also contributed to the decrease in the number of children who are categorized as

participating in the bullying process. Consequently, there were more children classified as having *no active role* in the bullying process. In addition, in the present study, the *active bystander* represents a clearer role in the bullying process than the category of *outsider*, which represents an ambiguous category with regard to active bullying participation. For example, Salmivalli and her colleagues proposed that children nominated as *outsiders* (e.g., *isn't really present, stays outside the situation, pretends not to notice what is going on, doesn't do anything, doesn't even know about the bullying, doesn't take sides with anyone*, and *goes away from the spot)* were aiding and abetting the bully; hence, maintaining the bullying process. However, I argue that the behavioural items employed to operationally define the *outsider* role could be used to identify children who are choosing to avoid becoming actively involved with bullying incidents; thereby, decreasing the positive feedback for the bully.

Finally, a further critique of the participant roles (*bully, reinforcer, assistant, defender, outsider*, and *victim*) proposed by Salmivalli, et al. (1996) is warranted. First, the *reinforcer* category includes behavioural descriptions that would, in the present classification, conflate *henchmen's* participation (e.g., *incites the bully by shouting, says to the bully: 'show him/her')* and *active bystanders'* involvement (e.g., *comes around to see the situation, is usually present, even if not doing anything, giggles, laughs*) in the children's episodic descriptions of bullying incidents in the present study. In the present classification system *henchmen'* and *active*

bystanders' roles are distinctly different in bullying episodes. H*enchmen* are directly involved, either, verbally or physically, in assisting the bullies, whereas, *active bystanders* are indirectly providing support for bullies by watching the incident or laughing at the verbal abuse directed toward the victim. This behavioural distinction is not made with Salmivalli's participant roles. Second, as mentioned earlier, the behavioural items that were comprised by the *outsider* scale are indeterminate as to the children's involvement in the bullying process. In fact, this category can include children who actively avoid and shun bullying incidents as well as those who know nothing about the bullying. Finally, using Salmivalli et al.'s classification scheme, *victims* were identified if 30% or more of the classmates named someone as a victim. Once again, this is a lenient standard to identify children who are repeatedly tormented by other classmates.

Gender Differences in Children's Peer Nominations of Bullying Roles. One of the more interesting findings of the present study was that children's participation in the bullying process was considered a gender-specific activity. The peer nomination results illustrate that the majority of children perceived bullying another child (e.g., *bullies*, *active bystanders*, and *henchmen*) predominantly as a male activity. In contrast, more females than males were nominated as *guardians* who support children who are tormented and persecuted by bullies.

Strong gender findings are unexpected for two reasons: First, Asher and Hymel (1981) found that children demonstrated a strong tendency to nominate opposite-sex

peers for negative items and same-sex peers for positive items. Accordingly, given that bullying is a negative behaviour, it was expected that the seventy males in the present investigation would show a bias in nominating the eighty-three females as *bullies, active bystanders, or henchmen* and males as *guardians*. However, such a bias effect was not evident. The present results are surprising given that Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, et al. (1996), in their research of the participant roles in bullying, found that both males and females were nominated as *bullies, assistants, reinforcers,* and *outsiders* in the bullying process, albeit males obtained significantly higher scores compared to females on all the pro-bullying roles (e.g., bullies, assistants, and reinforcers). The different and less restrictive criterion for the particular *participant roles* than that used in the present study may account for the greater number of nominations of females to the participant roles of *bullies, assistants (henchmen)* or *reinforcers (active bystanders)* in the earlier research. For example, when the more lenient criterion of Z score of greater than zero was used with the present data, more females were included to the classroom sample and the focal sample as *active bystanders* (increased by 10, increased by 6, respectively) and *henchmen* (increased by 5, increased by 3, respectively). Sutton and Smith (1999) also found that more females were nominated to the pro-bullying roles than in the present study; however, this may be due to the fact that they used only same-sex nominations. This methodological difference would definitely increase the number of females nominated to each bullying role because females could only nominate females to those roles.

A second explanation for the present finding that the majority of children viewed active bullying to be dominated by males derives from the previous research that males attach more importance to achieving control over their victims (Boldizar, et al., 1989). Given that bullying is typically viewed as a power move by a dominant child over a subservient child, it is not surprising that the children in the present study viewed their social worlds in this manner. Moreover, an examination of children's responses to *"what is bullying?"* the majority of males and females in the present study defined bullying as behaviours that involved direct forms of physical and verbal aggression (87% and 88%, respectively). Thus, it was not unexpected that significantly more males would be nominated by their classmates as *bullies, henchmen,* and *active bystanders* in the bullying process. In addition, previous research has documented that males are nominated by their peers more frequently to all types of aggression (physical, verbal, relational) compared to females (O'Connell, et al., 1995).

In addition, an alternate explanation for the present finding that active bullying behaviour was dominated by males can be linked to previous research that has documented the acceptance of male aggression within the peer group (Huesmann, et al., 1992). As stated previously, these researchers found that males were more likely to approve aggression than females. Likewise, Serbin and her colleagues (1993) found that aggressive males were highly involved in peer activities; in contrast, peers disliked aggressive females. Similarly, in a recent research study it was found that

"tough" boys were nuclear within the classroom social network indicating that boys who engage in domineering and aggressive behaviours are perceived by their peers as prominent members of their social groups and possess many peer associations within the classroom (Rodkin, Farmer, Pearl, & Van Acker, 2000). Consequently, the children in the present study may also regard bullying behaviour to be more acceptable and even normative for males.

Finally, it has been argued that the majority of research studies on bullying and peer victimization have failed to include indirect or relational-oriented forms of aggression and typically focus on overt aggression (Crick & Bigbee, 1995; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). To address this methodological limitation of past research on children's bullying, the definition of bullying that was presented to children in the current study included indirect relational forms of aggression (e.g., purposely left out of group activities) in addition to overt aggression (e.g., hit, kicked, threatened, called nasty names). However, making explicit that bullying can involve the relational aggressive behaviours did not greatly influence children's episodic descriptions of bullying incidents. The majority of children in this research study provided bullying narratives that centered on verbal and physical forms of peer abuse (e.g., 45% of children's narratives included direct verbal aggression, 20% involved physical peer abuse, and 25% of the bullying episodes contained both direct verbal and physical forms of bullying). A small minority of children (10%) reported on bully/victim incidents that involved relational aggression (e.g., the bully asked classmates to join

the *"I hate Aileen club"*). Despite the recent focus on female aggression by researchers, this gender shift has not transferred to children's mental representations of bully/victim incidents; in fact, children identified males to be the primary negative figures in the bullying process.

The present data also indicated that children nominated more females as *guardians* in bully/victim incidents compared to males. This research finding is consistent with the recent work on the various participant roles in the bullying process reported by Salmivalli and her colleagues (1996) and Sutton and Smith (1999). These researchers reported that females were significantly more likely to be nominated as defenders of the victims than males. This gender effect is concordant with the large body of research linking sex role differentiation to gender differences in children's social representations of aggression (Hyde, 1984). Females are socialized to be primary caretakers of individuals and therefore, view acts of aggression (e.g., bullying) to be negative and an illegitimate use of control over another individual. Hence, females are socialized believing that it is their responsibility to help other children. Conversely, the traditional roles of males in industry, business, and the military may have led to an instrumental social representation in which aggression is perceived in a more positive light as a means of exercising control over others. Moreover, Boldizar and his colleagues (1989) demonstrated that males attach more importance to gaining control over the victim and attached less value to the negative consequences of aggression compared to females. Hence, males may be socialized to

view acts of aggression as necessary to gain control and status and hence, are less prone to intervene in bullying situations. These sex- role beliefs are taught to children very early in life.

The present finding is also consistent with the recent investigation of peer support systems conducted by Cowie (2000). She found that there was a strong gender imbalance in which females outnumber the males as the children who participate in peer support systems. Moreover, in mixed-sex schools, males are reluctant to volunteer for the role of peer mediators in children's conflict situations. However, Cowie (2000) also reported that at all male schools there was an overwhelming response of males volunteering for the training and practice as peer mediators, suggesting that males are capable of using their caring abilities when the appropriate organizational conditions exist (e.g., no females available to fulfill the role).

Social Network Centrality and Children's Bullying Behaviours

The present study examined children's social networks and demonstrated that children's social affiliations within the classroom were related to their roles in bullying incidents. The results of the social network analyses indicated that children who share similar behavioural roles in the bullying process keep company with each other in the classroom. These present findings provide indirect evidence that particular groups of children are viewed by their classroom peers as exhibiting *pro-bullying behaviours*

has contributed to a recent body of research that has examined the relations between children's social networks and their behavioural characteristics. Furthermore, the research findings reported herein indicated that there are distinct social groups established within the classroom whose members share common *anti-bullying* attitudes and behave as *guardians*.

Social network centrality was operationalized by determining the degree of the children were members of social groups and their respective social centrality within that group (Cairns, et al., 1988). Four groups of children in this study were identified on the basis of their respective social standing or social network centrality within the classroom: (1) *nuclear-nuclear* (children were members of a prominent social group and their affiliations with other group members was high); (2) *nuclear-secondary* (children were members of a prominent social group but their social ranking within that group was low); (3) *secondary* (children were members of a less visible group but their social ranking within that group was high); and (4) *isolates* (children who did not belong to a classroom social group). The research findings indicated that children's *bullying roles* were related to their respective social standing within the classroom. Therefore, the present data are unique in that they established a link between children's involvement in the bullying process and the classroom social hierarchy. Thus, it appears that bullies and their accomplices occupy positions the classroom social network that may be associated with interpersonal power.

The second objective of this study was to investigate how social networks were related to bullying and peer victimization. Previously researchers have suggested that behavioural similarities among social group members play a major role in children's socialization (Cairns & Cairns, 1994; Hartup, 1996). Furthermore, given the empirical evidence for the influence of social groups on children's antisocial or prosocial behaviour (Cairns, et al., 1988; Patterson, Capaldi, & Bank, 1991), it was hypothesized that children who were members of classroom groups were more likely to be *bullies, guardians, active bystanders,* and *henchmen* in bully/victim episodes than *victims*.

As hypothesized, the results of the present study indicated that the *nuclear-nuclear* children (children who retain a prominent social ranking within a high salient classroom social group) received more Bully peer nominations from their peers compared to *secondary* children (children who possess a prominent social ranking within a low salient classroom social group). Given that bullying has been classified as a subtype of aggression, this finding is consistent with previous research that has documented that highly aggressive students were *nuclear* in their social network centrality (Cairns, et al., 1988). Furthermore, network centrality is an indication of prominence within the social structure of the classroom (Cairns & Cairns, 1994); therefore, it is not surprising that *bullies* would possess this prominent or powerful social classroom position.

As postulated, *isolates* within the classroom social network received more Victim peer nominations compared to their classmates. One explanation for this may lie in the fact that children who are isolated from the peer group and hence, receive no peer social support, are more likely to be enticing targets for *bullies* and their associated tormenting behaviour. This is consistent with the similar finding of Salmivalli, Karhunen and Lagerspetz (1996b) that *victims* were the unpopular and rejected children within the classroom. Moreover, Farmer and Rodkin (1996) found that *isolates* scored significantly higher on indices of shyness and withdrawn behaviour compared to children who had higher social network centrality. Accordingly, the results of the present study have provided support and extended the previous findings suggesting children who are socially withdrawn and rejected or isolated from their peers are 'at risk' to be the *victims* in the bullying process (Olweus, 1993b; Parker & Asher, 1987; Rubin & Asendorf, 1993).

Finally, the present data demonstrated that the *nuclear-nuclear* children received more Guardian nominations from their classmates compared to children with lower social network centrality. Similarly, Salmivalli, et al. (1996) found that *defenders of the victim* had the highest social status (e.g., popular among their classmates) compared to other participant roles. These researchers hypothesized that high-status children were unafraid of being victimized themselves. Consistent with Salmivalli's research, the data in the present study has provided empirical evidence that children who were members of salient classroom groups and possessed many

social alliances with other children enjoy a social ranking that enables them to intervene and assist the unpopular *victim*. Given that *nuclear-nuclear* children have acquired a prominent position within the classroom social hierarchy, they are less likely to receive negative retribution from their peers or *bullies* if they choose to support the *victim* in a bullying episode.

In addition, the results of the present study demonstrated that *nuclear-secondary* children (children who were members of a prominent social group but maintained a low profile within their respective social group) received more Guardian nominations from their peers compared to *isolates*. This result is not surprising given that *isolates* have the fewest social alliances within the classroom and hence are more likely to be the *victims* in bullying incidents.

Same Group Membership between Bullies and Children in Other Bullying Roles. The present findings are also relevant to the hypothesis that social groups may provide peer support for antisocial behaviours (Cairns & Cairns, 1994). More specifically, Patterson and his colleagues (1991) theorized that deviant social groups provide the training arena in antisocial behaviours for children already disposed to negative behaviour by early childhood experiences. Therefore, it was hypothesized that *henchmen* and *active bystanders* were likely to have joint membership with *bullies* in the same social group. Moreover, it was expected that *bullies* would receive a salient ranking within their respective social groups whereas *active*

bystanders and *henchmen* would have medium or low saliency within the same social groups.

As predicted, children who share similar behavioural roles in the bullying process keep company with each other in the classroom. Specifically, *henchmen* were more likely to belong to the same social group as *bullies* compared to children who did not play an active role in the bullying process. Likewise, *active bystanders* shared joint membership with *bullies* in a classroom social group. These results demonstrated these classroom social groups possess a positive disposition toward bullying and peer victimization. Consistent with previous findings that suggest aggressive children were likely to belong to a social group (Cairns et al., 1988), the data in the present study suggest that classroom organization preconditions exist to make it possible for *bullies* to receive positive reinforcement from their peers for their antagonistic behaviours. The shared group membership of *bullies*, *henchmen*, and *active bystanders* provide mutual support for their antisocial bullying behaviours and values, thereby increasing the probability that the bullying process in the classroom will continue. More importantly, although Cairns and his colleagues (1988) failed to demonstrate that 10- and 13-year old males' aggression scores were primary factors for joint membership in a social group, the research findings of the present study indicated that children with compatible bullying behaviour tended to be in the same consensus social groups. Thus, younger children may not use general

aggression as a basis for selective affiliations; however, they may affiliate because of role compatibility in the bullying process.

The present research findings indicated that *bullies* were prominent members of high ranking peer groups within the classroom social hierarchy. Moreover, as predicted, the results of the present study indicated that *nuclear-secondary* children (children who received a lower ranking within prominent classroom social group) received more Active Bystander peer nominations. This research finding can be explained in two ways. First, Parker and Gottman (1989) suggested that peer group acceptance is an important social concern during middle childhood. Consequently, children may participate as *active bystanders* in the bullying process to gain approval or peer acceptance from *bullies,* children who are the higher-ranking *nuclear* members of their social groups. *Active bystanders* want to maintain their social status within the *bullies'* social group and thus, they silently or indirectly approve the *bullies'* peer abusive behaviour.

Second, *active bystanders* may feel like they are not contributing to the bullying process because they play a less obtrusive or more passive role compared to the *bullies'* primary role involvement or the *henchmen's* secondary active role participation. Hence, *active bystanders* have a decreased sense of individual responsibility for the negative plight of the victim. It is well established within the social psychological research that an individual's sense of responsibility for a negative action, such as bullying, may be considerably reduced when there are multiple

individuals involved in the incident (Olweus, 1993a). As a consequence, this diffusion of responsibility would lessen or eliminate any guilt feelings that *active bystanders* could develop based on their involvement in the persecution of the victim. Or it may be that *active bystanders* convince themselves that they are not even involved and hence the diffusion of responsibility is unnecessary.

The prediction concerning the *henchmen's* medium or low saliency within the same social group as the high-ranking *bullies* was not supported. The present results indicated *nuclear-nuclear* children received significantly more Henchmen peer nominations compared to *secondary* children (children who were less visible within the classroom hierarchy). Several explanations may account the present research finding. First, previous research has suggested that social hierarchies emerge in classrooms and schools as some peer groups have greater social prominence and influence than others (Alder & Alder, 1996; Cairns et al., 1988). For example, Alder and Alder (1996) identified popular social groups that were composed of cool students and their followers. Children in popular social groups commanded attention from others and set the behavioural criterion for the rest of the class. Therefore, *bullying* social groups in elementary school may have a similar positive effect on children's social affiliation. Given that in the present study it was found that members of smaller less powerful groups within the classroom received fewer Henchmen peer nominations, some children may be choosing to be members of the

prominent *bullying* social groups to enhance their own social affiliations with other classmates.

Second, as explained earlier, group mechanisms may play an important role in the bullying process. Numerous studies have documented that children are more likely to behave in an aggressive fashion after watching someone who has behaved aggressively (Parke & Slaby, 1983). Furthermore, the effect is stronger if the observer has a positive evaluation of the peer *model*. Hence, the *henchmen* in this study were more likely to engage in the peer victimization because of their strong affiliations with the dominant and salient classroom *bullies*. Once again, *prominent* or powerful ranking is perceived by children at this age to be an enticing and attractive social status. Hence, the *henchmen* could be imitating the powerful *bullies* who are respected members of their groups.

Third, children's affiliations with *bullies* may be considered to be a coping mechanism because specific peer coalitions within the classroom may serve as a protective measure from future peer abuse. There is a stronger likelihood that the targets of bullying and victimization would not possess strong alliances with the initiators of the peer abuse—the *bullies*. For example, the data from the children's narratives indicated that one of the reasons children join the bully was fear of being the *bullies'* next victim. Moreover, previous research has suggested that children engage in bullying incidents and assist *bullies* because they are afraid the *bullies* may turn against them (Rigby & Slee, 1991). Accordingly, it is not unexpected that

children become affiliated with *bullies*; and thereupon, guaranteeing their personal safety and strengthening their social position within the classroom.

Finally, the finding that *nuclear-nuclear* children received more Henchmen nominations may have occurred because of the methodological design of the present study. When children were asked questions concerning the classroom social network, they had access to lists of all members in the class. Consequently, this visual aid may have enhanced their own memory recall and thus, their social cognitive maps of the classroom were more inclusive rather than exclusive compared to if children were left to their own memory processes. As a consequence, children's social network centrality may have been slightly inflated by the fact that more children may have been named as *nuclear* and fewer children would receive a *secondary or peripheral* ranking in the present study.

Same Group Membership between Guardians and Children in Other Bullying Roles. Although no specific hypotheses were advanced concerning the extent of joint membership with *guardians* and other children in the bullying process, the present findings are consistent with the proposition that social groups provide peer support for prosocial behaviours (Cairns & Cairns, 1994). The present findings indicated that *guardians* were more likely to affiliate with other *guardians* compared to *no role* children (e.g., children who do not play an active role in the bullying process). Given that more females were nominated as *guardians*, one plausible explanation for the present result may be that females have joint membership with other females.

However, there were only five female social groups in which all members were nominated as *guardians*. The remaining *guardians* were members of mixed-sex social groups.

A second, and more convincing, explanation for this finding is that children who have similar behaviours (e.g., caring and empathy for the *victims* of bullying incidents) tend to affiliate with each other within the classroom. Cowie (2000) suggested that males demonstrated care for victims if the proper preconditions exist (e.g., no females present). Therefore, future studies of bullying incidents for the presence of females are warranted. It is possible that males are choosing not to behave as *guardians* in bullying situations because females are present in the bullying incident and they want to protect their *"macho"* image.

Children's Descriptions and Opinions of Bullying Incidents

The third objective of the present study was to examine children's perceptions or episodic descriptions of specific bullying episodes (e.g., an incident when the first nominated *bully* was picking on the first nominated *victim*). The present study confirmed earlier research that has investigated children's bullying indicating that on an episodic level third parties are typically involved in bully/victim incidents. Specifically, only one quarter of the bullying incidents were dyadic in nature (e.g., only *bullies and victims*). The remaining bullying narratives included third parties—*guardians, active bystanders,* and/or *henchmen.* Furthermore, contextual and

relationship factors influence the presence of *guardians* and *henchmen* as third parties in bully/victim incidents. Additionally, the present study represents a unique and important addition to the body of research on children's bullying because the examination of children's episodic descriptions of bullying incidents provides a *child's eye view* of the bullying process. Furthermore, it highlights how the multiple bullying roles are associated with one another and places the bully/victim incident in the larger context of the peer group.

Peer Involvement in Bullying: Episodic Analysis. The research findings emerging from the children's narratives provided further evidence that bullying is a group phenomenon and can involve children who act as *bullies, victims, guardians*, *active bystanders*, or *henchmen* in bully/victim incidents. The children's descriptions of bully/victim episodes included *guardians* (44%), *active bystanders* (31%), and *henchmen* (39%). The fact that bullying episodes included these third parties contributed to the readiness demonstrated by the children when asked to nominate classmates to these bullying roles. In addition, children's bullying situations occurred in locations in which other children were within the vicinity of the bully/victim incident (e.g., classroom, class line-up). Hence, observational studies (Pepler & Craig, 1995), peer nomination assessments (Salmivalli, et al., 1996; Sutton & Smith, 1999) and in the present study, an examination of children's bullying narratives contribute to the validity and necessity of examining particular roles children assume when confronted with bullying in their environments. Furthermore, the results

reported herein highlight the social nature of bullying and the examination of children's narratives provides an alternate method of studying bully/victim incidents.

In contrast to the gender differences found with the peer nomination results, the research findings associated with the children's narratives of bullying incidents indicated that both males and females participated as *bullies, guardians, active bystanders*, and *henchmen*. First, twenty-eight percent of the children nominated a female as the dominant bully of the class. Second, when *guardians* were included as third parties in bullying incidents, male *guardians* were mentioned by forty-five percent of the children. Third, females joined in and assisted with the victimization of another child (e.g., participated as *henchmen*) in thirty percent of the children's narratives. Finally, fifteen percent of the children provided narratives that included females acting in the role of *active bystanders*. For that reason, the present findings illustrate that it is essential to analyze bullying on an episodic level for a comprehensive understanding of the dynamics involved in bully/victim incidents.

There are several explanations for the discrepancy between the peer nominations of bullying roles and the episodic analysis of bullying incidents. First, as stated previously, the methodology associated with the peer nomination data identified children who were in the upper eighty-fifth percentile of the class distribution for that specific bulling role. Whereas, the children's personal narratives were based on bullying incidents that included the first nominated child in the bully role; thus, with the episodic analysis there were more opportunities to relate bullying

experiences that included females as the number one offender. Hence, these female *bullies* may have not been identified in the upper eighty-fifth percentile in the class distribution. Second, given that males are more likely to engage in physical forms of aggression compared to females (Bjorkqvist, et al., 1992) and physical aggression is very conspicuous to all the children in the classroom, the children may have a greater likelihood to remember such incidents. For example, in the present study there was a bullying incident during recess in which the *bully* and the *henchmen* spat on and damaged the *victim's* bike. Many children witnessed the physical abuse. In spite of the fact that the teacher discussed this incident with the class, the teacher did not catch the bully. This was very disturbing to many children in the class and thus, became a very salient memory of bullying. Even children in other classes knew about this bullying incident.

Emotions Associated with each Bullying Roles. Recall that *focal* children were asked to recall and describe an actual bully/victim episode involving the nominated bully and the nominated victim. The children's episodic accounts provided information relating to the feelings, motivations, and experiences associated with each bullying role. *Bullies*, *henchmen*, and *active bystanders* were all described as feeling primarily happiness throughout the bullying incident. These findings may be explained by the research conducted by O'Connell and his colleagues (1999). These researchers suggested that children actively join in with bullying so they can sense the positive feelings associated with the bully's perceived sense of power and dominance.

In contrast, and as might be expected, the *victims'* emotional state differed dramatically from the children who behaved in the *pro-bullying* roles. Frequently, children characterized the *victims'* in the bullying episodes as experiencing *sadness* and *anger*. This current finding, especially that regarding anger, is congruent with the research on provocative and chronic victims (Schwartz, et al., 1993; Salmivalli, et al., 1996). For example, provocative victims would react with anger and retaliate against the bully; whereas chronic victims of peer abuse feel very helpless and therefore, are consumed with feelings of sadness and dejection as a result of the peer abuse. Finally, *guardians* share *victims' anger* but do not directly experience *sadness*. Rather, these children *empathize* with the victims' plight. *Guardians* do act against *bullies* and may be effective in attaining retribution but other children do not perceive this as contributing to their happiness. For example, in one incident in which a *victim* was being physically and verbally tormented, a male *guardian* went and asked the teacher for help (despite the *victim's* protests) and that ended the bullying incident. But the *guardian* related later during the interview that he was not really feeling satisfied about his supportive actions because he stated, "*But I really wanted them to leave Andy alone for good because I know that sometime they are going to do it again.*"

Goals Associated with each Bullying Role. Regarding the goals of the children participating in the bullying episode, *focal* children described that the *bullies'* and *henchmen*' primary intentions or goals in the bullying incident were *to bother or hurt the victim*. The present findings are consistent with research that has suggested

that bullies have a powerful desire to inflict pain upon other children (Olweus, 1993a). In addition, the *bullies'* and *henchmen's* primary goal to bother or hurt the victim, provides corroboration for research findings that aggressive children have a more positive attitude toward gaining control over another child (Boldizar, et al., 1989). Not surprisingly, children described *active bystanders'* primary goal in bullying episodes as one of *joining the bully or having fun with the bully.* Again, *active bystanders'* secondary status within the *bullies'* social group can explain this finding. *Active bystanders* may be exploring ways to climb the classroom social ladder and the activity of watching or laughing at the *bullies'* victimization behaviours may be the *active bystanders'* avenue for acceptance by the peer group. Furthermore, and as expected the children described *victims'* and *guardians'* primary goal in bullying incidents for the cessation of the bullying to stop.

Motivations Associated with Each Bullying Role. Concerning the motivations of the children involved in the bullying incidents, *focal* children described *bullies* as having an extreme dislike of, or anger with, the victim and they wanted to demonstrate their desire for power and control by abusing the victim. Whereas *henchmen's* and *active bystanders'* involvement in bullying situations centered on *excitement* or *maintaining a positive relationship with the bully.* These findings are similar to Madsen and Smith (1994) who found that children reported that three primary reasons for why children bully other children were for pleasure/fun, to raise one's self esteem, and dislike for the victim. However, these researchers failed to

investigate if peer relationships played a significant motivating factor in for the third party involvement (e.g., *henchmen and active bystanders*) in bullying incidents. In contrast to children occupying other roles, the majority of children reported that *guardians* possessed motivations centered on justice and moral values (e.g., it is not fair for the bully to pick on the victim).

Strategies *Victims* Employ in Bully/Victim Incidents. Consistent with previous research, the data in the present study indicated that *victims'* employed two main strategies when dealing with a bullying situation. First, some *victims* reacted in an aggressive manner, either physically or verbally, (e.g., provocative victim) and as a consequence escalated the bullying situation. This aggressive retaliation may provide an opportunity for other children to join in the bullying situation. For example, *henchmen* were frequently friends with the *bully* and therefore, they may perceive their involvement as a positive action because they were assisting a friend in an aggressive situation. Second, some *victims* endured the *bullies* torment and abuse by doing nothing (e.g., chronic victims); however, they did not remove themselves from the bullying situation. Finally, a small minority of *victims* used passive strategies in bullying situations (e.g., ignored or walked away from the bully). Salmivalli and her colleagues (1996b) found that children reported that victims' who use strategies based on *nonchalance* (e.g., stays calm, doesn't take the bullying seriously) are perceived by classmates to be effective ending bullying situations. Therefore, by not responding to the bully takes away bullies' sense of power and control—if the victim

is no longer there, bullies can not continue with their tormenting behaviour—and places the power back on the victims' shoulders. *Bullies* will have to search for new victims. Finally, the results indicated a small proportion of the *victims* asked a teacher or the principal for help with the bullying incident. This finding is distressing because *victims* in the present study did not perceive the teachers as potential allies when frequently the sole factor that could stop the bullying situation was the presence of the homeroom teacher.

Another disturbing finding emerged when *focal* children were asked about the strategies they could employ if they witnessed the bullying incident. Although some children reported they would try to behave like *guardians* and ask the bully to stop or seek adult intervention to help terminate the bullying situation; about one-quarter of the children expressed *apathy* and they regarded the bullying incident as none of their business. For example, when asked about what you could do to help the victim, a female in grade five reported, *"No one really cares. There's nothing you can do to help. There's nothing you can do to stop it. There's nothing you can do to prevent it. Except maybe get someone but I don't know. Archie doesn't really care if he gets in trouble anymore."* Or another female in grade five said, *"So I think that the recess room is a lost cause where kids just sit there staring at a wall, not getting in real trouble. Just losing their recess and then the next recess they go out and do it again and they don't really care. You can yell at them tons and tons of times but they've made themselves immune to yelling. So I think they should find another way to give*

penalties." The previous two examples highlight that children are losing faith in the educational system when dealing with the bullies. In the future if we teach children about bullying as a group process, children may develop a sense of determination to exercise their own personal power on the playground and intervene when they witness bullying. Moreover, Peterson and Rigby (1999) found that anti-bullying activities were more successful if they were directed and implemented by the students themselves compared to anti-bullying programs that were implemented by educators.

Contextual Factors and the Henchmen Role. The results presented herein indicated that the presence of children in bullying incidents behaving as *henchmen* was determined by contextual factors. Specifically, *henchmen* were less likely to engage in tormenting another child when a regular and familiar teacher was in the immediate environment (e.g., homeroom teacher) compared to other school personnel. One possible explanation for this result is the regular homeroom teacher understands the dynamics of the classroom and consequently, he/she is capable of discouraging children from engaging in abusive behaviour that may assist the bully in peer victimization. An alternate explanation is that the homeroom teacher has the most external power over children's academic success and this may deter children from engaging in bullying behaviours.

Peer Support in Bullying Situations. The present findings also highlight the importance of children's friendships and subsequent bullying behaviours. For example, when *focal* children were asked about the relationships among the

participants depicted in the bullying incident, they indicated that *bullies* have strong positive relationships with *henchmen.* This provides an explanation for this third party involvement in bullying incidents. In addition, *bullies* did not have positive relationships or feelings toward the *victims*. Indeed, antagonistic feelings were mutual for the *victims* and the *bullies.* Hence, the animosity that characterizes the bully/victim relationship may provide an explanation for the actual occurrence of the bullying incident (e.g., children who do not like each other have a greater likelihood of engaging in conflict with each other). Furthermore, *focal* children indicated that *guardians* and *victims* were considered to be companions. These findings are congruent with the research on children's friendships (Furman & Buhrmester, 1985; Bukowski & Hoza, 1989). Specifically, children's friendships have been found to be important sources of reliable alliance shared between two children. In addition, Boulton and his colleagues (1999) have investigated if children's friendships provide protection against bullying. These researchers found that children who possessed mutual best friendships received fewer victimization nominations. Hence, bullying incidents may involve children as third parties as *henchmen* or *guardians* because of the established positive alliances these children have with the *bullies* and *victims*, respectively.

In addition, the present data indicated that children reported more negativity surrounding a bullying incident when *henchmen* were involved in the peer

victimization. This is not surprising because there are multiple children abusing the victim.

Bullying Role Differences: Pro-bullying, Victims, Guardians, and No Role Children

The fourth objective of the current research was to examine children's episodic descriptions of specific bullying situations and if significant differences existed between participants who engage in the bullying process. Given the limited research evidence that has examined bullying as a group process and the different participant roles children enact during bullying episodes, the present study represents an unique and important contribution to the substantial body of research that has examined children's aggression. Recall four groups of children: *pro-bullying (bullies, henchmen, and active bystanders)*, *victims*, *guardians*, and *no role (children who were nominated as not having a role in bullying incidents)* were compared to examine differences in children's episodic descriptions of bullying incidents. The research findings of the present study indicated that there were group differences in children's feelings about bullying, their motivations involved in bullying, their personal strategies children employ in bully/victim situations and their perceptions of victim intervention.

Emotional State During Bully/Victim Incidents. First, the present results indicated that *victims* were more likely to be feeling *sadness* and *anger* compared to other children. As explained in the previous section, this finding is consistent with the

research on provocative and chronic victims (Schwartz, et al., 1993; Salmivalli, et al., 1996). In addition, *guardians* are more likely to feel *empathy/sympathy* about the victims' predicament compared to other children, thereby prompting *guardians* to intervene in some manner to abet and support the *victims* who are being physically, verbally and/or psychologically abused by their classmates. This finding emphasizes the importance of raising children's consciousness regarding their personal contribution to the level of peer abuse that victims' endure and those years of peer abuse may lead to the victims' suicide. Then perhaps more children will empathize with *victims* of bullying and behave as *guardians* by seeking retribution on behalf of *victims*.

Finally, the research findings indicated that *no role* children asserted that the *victims* in the bullying incidents were experiencing *sadness*. This result suggests that although the *no role* children understood the distress experienced by the *victims*; the awareness is not sufficient for intervention. It is children's *empathy* for the victim that is necessary for actions for protecting the victims against the bullies' malicious behaviours. In addition, *pro-bullying* children expressed the opinion that *victims* were experiencing *fear* throughout the bullying incident compared to other children indicating that *pro-bullying* children are cognizant of the power imbalance that exists between bullies and their victims. Olweus (1993b) indicated that typical victims are anxious and insecure and display *fear* when attacked by other students. Similarly,

Boldizar and her colleagues (1989) found that aggressive children want to gain control over other children and thus, may perceive victims as frightened and insecure.

Motivations in Bullying Incidents. The data in the present study indicated that there were differences among the groups of children regarding their personal motivations concerning bullying incidents. First, and not surprisingly, the *pro-bullying* children were apathetic and unconcerned about the occurrence of a bully tormenting another child. These children did not care about what was happening and wanted to forget that the bullying incident occurred. Slee (1993) suggested that bullies' have fewer non-aggressive solutions to aggressive overtures of another child; hence, the *pro-bullying* children in the present study may have a limited repertoire of socially approved responses to bullying incidents and resolved that the bullies had no alternatives but persecution of the victims. Second, *victims* regard bullies' personal disposition (e.g., bully enjoys being powerful, bully dislikes other children) to be the primary driving force in bullying situations. As stated previously, this finding is consistent with the previous research that has examined the reasons why children bully other children (Madsen & Smith, 1994).

Strategies Children Employ in Bully/Victim Situations. As expected, the findings indicated that *pro-bullying* children suggested that verbal or physical retaliation was the best strategy to use if other children tormented them. Once again, this finding is consistent with research involving aggressive children (Pepler & Rubin, 1991). Similarly, *pro-bullying* children suggested that they would use aggressive

strategies (e.g., physically restrain the bully or victim) if they witnessed a bully/victim episode. Likewise, *pro-bullying* children would use confrontational strategies when asked about specific interventions they would use in specific bullying incidents. In contrast the *no role* children and *guardians* believed that an assertive strategy like telling the bully to stop was the best solution when dealing with bullying situations. These findings are concordant with the research presented by Slee (1993). He suggested that 'normal' children chose non-aggressive solutions when confronted with bullying.

Finally, *victims* maintained that passive strategies (e.g., ignore or walk away) were the optimal actions to enact when dealing with abusive children. However, *victims'* strategy choice changed when they were asked about intervention in a bullying episode (e.g., 'what could you do to help the victim?'). The present data also indicated that *victims* would inform a teacher about the bullying incident. Hence, *victims* changed from reacting in a passive fashion to actively intervening on behalf of the victim. Moreover, *victims* were less likely to suggest that alliance with the victims as a possible strategy for assisting children who were targets of bullying. It is plausible that *victims* are unaware of the impact of friendships in thwarting peer victimization. This is not surprising given the social network data indicated *victims* are isolated within the classroom. Hence, *victims* have not had the personal experience of rarely being helped out by other children or even being members of classroom group.

Interventions in Bully/Victim Incidents. One of the alarming findings of the present study was that *pro-bullying* children provided bullying narratives in which the victim was portrayed as receiving teacher assistance. This possible biased reporting can be explained a number of ways. First, *pro-bullying* children minimize the negative consequences associated with bullying because they perceive victims as receiving a lot of assistance from peers and teachers. Thus, they can rationalize their own behaviour and continue with their abusive behaviour. Moreover, *pro-bullying* children were more likely to provide bullying situations that were dyadic with the exclusion of children acting as a third party in the bully/victim incidents. Second, there are many occurrences of bullying within the school environment, it is possible that *pro-bullying* children selected specific bully/victim incidents when there was active victim intervention. Finally, research on bullying that has consistently documented that children's self-reports are biased and tend to underestimate the extent of bullying within the classroom (Sutton & Smith, 1999).

Ethical Issues arising from the Use of Peer Nomination Data

There has been considerable debate concerning the ethical issues involved in sociometric testing, particularly in the case of negative sociometric measures, which ask children to indicate peers whom they do not like or with whom they do not like to play. There is a concern that asking children to name peers whom they do not like would implicitly sanction the saying of negative things about their classmates. The

ethical issue for the present study arises when questions were asked about bullying roles. Specifically, children were asked to identify children *who pick on other children, who are picked on by other children,* and *when they see a child being picked on, will join in and help pick on that child.* Observational studies that have employed sociometric testing have demonstrated however that sociometric testing did not appear to adversely influence children's peer interactions (Coie & Kupersmidt, 1983; Hayvern & Hymel, 1984). In addition, the participating schools in this study benefited from the data collected because each school received a detailed report of the prevalence and the dynamics of bullying and peer victimization within the school. Also, to date, there are no reports of increased bullying within schools where *bullying and peer victimization* have been the focus of a research study (Pepler, et al., 1993; Sharp & Smith, 1991).

Several safeguards were put in place to protect the well-being of the participants in this study. As stated in the method section, at the beginning of each session there was a discussion of the importance of confidentiality and children were asked not to talk about the task during or after the administration. Children were debriefed at the end of each interview reminding them about the importance of confidentiality. Furthermore, negative nominations are usually classroom-administered but in the present study the negative nominations associated with bullying were collected during a semi-structured individual interview with the researcher thereby decreasing the possibility that children would make negative

comments to a peer during or after the child-researcher interview. Finally, the researcher interviewing the children had some clinical training dealing with children and their social problems and thus, was able to provide the children with support and guidance if problems arose during the interview. If children indicated that they are experiencing problems with bullying, the principal investigator would try to arrange, in coordination with the school principal, an opportunity for the children to speak with a member of the school staff. Also, the principal investigator was available for consultation following the data collection process.

Further safeguards involved the assigning of coded numbers to each participant involved in the study. Each questionnaire, audio-tape, and interview transcript was classified according to the assigned research numbers not personal identification. Finally, the questionnaire data and audio-tapes used to record the data associated with the semi-structured interview between the participant and the researcher was securely stored at the University. Only the principal student investigator and her supervisors had access to the data collected in this study.

Limitations and Future Directions for Research on Children's Bullying

Recall that the majority of children's episodic descriptions of bullying incidents did not include relational bullying despite the fact that the interviewer included relational aggressive behaviours in the definition of bullying utilized in the present study. Therefore, children may not always be using the categories the way

the experimenters define them. Furthermore, Swain (1998) found 93% of children in grade three and 92% of children in grade six agreed that bullying contained an indirect form of relational aggression (e.g., *always leaving someone out of a game, and not letting them play*). Hence, as stated previously, even though children have knowledge about relational aggressive behaviour, this was not a predominant form of bullying reported by children in the present study. This observation leads to the conclusion that the experimenters must always check the validity of the intended definition.

This problem raises a concern in the research studies on bullying because there is not a universally accepted operational definition of bullying (Swain, 1998). Nor does there appear to be consensus among children themselves. Swain (1998) suggested that younger children (e.g., third grade in contrast to those in the sixth grade) have an overly extensive conception of bullying (e.g., any harmful or nasty behaviour) which is not necessarily associated with repetition or a power imbalance between the bully and the victim. Accordingly, a precautionary measure was taken in the present study; that is, when children were asked to provide personal narratives describing the bullying incident between the nominated bully and the nominated victim, and there was a question about the validity of the bullying incident, the researcher asked the child if the *bully* picked on the *victim* frequently to ensure that repetition and power imbalance characterized the bullying interpersonal interaction.

Salmivalli and her colleagues (1998) reported that participant roles are relatively stable from one year to the next. However, an examination of the bullying incidents in the present study demonstrated that children's bullying roles are influenced by the situational context (e.g., relationships between the children, location of bullying incident). For example, a female who was nominated by her classmates as a *guardian* reported that she participated as a *henchman* in the bullying episode. When asked *why she joined in with the bully?* This female *henchman* replied, *"because she did not want to be the bully's next victim."* Therefore, she assumed that the *henchmen* role would serve as a protective measure thereby reducing the possibility that she would become the bully's next target of verbal abuse. This example emphasizes the point that the same child may take a different, even opposing, roles depending on the context of the bullying situation. Accordingly, an extensive examination of the situational factors associated with the third party roles of bullying incidents deserves greater attention in future studies.

Although the hypotheses tested in this study regarding the association between children's social networks and bullying roles were theoretically driven, it is important to note that the direction of causality could not be determined. For example, it was shown that *bullies, henchmen,* and *active bystanders* were members of the same social group. However, it was not clear that their common behaviours in bullying episodes was the causal link that drew them to form social groups. Therefore, in the future, researchers should first identify the classroom social groups

and then examine if common bullying attitudes and behaviours are consolidating attributes for the basis of group formation perhaps by examining behaviour change when children move in and out of groups (Kindermann, 1993; Neckerman, 1996).

Finally, given the low number of males nominated to the bullying role of *guardian*, future intervention programs should target males and nuclear members of nuclear groups and teach them to become more involved as *guardians*. Dan Olweus (1993a) suggested that one way to achieve this would be to implement class meetings and class rules centered bullying as a group phenomena into the school curriculum. These class meetings can focus on teaching children, and educators, about the third party roles involved in bullying incidents and how they can start taking social responsibility for the suffering of the victim. In addition, positive reinforcement schedules can be established in the classroom where *henchmen* and *active bystanders* receive more pleasure and peer acceptance by not joining *bullies* rather than the established perceived sense of power they now enjoy from their participation in the bullying process.

Conclusions

The present study contributed to the literature extant by demonstrating that bullying is a group phenomenon involving children in different roles. Beyond the commonly researched dyad, *bullies* and *victims*, the present data highlighted there are other children who participate in the bullying process: *guardians* (e.g., who assist

and console the targets of bullying), *henchmen* (e.g., who actively assist the bullies) and *active bystanders* (e.g., who provide positive indirect support of bullying behaviour). Therefore, given that many children are somehow involved in the bullying process, anti-bullying programs should be directed not only toward the *bullies* and their *victims*, but also towards the whole classroom peer group.

Two aspects of children's peer relations were examined in relation to their bullying roles: popularity and social network positions. With respect to popularity, the present data replicates previous research that has suggested children who assist and help out the *victims* of peer abuse (e.g., *guardians*) receive more positive nominations from classmates compared to other children (Salmivalli, et al., 1996). This result supports the research that asserts that prosocial children enjoy popularity among their peers (Coie et al., 1990). Unique to the present study, the social network analysis demonstrated that children's social positions within the classroom were associated with participant roles in bullying incidents.

The results of the present study may have implications for the development of social interventions for children who are *victims* in the bullying process. First, the results suggest that *victims* are isolated within the classroom. This highlights the importance of promoting positive social alliances between all members of the classroom. Peer inclusion techniques can be implemented within the school curriculum. For example, rotating group class projects and class distribution are ways in which *victims* have the affiliative opportunities all members of their classroom.

This is important given there is greater likelihood that children will intervene and help a target of bullying if they view *victims* in a emphatic manner. Collaboration on school projects is may be one way that children can develop positive feelings for one another. In addition, findings from the present research provide a link between the classroom hierarchy and bullying behaviour. It is possible that changes be made to the existing classroom social structure and the manner in which classroom groups are established. If the school curriculum could use rotating groups so children are interacting with all the children in the classroom may lessen the probability that powerful bullying groups could be established. However, further research is warranted to determine if such classroom procedures are warranted and feasible.

In addition, the research findings of this study indicated that children's friendships played an important role in the bullying process. The current results support the friendship protection hypothesis that proposes children who are befriended by other children will be protected from peer victimization (Boulton, et al., 1999). These present results indicating that *guardians* had emphatic relations with *victims* emphasize the importance of friendship quality between *victims* and other children and peer intervention in the bullying process.

Moreover, the present results reported herein revealed that strong affiliations existed between *bullies*, *henchmen*, and *active bystanders*. In addition, *active bystanders* have a secondary role or limited power within their classroom peer groups. Therefore, *henchmen* and *active bystanders* may be targeted and trained as

peer helpers within the classroom and playground. Typically, the training of peer supporters involves teaching skills of active listening, empathy, problem solving, and supportiveness. Naylor and Cowie (1999) reported that bystanders can be actively involved as peer helpers, with appropriate training and education, and assist children who are *victims* in bullying incidents.

Previous research has highlighted the importance of implementing weekly class meetings centered on social problems (e.g., bullying) within the classroom (Olweus, 1993a). Teachers could emphasize the social nature of bullying and the individual responsibility children have toward eliminating peer abuse within their classroom; making children accountable for the experiences within their own social environment. Furthermore, class meetings may provide *victims* with a active voice thereby increasing *victims'* sense of individual power and confidence. The *victims'* newfound confidence may decrease the likelihood that they would be targets of future bullying incidents (Schwartz, Dodge, et al., 1993).

In summary, given the results of this study and the conclusions derived from them, it has been shown that it is imperative to focus on bullying as a group process when assessing the negative consequences of peer victimization. Moreover, the results presented herein highlight that anti-bullying intervention programs need to address the contextual factors (e.g., social network centrality) and the role they play in abetting the power imbalance inherent in bullying episodes. In addition, the relevance of the findings suggest that social-cognitive models of aggression are

incomplete and need to be expanded to encompass the other roles and the fundamental cognitive mediators that are involved in anti-social behaviour (e.g., *henchmen* and *active bystanders*). It is important to know the many faces of the protagonist in bullying situations however, there is a necessity to apply this model of aggression to understand pro-bullying roles. Also, to address the problems associated with bullying and the development of appropriate intervention strategies, researchers must focus on not only the behavioural characteristics of bullies but on the social mechanisms in the classroom that support such bullying behaviour. Finally, the present study highlight the social nature of bullying and the examination of children's narratives provided an alternative method of studying bully/victim incidents.

REFERENCES

Alder, & Alder, (1996). Preadolescent clique stratification and the hierarchy of identity. Social Inquiry, 66, 111-142.

Asher, S. R., & Hymel, S. (1981). Children's social competence in peer relations: Sociometric and behavioral assessment. In J. D. Wine & M. D. Smye (Eds.), Social competence (pp. 125-157). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Bandura, A. (1973). Aggression: A social learning analysis. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bandura, A. (1986). Social foundations of thought and action. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Berndt, T. J. (1983). Social cognition, social behavior, and children's friendships. In E. T. Higgins, D. N. Ruble, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), Social cognition and social development: A sociocultural perspective. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Berndt, T. J. (1986). Children's comments about their friendships. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology: Vol. 18. Cognitive perspectives on children's social and behavioral development (pp. 189-212). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Berndt, T. J., & Perry, D. G. (1986). Children's perceptions of friendships as a supportive relationships. Developmental Psychology, 22, 640-648.

Bigbee, M. A., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995, March). Relational and overt forms of victimization and aggression. Crick, N. R., & Bigbee, M., A. (1995, March). A poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.

Bjorkqvist, K., Ekman, K., & Lagerspetz, K. (1982). Bullies and their victims: Their ego picture, ideal ego picture, and normative ego picture. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 23, 307-313.

Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. Aggressive Behavior, 18, 177-127.

Boldizar, J. P., Perry, D. G., & Perry, L. C. (1989). Outcome values and aggression. Child Development, 60, 571-579.

Boulton, M. J. (1996). A comparison of 8- and 11-year-old girls' and boys' participation in specific types of rough-and-tumble play and aggressive fighting: Implications for functional hypothesis. Aggressive Behavior, 22, 271-287.

Boulton, M. J., & Underwood, K. (1992). Bully/victim problems among middle school children. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 62, 73-87.

Boulton, M. J., Trueman, M., Chau, C., Whitehead, C., & Amatya, K. (1999). Concurrent and longitudinal links between friendship and peer victimization: Implications for befriending interventions. Journal of Adolescence, 22, 461-466.

Bukowski, W. M., & Hoza, B. (1989). Popularity and friendship: Issues in theory, measurement and outcome. In T. J. Berndt & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), Peer relationships in child development (pp. 15-45). New York: Wiley.

Cairns, R. B., & Cairns, B. D. (1991). Social cognition and social networks: A developmental perspective. In D. J. Pepler and K. H. Rubin (Eds.), The development and treatment of aggression (pp. 249-278). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Cairns, R. B., & Cairns, B. D. (1994). Lifelines and risks: Pathways of youth in our time. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B. D., Neckerman, H. J., Gest, S. D., & Gariepy, J. L. (1988). Social networks and aggressive behavior: peer support or peer rejection? Developmental Psychology, 24, 815-823.

Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B. D., Neckerman, H. J., Ferguson, L. L. & Gariepy, J. L. (1989). Growth and aggression: I. Childhood to early adolescence. Developmental Psychology, 25, 320-330.

Cairns, R. B., Leung, M-C., Buchanan, L. & Cairns, B. D. (1995). Friendships and social networks in childhood and adolescence: Fluidity, reliability, and interrelations. Child Development, 66, 1330-1345.

Campbell, A. (1993). Men, women, and aggression. New York: Basic Books.

Coie, J. D. (1990). A theory toward peer rejection. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 365-401). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Coppotelli, H. (1982). Dimensions and types of social status: A cross-age perspective. Developmental Psychology, 18, 557-570.

Coie, J. D., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1983). A behavioral analysis of emerging social status in boys' groups. Child Development, 54, 1400-1416.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1990). Peer group behavior and social status. In S. R. Asher & Coie, J. D. (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 17-59). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1998). Aggression and antisocial behavior. In W. Damon (Series Ed.) and N. Eisenberg (Vol. Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology: Vol. 3 Social, emotional, and personality development (5th Ed., pp. 779-862).

Cowie, H. (2000). Bystanding or standing by: Gender issues in coping with bullying in English schools. Aggressive Behavior, 26, 85-97.

Craig, W. M. (1995, March). Victimization and aggression: Are they related? A paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.

Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1995). Naturalistic observations of bullying and victimization in the school yard. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, York University, Toronto, Canada.

Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1994). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 115, 74-101.

Crick, N. R., & Bigbee, M., A. (1995, March). Gender differences in the expression and experience of maltreatment: Relational and Overt Aggression. A paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.

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

Crick, N. R., Bigbee, M. A., & 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.

Dishion, T. J., Patterson, G. R., & Griesler, P. C. (1994). Peer adaptations in the development of antisocial behavior: A confluence model. In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives (pp.61-95). New York: Plenum Press.

Dodge, K. A. (1980). Social cognition and children's aggressive behavior. Child Development, 51, 162-170.

Dodge, K. A. (1983). Behavioral antecedents of peer social status. Child Development, 54, 1386-1399.

Dodge, K. A. (1986). A social information processing model of social competence in children. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology: Vol. 18. Cognitive perspectives on children's social and behavioral development (pp. 77-125). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Dodge, K. A. (1991). The structure and function of reactive and proactive aggression. In J. D. Pepler & K. H. Rubin (Eds.) The development and treatment of childhood aggression (pp. 201-218). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum

Dodge, K. A., Coie, J. D., & Brakke, N. P. (1982). Behavior patterns of socially rejected and neglected preadolescents: The roles of social approach and aggression. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 10, 389-410.

Dodge, K. A., & Frame, C. I. (1982). Social cognitive biases and deficits in aggressive boys. Child Development, 55, 163-173.

Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1987). Social information-processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 53, 1146-1158.

Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1989, April). Bully-victim relationships in boys' play groups. Paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Kansas City, MO.

Dodge, K. A., Coie, J. D., Petit, G. S., & Price, J. M. (1990). Peer status and aggression in boys' groups: Developmental and contextual analyses. Child Development, 61, 1289-1309.

Dodge, K. A., Price, J. M., Coie, J. D., & Christopoulos, C. (1990). On the development of aggressive dyadic relationships in boys' peer groups. Human Development, 33, 260-270.

Duck, S. (1983). Friends for life: The psychology of close relationships. New York: St. Martin's Press.

El-Sheik, M., Cummings, E. M., & Goethch, V. L. (1989). Coping with adults' angry behavior: Behavioral, physiological, and verbal responses in preschoolers. Developmental Psychology, 25, 490-498.

Epstein, J. L. (1989). The selection of friends: Changes across the grades and in different school environments. In T. J. Berndt & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), Peer relationships in child development (pp. 158-187). New York, NY: Wiley.

Farmer, T. W., & Rodkin, P. C. (1996). Antisocial and prosocial correlates of classroom social positions: The social network perspective. Social Development, 5, 176-190.

Farmer, T. W., & Hollowell, J. H. (1994). Social networks in mainstream classrooms: Social affiliations and behavioral characteristics of students with emotional and behavioral disorders. Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 2, 143-155.

Fine, G. A. (1987). With the boys: Little league baseball and preadolescent culture. Chicago: University Press.

Furman, W., & Buhrmester, D. (1985). Children's perceptions of personal relationships in their social networks. Developmental Psychology, 21, 106-1024.

Gottheil, N. F. (1995, March). Bullies and victims: Patterns of the use and receipt of physical aggression as a possible mechanism for status maintenance. A poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.

Guerra, N. G., & Slaby, R. (1990). Cognitive mediators of aggression in adolescent offenders: Intervention. Developmental Psychology, 26, 269-277.

Hall, W. M. (1973). Observational and interactive determinants of aggressive behavior in boys. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Indiana University. As cited in R. B. Cairns, (Ed.), Social development: The origins and plasticity of interchanges. San Francisco, CA: W. H. Freeman and Company

Harter, S. (1982). The perceived competence scale for children. Child Development, 53, 89-97.

Hartup, W. W. (1983). Peer relations. In P. H. Mussen (Series Ed.) & E. M. Hetherington (Vol. Ed.), Handbook of child psychology: Socialization, personality, and cognitive development Vol. 4. (pp. 103- 196).

Hartup, W. W. (1996). The company they keep: Friendships and their developmental significance. Child Development, 67, 1-13.

Hays, W. L. (1988). Statistics 4th Edition. New, NY: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, Inc.

Hayvern, M., & Hymel, S. (1984). Social behavior and sociometric preferences: Do children really play with peers they like? Child Dvelopment.

Hymel, S. & Franke, S. (1985). Children's peer relations: Assessing self-self-perceptions. In B. H. Schnieder, K. H. Rubin, & J. E. Ledingham (Eds.), Children's peer relationships: Issues in assessment and intervention (pp. 75-92). New York: NY Springer-Verlag.

Higgins, E. T. & Parsons, J. E. (1983). Social cognition and the social life: Stages as subcultures. In E. T. Higgins, D. N. Ruble, & W. W. Hartup (Eds.), Social cognition and social development (pp. 15-62). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Hodges, E. V., Malone, M. J., & Perry, D. G. (1995, March). Behavioral and social antecedents and consequences of victimization by peers. A paper presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.

Huesmann, L. R. (1988). An information-processing model for the development of aggression. Aggressive Behavior, 14, 13-24.

Huesmann, L. R., & Eron, L. D. (1984). Cognitive processes and their persistence of aggressive behavior. Aggressive Behavior, 10, 243-251.

Huesmann, L. R., Eron, L. D., Lefkowitz, M. M., & Walder, L. O. (1984). Stability of aggression over time and generations. Developmental Psychology, 20, 1120-1134.

Hyde, (1984). How large are gender differences in aggression? A developmental meta-analysis. Developmental Psychology, 20, 722-736.

Kindermann, T. A. (1993). Natural peer groups a contexts for individual development: The case of children's motivation at school. Developmental Psychology, 29, 970-977.

Kupersmidt, J. B., & Coie, J. D. (1990). Preadolescent peer status, aggression, and school adjustment as predictors of externalizing problems in adolescence. Child Development, 61, 1350-1362.

Ladd, G. W., & Price, J. M. (1986). Promoting children's cognitive and social competence: The relation between parent's perception of task difficulty and children's perceived and actual competence. Child Development, 57, 446-460.

Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Bjorkqvist, K., Berts, M. & King, E. (1982). Group aggression among school children in three schools. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 23, 45-53.

Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Bjorkqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression typical of females? Gender differences in aggressiveness in 11- to 12-year old children. Aggressive Behavior, 14, 403-404.

Ligwag, M. D., & Stein, N. L. (1995). Children's memory for emotion episodes: The importance of emotion enactment. Child Development, 60, 2-31.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). The psychology of gender differences. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Maccoby, E. E. & Jacklin, C. N. (1980). Sex differences in aggression: A rejoinder and reprise. Child Development, 51, 964-980.

Madsen, K., & Smith, P. K. (1994, June). Age and gender differences in participants' perceptions of why people bully. A poster presented at the 13 th Biennial Meetings

of the International Society for the Study of Behavioral Development, Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

Naylor, P., & Cowie, H. (1999). The effectiveness of peer support systems in challenging school bullying: The perspectives and experiences of teachers and pupils. Journal of Adolescence, 22, 467-479.

Neckerman, H. J. (1996). The stability of social groups in childhood and adolescence: The role of the classroom social environment. Social Development, 5, 131-145.

O'Connell, P. D., Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: Insights and challenges for intervention. Journal of Adolescence, 22, 437-452.

O'Connell, P. D., Pepler, D. J., & Kent, K. (1995, March). Gender and age differences in types of aggressive behavior. A poster presented at the biennial meeting of the Society for Research in Child Development, Indianapolis, IN.

Olweus, D. (1989). 'Questionnaire for Students' (Junior and senior versions). Unpublished manuscript.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school children: Basic facts and effects of school-based intervention programs. In D. J. Pepler and K. H. Rubin (Eds.), The development and treatment of aggression (pp.). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

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

Olweus, D. (1993b). Victimization by peers: Antecedents and long-term outcomes. In K. H. Rubin and J. Asendorf (Eds.), Social withdrawal, inhibition and shyness in childhood. Hillsdale NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Parke, R. D.,& Slaby, R. G. (1983). The development of aggression. In P. H. Mussen (Ed.), & E. M. Hetherington (Ed.), Handbook of Child Psychology, Vol. 4 (pp. 547-641). New York: Wiley.

Parker, J. G. & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? Psychological Bulletin, 102, 357-389.

Parker, J. G., & Gottman, J. M. (1989). Social and emotional development in a relational context: Friendship interaction from early childhood to adolescence. In T. J. Berndt & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), Peer relations in child development (pp. 15-45). New York: Wiley.

Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1993). Friendship and friendship quality in middle childhood: Links with peer group acceptance and feelings of loneliness and social dissatisfaction. Developmental Psychology, 29, 611-621.

Parker, J. G., Rubin, K. H., Price, J. M., & DeRosier, M. E. (1995). Peer relationships, child development, and adjustment: A developmental psychopathology perspective. In D. Cicchetti and D. Cohen (Eds.), Developmental psychopathology: Vol. 2: Risk, disorder, and adaptation. New York: Wiley.

Patterson, G. R., Littman, R., & Bricker, W. (1967). Assertive behavior in children: A step toward a theory of aggression. Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development, 32 (Serial No. 113).

Patterson, G. R. , Capaldi, D., & Bank, L. (1991). An early starter model for predicting delinquency. In D. J. Pepler & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), The development and treatment of childhood aggression (pp. 139-168). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pepler, D. J., & Rubin, K. H. (1991). The development and treatment of childhood aggression. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Pepler, D. J., King, & Byrd, (1991). In D. J. Pepler & K. H. Rubin (Eds.), The development and treatment of childhood aggression (pp. 139-168). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M., Ziegler, S., & Charach, A. (1993). An evaluation of an anti-bullying intervention in Toronto schools. In D. Tattum (Ed.), Understanding and managing bullying (pp. 76-91). Hienemann Books.

Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (1995). A peek behind the fence: Naturalistic observations of aggressive children with remote audiovisual recording, Developmental Psychology, 31, 548-553.

Perry, D. G., Perry, L. C., & Rasmussen, P. (1986). Cognitive social learning mediators of aggression. Child Development, 57, 700-711.

Perry, D. G., Kusel, S. J., & Perry, L. C. (1988). Victims of peer aggression. Child Development, 24, 807-814.

Perry, D. G., Williard, J. C., & Perry, L. C. (1990). Peers' perceptions of the consequences that children provide for their aggressors. Child Development, 61, 1289-1309.

Peterson, L., & Rigby, K. (1999). Countering bullying at an Australian secondary school with students as helpers. Journal of Adolescence, 22, 481-492.

Price, J. M., & Dodge, K. A. (1989). Reactive and proactive aggression in childhood: Relations to peer status and social context dimensions. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 17, 455-471.

Rigby, K., & Sharp, S. (1993). Cultivating the art of self defense amongst victimized children. The International Journal of Protective Behaviors, 1 (2), 24-27.

Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1991). Bullying among Australian school children: Reported behavior and attitudes to victims. Journal of Social Psychology, 131, 615-627.

Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1993). Dimensions of interpersonal relation among Australian school children and their implications for psychological well-being. Journal of Social Psychology, 133 (1), 33-42.

Rivers, I., & Smith, P. K. (1994). Types of bullying behaviors and their correlates. Aggressive Behavior, 20, 359-368.

Rodkin, P. C., Farmer, T. W., Pearl, R. & Van Acker, R. (2000). Heterogenity of popular boys: Antisocial and prosocial configurations. Developmental Psychology, 36, 14-24.

Ross, H., Ross, M., Wilson, A., & Smith M. (1999). The dandelion war. In S. R. Goldman, A. C. Graesser, and P. Van den Broek (Eds.), Narrative comprehension, causality, and coherence: Essays in honor of Tom Trabasso (pp. 253-278). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rubin, K. H., & Coplan, R. J. (1992). Peer relationships in childhood. In M. H. Bornstein and M. E. Lamb (Eds.), Developmental Psychology: An advanced textbook (3rd Ed.) (pp. 519-578). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rubin, K. H., & Asendorf, J. (1993). Shyness, social withdrawal , and inhibition in childhood. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rubin, K. H., & Daniels-Bierness, (1983). Concurrent and predictive correlates of sociometric status in kindergarten and grade one children. Merrill Palmer Quarterly, 29, 337-351.

Rubin, K. H., & Krasnor, L. R. (1983). Age and gender differences in the development of a representative social problem-solving skill. Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 4, 463-475.

Rubin, K. H., & Krasnor, L. R. (1986). Social cognitive and social behavioral perspectives on problem solving. In M. Perlmutter (Ed.), Minnesota Symposia on Child Psychology: Vol. 18. Cognitive perspectives on children's social and behavioral development (pp. 1-88). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Rubin, K. H., Hymel, S., LeMare, L. J.., & Rowden, L. (1989). Children experiencing social difficulties: Sociometric neglect reconsidered. Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 21, 94-111.

Rubin, K. H., LeMare, L. J., & Lollis, S. (1990). Social withdrawal in childhood: Developmental pathways to peer rejection. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood (pp. 217-249). Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, K. H., Bream, L., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1991). Social problem solving and aggression in childhood. In D. J. Pepler and K. H. Rubin (Eds.), The development and treatment of aggression (pp. 219-248). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rubin, K. H., Hymel, S., Mills, R. S. L., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1991). Conceptualizing different developmental pathways to and from social isolation in childhood. In D. Cicchetti and S. L. Toth (Eds.), Rochester Symposium on Developmental

Psychopathology: Vol. 2. Internalizing and externalizing expressions of dysfunction (pp. 91-122). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rubin, K. H., & Rose-Krasnor, L. (1992). Interpersonal problem solving. In V. B. Van Hasset & M. Hersen (Eds.), Handbook of social development (pp. 283-323). New York: Plenum.

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

Salmivalli, C., Karhunen, J., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1996b). How do victims' respond to bullying? Aggressive Behavior, 22, 99-109.

Salmivalli, C., Huttunen, A., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1997). Peer networks and bullying in schools. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 38, 305-312.

Salmivalli, C., Lappalainen, M., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1998). Stability and change of behavior in connection with bullying in schools. Aggressive Behavior, 24, 205-218.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1993). The emergence of chronic peer victimization in boys' play groups. Child Development, 64, 1755-1772.

Serbin, L. A., Marchessault, K., McAffer, V., Peters, P., & Schwartzman, A. E. (1993). Patterns of social behavior on the playground in 9-11 year-old girls and boys: Relation to teacher perceptions and to peer ratings of aggression, withdrawal, and likability. In C. Hart (Ed.), Children on the playground (pp. 162-183). New York, NY: SUNY Press.

Selman, R. L. (1980). The growth of personal understanding. Orlando, FL: Academic.

Selman, R. L. (1981). The child as a friendship philosopher. In S. R. Asher & J. M. Gottman (Eds.), The development of children's friendships (pp. 242-271). New York: Cambridge Press.

Selman, R. L., & Schultz, L. H. (1990). Children's strategies for interpersonal negotiation with peers: An interpretative/empirical approach to the study of social development. In T. J. Berndt & G. W. Ladd (Eds.), Peer relationships in childhood. New York: Wiley.

Sharp, S., & Smith, P. K. (1991). Bullying in UK schools : The DES Sheffield Bullying Project. Early Child Development and Care, 77, 47-55.

Slaby, R. G., & Roedell, W. C. (1982). The development and regulation of aggression in young children. In J. Worrell (ED.), Psychological development in elementary years (pp. 97-149). New York: Academic Press.

Slaby, R. G., & Guerra, N. G. (1988). Cognitive mediators of aggression in adolescent offenders: 1. Assessment. Developmental Psychology, 24, 580-588.

Slee, P. T. (1993). Bullying: A preliminary investigation of the nature and effects on social cognition. Early Childhood Development and Care, 87, 47-57.

Slee, P. T., & Rigby, K. (1993). The relationship of Eysenck's personality factors and self-esteem to bully/victim behavior in Australian boys. Personality and Individual Differences, 14, 371-373.

Slee, P. T., & Rigby, K. (1993). Australian school children's self-appraisal of interpersonal relations: The bullying experience. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 23, 272-283.

Smith, P. K., & Boulton, M. (1990). Rough and tumble play, aggression, and dominance: Perception and behaviors in children's encounters. Human Development, 33, 271-282.

Spivack, G., & Shure, M. B. (1974). Social adjustment of young children: A cognitive approach to solving real-life problems. Washington, DC: Jossey-Bass

Stein, N. L., & Ligwag, M. D. (1997). A goal-appraisal approach to understanding and remembering emotional events. In P. Van den Broek, P. Bauer, & T. Bourg (Eds.), Developmental spans in event comprehension and representation (pp. 199-235). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Sullivan, H. S. (1953). The interpersonal theory of psychiatry. New York: Norton.

Sutton, J., & Smith, P. K. (1999). Bullying as a group process: An adaptation of the participant role approach. Aggressive Behavior, 25, 97-111.

Swain, J. (1998). What does bullying really mean? Educational Research, 40, 358-364.

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

Appendix A

Demographic Survey

FAMILY BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Child's Name _____

Birthdate_____ (month)_____(day)_____(year) Age_____Boy___Girl___

Has your child always lived with you?_____ If not, explain_____

Child's Mother's name: _____

Age _____ Occupation _____

Mother's education completed:

- Elementary School _____
- High School _____
- College _____
- University _____
- Graduate School _____
- Other _____

Mother's country of birth: _____

Mother's original ethnic origin: _____

Child's Father's name: _____

Age _____ Occupation _____

Father's education completed:

- Elementary School _____
- High School _____
- College _____
- University _____
- Graduate School _____
- Other _____

Father's country of birth _____

Father's original ethnic origin: _____

Marital Status (check one)	Married	_____	Common Law	_____
	Divorced	_____	Single	_____
	Separated	_____	Other	_____

List all the people living within your household and their relationship to you:

Name	Relation
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

An Executive Summary of the study's results will be mailed to you. This summary will contain general findings resulting from this study and **will not include any personal information about the children who have participated in the study.** A copy of the Executive Summary will also be given to your child's principal and guidance counselor and will be available to the participants upon their request.

Mailing Address: _____

_____

_____

Appendix B

Instructions Concerning Interview Questions and Confidentiality

Hi, my name is _____ and I am currently a student a the University of Waterloo. As part of my school work I have decided to do a research study on children's peer relationships. Specifically, I am interested in children's relationships within your class. Therefore, today I am going to ask you about children in your class. It is important to me to know and understand how the children your class are interacting. I am going to ask you to help me by filling out some forms and answering some questions that ask about you, kids you know, and how well you get along together at school. Remember, this is not a test. You will not be graded. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions. It is your opinion that is important. I feel that children are the experts and can teach adults, like myself, something new. I came here today to gain some information from the experts. Before I begin I would like to remind you that the information you tell me is confidential. Do you remember what confidentiality means? That's right! When we say answers are 'confidential', it means that it is a secret and no one else will know about it. Your answers today will be a secret. No one else will know about them. Your answers are just between you and me. They are private and you should keep them private. Please try not to talk to your friends about what we have discussed today. Keep your answers a secret. Everyone has different ideas. Not all kids think and feel the same way about things as you do. So do not worry about what anyone else thinks. Just tell me what you think. Okay? Do you understand? Are there any questions?

Okay who is the boss—you or me? That's right you are the boss. So if any of the questions make you feel uncomfortable, just let me know and we can move on to the next activity. Okay? This is really important because I want you to have fun with me today—so let me know if you do not want to answer a question. Also, if you want to return to class, just let me know—because you are the boss. Okay? Are there any questions?

Appendix C

Complete Interview Protocol

Hi, my name is _____ and I am currently a student a the University of Waterloo. As part of my school work I have decided to do a research study on children's peer relationships. Specifically, I am interested in children's relationships within your class. Therefore, today I am going to ask you about children in your class. It is important to me to know and understand how the children your class are interacting. I am going to ask you to help me by filling out some forms and answering some questions that ask about you, kids you know, and how well you get along together at school. Remember, this is not a test. You will not be graded. There are no right or wrong answers to any of the questions. It is your opinion that is important. I feel that children are the experts and can teach adults, like myself, something new. I came here today to gain some information from the experts. Before I begin I would like to remind you that the information you tell me is confidential. Do you remember what confidentiality means? That's right! When we say answers are 'confidential', it means that it is a secret and no one else will know about it. Your answers today will be a secret. No one else will know about them. Your answers are just between you and me. They are private and you should keep them private. Please try not to talk to your friends about what we have discussed today. Keep your answers a secret. Everyone has different ideas. Not all kids think and feel the same way about things as you do. So do not worry about what anyone else thinks. Just tell me what you think. Okay? Do you understand? Are there any questions?

Okay who is the boss—you or me? That's right you are the boss. So if any of the questions make you feel uncomfortable, just let me know and we can move on to the next activity. Okay? This is really important because I want you to have fun with me today—so let me know if you do not want to answer a question. Also, if you want to return to class, just let me know—because you are the boss. Okay? Are there any questions?

Now I am going to ask you a few questions about the children in your class. Okay?
(Have class list present)

Are there kids who play with or hang around together a lot? Who are they?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

Group Four: _____

Group Five: _____

Are there kids outside of your class who play with or hang out with this particular group?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

Group Four: _____

Group Five: _____

(If only same-sex groups were named) Are there any groups of boys and girls?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

Group Four: _____

(If the child does not mention him-or herself) What about yourself? Do you have a group you hang around with in your class?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

(If no) Do you have a group you hang around with in school?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

Are there children in your class who do not belong to a social group? Who?

_____

(If yes) Why do you think _____ does not belong to a social group?

_____

Now I would like you to circle the names of three kids in your class who YOU LIKE TO PLAY WITH. Are there anymore kids who you like to play with?

Now I am going to ask you some questions about bullying.
"What do you think bullying means?"

Following the children's responses, the researcher will read the following definition of bullying:
"We say that a student is being bullied or picked on when another student, or a group of students, say nasty and unpleasant things to him or her. It is also bullying when a student is hit, kicked, threatened, locked inside a room, sent nasty notes, when no one ever talks to them, and things like that. It is also bullying when a student is teased repeatedly in a nasty way or is purposely left out of group activities. These things may happen often and it is hard for the student to defend himself or herself. BUT, it is NOT BULLYING OR PICKING ON SOMEONE when two children of about the same strength have the odd fight or quarrel."

Now I would like to ask you some questions about bullying in your class. Specifically, I want you to circle the names of three kids who BULLY OR PICK ON other kids. Are there any more kids who pick on other kids?

Now I would like you to circle the names of three kids who ARE BULLIED OR PICKED ON by other kids. Are there any more kids who are picked on by other kids?

Now I would like you to circle the names of three kids who HELP OTHER KIDS when they are being picked on by someone. Are there any more kids who help other kids when they are being picked on someone?

Now I would like to circle the names of three kids whom LIKE TO STAND AROUND AND WATCH BUT DON'T DO ANYTHING when someone is picking on another kid, that is when bullying is happening. Are there any more kids who like to stand around and watch?

Now let us say that someone is being picked on by other kids, I would like you to circle the names of three kids who will JOIN IN AND HELP PICK ON the other kid. Are there any more kids who will join in and help pick on the other kid?

The researcher will ask the child about the BULLY-VICTIM relationships that they have indicated.

Now I would like to know about your experiences with bullying. Can you tell me about a time when _____ (first bully's name indicated) was picking on _____ (first victim's name indicated) ? Did you see when _____ was picking on _____ _____?

What you were feeling when _____ was picking on _____? (**provide the child with a list of emotions: happiness, sadness, anger, fear, surprise, disgust or neutral)

Now tell me exactly what happened. I want to know <u>all</u> of the things that you remember. When did the bullying take place? Where did it happen?

How did the bullying situation start? Who started it?

_____

Did _____ (victim's name) do anything to start it?

_____

What happened once the bullying started?

_____

And then?

_____

And then?

_____

Is there anything else?

_____

How did it end?

_____

Repeat the list of names the child indicated in his/her narrative. You said _____ was there?

_____

Who else was involved in the bullying situation? When were they there? (Some or all the time)

_____

And what did _____ do? What do you remember about what they did or said what?

_____

Was anybody else there?

What did you want to happen? Why?

Did you get some of what you wanted?

What did _____ (each participant named in the bullying episode) want to happen? Why?

How do you think _____ (name each child that was mentioned in the bullying episode) felt during the bullying episode? (Show child the list of emotions)_____

Did any good things come because of the bullying incident?

Did any bad things come because of the bullying incident?

What would you do if you were _____ (victim's name)?

What would you do if you were one of the kids watching?

What would you do to help _____ (victim's name)? What else would you do?

Did anybody else pick on _____ (victim's name)?

Did anyone else help or join in with _____ (bully's name)? And what did _____ do or say?

Why do you think they helped _____ (bully's name)?

Did any kid try to help _____ (victim's name)? And what did _____ do or say?

Why do you think they helped or did not help _____ (victim's name)?

Now let me see if I understand the situation. Retell the child's story.

Ask about the relationships between the participants involved in the bullying incidents. Were they friends, acquaintances, or not friends?

Ask about the role each child played in the bullying incident. Were they the BULLY, VICTIM, ACTIVE BYSTANDER/WITNESS, GUARDIAN, or HENCHMEN (accomplice of the bully). (Provide the child with a list of the five bullying roles.)

Now, I want thank you for your participation and your cooperation. You have been very helpful. I would like to remind you that everything you have told me today is confidential and will not be told to anyone else. Your answers are private information. I will not discuss your answers with your teachers, your principal, your classmates, or your parents. Also, you will help me if you remember that your answers are a secret. Please do not discuss your answers with other classmates.

Remember, this was not a test. As far as I am concerned every question you answered was correct. Thank you very much for all your help. Are there any questions? Do you have any concerns about the bullying that occurs within your classroom? Is there anyway I can help?

SUBJECT IDENTIFICATION NUMBER: _____

SEX: MALE FEMALE

GRADE: _____

DATE: _____

HAPPINESS

SADNESS

ANGER

FEAR

SURPRISE

DISGUST

NEUTRAL

BULLY

VICTIM

ACTIVE BYSTANDER/WITNESS

BULLY'S HELPER

VICTIM'S HELPER

FRIEND

ACQUAINTANCE

NOT A FRIEND

Appendix D

Peer Nomination Scales for Identifying Roles in a Bullying Episode

Circle the names of three kids in your class who BULLY OR PICK ON other kids.

Ellen
Stephen
Tomas
Paul
David
Melissa
Lisa
Fred
Daniella
John
Darren
Mary
Arthur
Jennifer
Calvin
Shaun
Cathy
Elizabeth
James
Dana
Angie
Sarah
Melanie
Jessi

Circle the names of three kids in your class who ARE BULLIED OR PICKED ON by other kids.

Ellen
Stephen
Tomas
Paul
David
Melissa
Lisa
Fred
Daniella
John
Darren
Mary
Arthur
Jennifer
Calvin
Shaun
Cathy
Elizabeth
James
Dana
Angie
Sarah
Melanie
Jessi

Circle the names of three kids in your class who HELP OTHER KIDS when they are being picked on by someone.

Ellen
Stephen
Tomas
Paul
David
Melissa
Lisa
Fred
Daniella
John
Darren
Mary
Arthur
Jennifer
Calvin
Shaun
Cathy
Elizabeth
James
Dana
Angie
Sarah
Melanie
Jessi

Circle the names of three kids in your class who LIKE TO STAND AROUND AND WATCH WHEN ANOTHER KID IS BEING PICKED ON BUT DON'T DO ANYTHING, that is, when bullying is happening.

Ellen
Stephen
Tomas
Paul
David
Melissa
Lisa
Fred
Daniella
John
Darren
Mary
Arthur
Jennifer
Calvin
Shaun
Cathy
Elizabeth
James
Dana
Angie
Sarah
Melanie
Jessi

Now let's say that someone is being picked on by other kids, please circle the names of three kids in your class who will JOIN IN AND HELP PICK ON THE OTHER KID.

Ellen
Stephen
Tomas
Paul
David
Melissa
Lisa
Fred
Daniella
John
Darren
Mary
Arthur
Jennifer
Calvin
Shaun
Cathy
Elizabeth
James
Dana
Angie
Sarah
Melanie
Jessi

Appendix E

Interview Protocol for Children's Narratives on Bullying

(Ross, Ross, Wilson & Smith, 1999)

The researcher will ask the child about the BULLY-VICTIM relationships that they have indicated.

Now I would like to know about your experiences with bullying. Can you tell me about a time when _____ (first bully's name indicated) was picking on _____ (first victim's name indicated) ?

Did you see when _____ was picking on _____?

What you were feeling when _____ was picking on _____?
(**provide the child with a list of emotions: happiness, sadness, anger, fear, surprise, or disgust)

Now tell me exactly what happened. I want to know all of the things that you remember.

When did the bullying take place? Where did it happen?
How did the bullying situation start? Who started it?
Did _____ (victim's name) do anything to start it?

What happened once the bullying started?
And then?
And then?
Is there anything else?
How did it end?

Repeat the list of names the child indicated in his/her narrative. You said _____ was there?
Who else was involved in the bullying situation? When were they there? (Some or all the time) And what did _____ do? What do you remember about what they did or said what?

Was anybody else there?

What did you want to happen? Why?
Did you get some of what you wanted?
What did _____ (each participant named in the bullying episode) want to happen? Why?

How do you think _____ (name each child that was mentioned in the bullying episode) felt during the bullying episode? (Show child the list of emotions)

Did any good things come because of the bullying incident?
Did any bad things come because of the bullying incident?

What would you do if you were _____ (victim's name)?

What would you do if you were one of the kids watching?

What would you do to help _____ (victim's name)? What else would you do?

Did anybody else pick on _____ (victim's name)?
Did anyone else help or join in with _____ (bully's name)? And what did _____ _____ do or say?
Why do you think they helped _____ (bully's name)?

Did any kid try to help _____ (victim's name)? And what did _____ do or say?
Why do you think they helped or did not help _____ (victim's name)?

Now let me see if I understand the situation. Retell the child's story.

Ask about the relationships between the participants mentioned in the bullying incident.

Ask about the role each child played in the bullying incident. Were they the BULLY, VICTIM, ACTIVE BYSTANDER (WITNESS - observed the bullying incident but they did not intervene), GUARDIAN, or HENCHMEN (accomplices of the bully). Provide the child with a list of the roles.

HAPPINESS

SADNESS

ANGER

FEAR

SURPRISE

DISGUST

NEUTRAL

BULLY

ACCOMPLICE / HENCHMEN

VICTIM

GUARDIAN

ACTIVE BYSTANDER

Appendix F

Coding Scheme for Bullying Narratives

(Madsen & Smith, 1994)

CODING VARIABLES FOR BULLYING INCIDENTS

SUBJECT NUMBER: e.g., A018

GENDER: 1=Male 2=Female

RACE: 1=Caucasian
2=Asian
3=Black
4=East/West Indian
5=Other

GRADE: 1= Four 2=Five 3=Six

AGE: e.g., 11.4

SCHOOL: 1=Alpine 2=Suddaby 3=Trillium

NUMBER OF PEERS IN EACH SPECIFIC BULLYING ROLE:

CHILD: BULLY: How many?
VICTIM:
GUARDIAN:
ACTIVE BYSTANDER:
HENCHMEN:

RESEARCHER: BULLY: How many?
VICTIM:
GUARDIAN:
ACTIVE BYSTANDER:
HENCHMEN:

OTHER PEOPLE STANDING/SITTING AROUND: 1-Yes 2=No

NUMBER OF PEERS: Total number of kids involved in the bullying incident

LOCATION: 1=Homeroom class
2=Hallway or line up
3=Scool yard or Playground
4=Another room
5=Other class: French, Music, Supply teacher, etc.

6=Other location

TIME OF DAY: 1=Recess
2=Lunch
3=Class time
4=Morning before first bell
5=After school/leaving the school
6=Other

FEELINGS:

1=Happiness	8=Sympathy/Emapathy
2=Sadness	9=Happy/Anger
3=Anger	10=Sad/Anger
4=Fear	11=Anger/Happy
5=Surprise	12=Sad/Fear
6=Disgust	13=Other Combination
7=Neutral	14=Not involved in bullying incident

Code for the Focal Child, Bully, Victim, Guardian, Active Bystander, Henchmen

INITIATING EVENTS: 1=Bully initiated
2=Victim initiated
3=Other initiated

DID THE VICTIM DO ANYTHING TO START THE BULLYING?

1=No 2=Yes

ACTIONS THAT CONCLUDED THE EPISODE?

1=Bell rang	5=Active Bystander initiated
2=Teacher/Adult intervened	6=Guardian initiated
3=Bully initiated	7=Henchmen initiated
4=Victim initiated	8=No reason 9=Other

SOME HELPED THE VICTIM: 1=No 2=Yes

WHY? 1=Friends with victim
2=Friends with bully
3=Don't like to see it; Don't like to see the victim get hurt;
It's not right to pick on kids

4=Bully was getting away with hurting the victim

5=Not applicable

6=Wanted to continue with the game, activity

WHY NOT?

1=Scared they would be bullied next

2=Afraid other kids won't like them

3=They don't know what to do

4=Think nothing will happen if they do intervene

5=They don't like to tattle on people; Did not want to get the victim or bully in trouble

6=It's none of their business; they don't care

7=They don't like the victim; It was the victim's fault

8=Afraid they will get in trouble if they become involved in the bullying incident

9=Friends with the bully

10=Did not hear the bullying or see the bullying; Nobody around to help

11=Other reason

12=Not applicable

13=I don't know

DID ANYBODY JOIN THE BULLY? 1=No 2=Yes

WHY DID THEY JOIN IN THE BULLYING?

1=Scared they would be bullied next

2=Peer pressure; scared they will lose friends; to make friends; it's cool

3=Exciting and fun; thought it was funny

4=Friends with the bully

5=Don't like or care for the victim

6=Victim deserved it; made at the victim

7=Personality; they are like that; they like to fight

8=They are more powerful together; power issues

9=Nobobdy joined in

10=Other reason

11=They didn't start it so they will not get in trouble; it was okay to join in

WAS THERE LAUGHING/CHEERING SUPPORT FOR THE BULLYING?

1=No 2=Yes

RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN THE PARTICIPANTS:

1=Friends 2=Friend/Acquaintance 3=Acquaintances

4=Acquaintances/Not a friend 5=Not Friends

FOCAL CHILD AND BULLY

FOCAL CHILD AND VICTIM

FOCAL CHILD AND GUARDIAN

FOCAL CHILD AND ACTIVE BYSTANDER

FOCAL CHILD AND HENCHMEN

BULLY AND VICTIM

BULLY AND GUARDIAN

BULLY AND ACTIVE BYSTANDER

BULLY AND HENCHMEN

VICTIM AND BULLY

VICTIM AND GUARDIAN

VICTIM AND ACTIVE BYSTANDER

VICTIM AND HENCHMEN

SPECIFIC GOALS: FOCAL CHILD, BULLY, VICTIM, GUARDIAN, ACTIVE BYSTANDER, HENCHMEN

0=Not involved

1=Ignore the bully

2=Victim to physically retaliate; someone to physically retaliate against bully; hurt the bully

3=Victim to verbally retaliate; tell the teacher

4=Bully to get in trouble: detention

5=Bully to get in trouble: expelled, go away forever

6=Bother the victim; hurt the victim; make victim mad/sad; likes teasing the victim; bully to continue picking on victim

7=Victim to get in trouble

8=Victim not to do anything; victim to walk away; victim to go away

9=Bully and victim to get in trouble; detention' reprimand from teacher/principal

10=Bully to walk away; leave the victim alone; bullying to stop; bully to be quiet

11=Nothing to happen; forget that the bullying happened

12=Bully issues: get attention; to gain power; to feel cool

13=Wanted to help the victim

14=Not sure; I don't know

15=Bully and victim to talk to each other; to say sorry to each other; to be friends

16=To have fun; to have friends

17=Teacher to intervene; wish the teacher had heard the bullying

18=Join the bully; to be included; wanted the fight to continue

WHY DID YOU WANT THAT TO HAPPEN? FOCAL CHILD, BULLY, VICTIM, GUARDIAN, ACTIVE BYSTANDER, HENCHMEN

0=Not involved

1=Bully issues; bully is bad; bully has a problem; bully likes to pick on kids; bully was doing something bad; bully was hurting the kid

2=Justice; it's not fair to pick on kids; feel sorry for the victim; it's not right to pick on kids

3=Bully did not want to get in trouble

4=Bully's power and control; so he/she could feel stronger; bully is happy when victim is mad; bully could have control of the activity

5=Does not like the bully; can't stand the bullying

6=Did not want to fight or have a conflict; victim did not like the bullying; not good role models for younger children

7=Victim provoked the bully

8=The kid did not care about what was happening

9=Bully to have remorse for his actions

10=Friends with the bully; wanted to be friends with the bully

11=It's cool; to look 'good' or 'cool'; to make friends

12=It's fun and exciting; it's a joke; thought it was funny; likes fights

13=Friends with the victim

14=I don't know

15=Mad at the victim; does not like the victim; victim to get in trouble

16=Wanted to be included; to be part of the group; victim to be included

17=Wanted to play the game; to continue with the activity

18=Victim did not want to get in trouble; active bystander did not want to get in trouble

DID ANY BAD THINGS HAPPEN? 1=No 2=Yes

WHAT BAD THINGS?

0=No bad things happened

1=Bully is still picking on victim; bully is getting away with it

2=Victim was in trouble

3=Victim was hurt; victim was being picked on

4=The victim should have been in trouble with the bully

5=Bully got in trouble

6=Victim became mad at the bully and henchmen

7=Victim is picking on people now

8=There was a fight; verbal fight; don't like bullying

9=Bully and victim were in trouble

DID ANY GOOD THINGS HAPPEN? 1=No 2=Yes

WHAT GOOD THINGS?

0=No good things

1=The bullying stopped; the bully went away; victim walked away

2=The bully has not picked on the victim lately

3=Victim had fun doing something else; hanging out with different people

4=Bully and victim were mad at each other

5=Victim realized that the bully was not a nice person; victim realized who were his/her friends

6=It was fair; no one was suspended

7=Bully learned a lesson; bully was in trouble

8=Bully and victim are friends again

9=Learned new information about the people

TYPES OF BULLYING:

1=direct verbal 2=direct physical 3=relational 4=direct physical and verbal

DID BULLY RECEIVE SUPPORT FOLLOWING THE INCIDENT?

1=No 2=Yes

DID VICTIM RECEIVE SUPPORT FOLLOWING THE INCIDENT?

1=No 2=Yes

STRATEGIES:

IF YOU WERE VICTIM?

1=Physically fight back

2=Verbally fight back; engage in negative conflict; yell back; threaten to fight

3=Talk with the victim

4=Ask a friend for help

5=Ask a teacher for help; tell the teacher

6=Tell a parent

7=Ignore the bully

8=Walk away

9=Nothing; afraid the bully might pick on them; it won't do anything

10=Other

11=Tell the principal

12=Talk with the bully; tell him to stop

WHAT HAPPENED; WHAT DID THE VICTIM DO?

Same coding categories as above

WHAT IF YOU WERE WATCHING THE BULLYING?

1=Break up the fight by physically restraining the bully

2=Break up the fight by physically restraining the victim

3=Talk with the bully; Tell him/her to stop

4=Talk with the victim

5=Join with the victim; help the victim out; help victim to fight back

6=Ask a friend for help

7=Tell the teacher

8=Tell a parent

9=Nothing; it is none of my business; don't want to get involved

10=Nothing because it won't do anything; don't know what to do; afraid they will be bullied next

11=Tell the principal

12=Join the bully

13=Have the bully and the victim to talk to each other and make up

WHAT COULD YOU DO TO HELP THE VICTIM?

Same coding categories as above

PERSONAL ROLE IN BULLYING INCIDENT?

1=Bully 2=Victim 3=Guardian 4=Active Bystander 5=Henchmen

6=Not involved; partially involved; heard about it

WAS THE BULLYING INCIDENT TOLD BY MORE THAN ONE CHILD?

1=No 2=Yes

DID THE PARENTS HAND IN A BACKGROUND SHEET?

1=No 2=Yes

CHILDREN'S DEFINITION OF BULLYING?

1=Direct physical 2=Direct verbal 3=Indirect relational

4=Direct physical and verbal

5=Making fun of kids; hurting kids; doing stuff to make them mad or cry; jealousy

6=All of the above

WAS 'TEASING/MAKING FUN OF PEOPLE' INCLUDED IN THE DEFINITION?

1=No 2=Yes

WAS 'POWER' INCLUDED IN THE DEFINITION? (Toughest; big kids picking on little kids; bugging kids for no reason; harassing kids; threatening kids)

WAS 'COOL' INCLUDED IN THE DEFINITION? (Want to be popular, impress someone/others, to show off)

Appendix G

Children's Social Network Protocol

(Cairns, Cairns, Neckerman, Gest, & Gariepy, 1988)

Now I am going to ask you a few questions about the children in your class. Okay?

Are there kids who play with or hang around together a lot? Who are they?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

Group Four: _____

Group Five: _____

Are there kids outside of your class who play with or hang out with this particular group?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

Group Four: _____

Group Five: _____

(If only same-sex groups were named) Are there any groups of boys and girls?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

Group Four: _____

(If the child does not mention him-or herself) What about yourself? Do you have a group you hang around with in your class?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

(If no) Do you have a group you hang around with in school?

Group One: _____

Group Two: _____

Group Three: _____

Are there children in your class who do not belong to a social group? Who?

_____

(If yes) Why do you think _____ does not belong to a social group?

_____

Appendix H

Bullies' Motivations During Bullying Incidents

Bullies' Motivations. When children were asked about the bullies' motivations in bullying episodes, 30.7% of the children expressed the opinion that the bully does not like the victim or was mad at the victim. Twenty-eight percent of the children reported bullies desire for power and control over the victim (e.g., he/she could feel stronger) as the primary bullying motivation. Bullies' personality characteristics (e.g., bully likes to pick on kids) were indicated by 16% of the children and 12% of the children claimed that bullies like to participate in bullying incidents because it is exciting and fun. Some children (9.3%) expressed that bullies engage in bullying behavior because they want to establish friendships or to be included by the peer group. Finally, four percent of the children felt that although the bully victimized another child, the bully did not want to receive punishment from the teacher.

Appendix I

Victims' Motivations During Bullying Incidents

Victims' Motivations. When children were asked about the reasoning motivating the victims' goals involved bullying incidents, thirty-two percent of the children reported that victims felt bullies' personality characteristics as the victims' primary motivation. Children (31.3%) indicated that victims detest the bully and bullying incidents. Approximately seventeen percent of the children (16.7%) expressed that victims did not want to engage in the bullying incident and does not enjoy conflict situations. Some children claimed that victims did not care about the bully/victim episode and wanted to continue with the peer group activity (8.7%). Children reported that peer inclusion (e.g., wanted to be part of the group) as the primary motivation for victims in bullying incidents. Finally, children indicated that victims wanted the bully to exhibit remorse for the bullying behavior (4.7%).

Appendix J

Guardians' Goals and Associated Motivations During Bullying Incidents

Guardians' Motivations. When children were asked about guardians' motivations in bully/victim episodes, the majority of children (38.5%) reported that guardians possessed motivations centered on justice and moral values. Some children (24.6%) indicated personal friendships (e.g., friends with the victim or the bully) as the primary motivation for guardians in bullying incidents. Twenty percent of the children expressed the opinion that guardians' motivations centered on continuing with the peer group activity and avoiding punishment from the teacher. Finally, 16.9% of the children reported that guardians felt that the bully possessed negative personality characteristics. Children's reports of the Guardians' goals and associated motivations are located in Tables 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, and 40.

Table 35

Guardians' First Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

First Goal	
Bullying to stop/Bully to walk away	49.2
Associated Motivations	
Justice—it's not fair to pick on kids	40.6
Wanted to continue with activity/Did not want to get in trouble	25.0
Friends with the victim or bully	18.8
Bully issues—Bully enjoys bullying	15.6

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 36

Guardians' Second Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Goal Number Two	
Wanted to help the victim	15.4
Associated Motivations	
Justice—It's not fair to pick on kids	40.0
Friends with victim or bully	40.0
Bully issues—Bully enjoys bullying	15.6

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 37

Guardians' Third Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Third Goal	
Bully and Victim talk with each other and settle their differences	10.8
Associated Motivations	
Wanted to continue with activity/Did not want to get in trouble	28.6
Bully issues—Bully enjoys bullying	28.6
Friends with the victim or bully	28.6
Justice—It's not fair to pick on kids	14.3

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 38

Guardians' Fourth Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Fourth Goal	
Bully to receive a detention or be expelled from school	10.8
Associated Motivations	
Justice—it's not fair to pick on kids	57.1
Bully issues—Bully enjoys bullying	28.6
Friends with the victim or bully	14.3

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 39

Guardians' Fifth Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Fifth Goal	
Victim to physically or verbally retaliate against the bully	7.7
Associated Motivations	
Wanted to continue with activity/Did not want to get in trouble	40.0
Friends with the victim or bully	40.0
Justice—It's not fair to pick on kids	20.0

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 40

Guardians' Sixth Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Sixth Goal	
Nothing to happen/Forget about the bullying incident	6.2
Associated Motivations	
Justice—It's not fair to pick on kids	50.0
Wanted to continue with activity/Did not want to get in trouble	25.0
Friends with the victim or bully	25.0

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Appendix K

Henchmen's Goals and Associated Motivations During Bullying Incidents

Henchmen Motivations. Approximately twenty-six percent of the children (25.8%) reported that henchmen' motivations involved in bully/victim incidents centered on their friendship with the bully. Children (22.6%) expressed that henchmen' involvement in peer victimization was the result of the excitement and fun henchmen receive when they engage in bullying behavior. Victim factors (e.g., detests the victim, angry with victim) were reported by children (19.4%) as a primary motivation for henchmen' involvement in bullying incidents. Peer relations (e.g., to make friends, it's cool) was mentioned by 17.7% of the children. Finally, the experience of power and control attached to peer victimization attracted henchmen to engage in bullying behavior was reported by 14.5% of the children. Henchmen goals and corresponding motivations reported by the children are located in Tables 41, 42, 43, and 44.

Table 41

Henchmen First Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

First Goal	
Bother the victim/Hurt the victim	48.4
Associated Motivations	
Friends with the bully	33.3
Mad at victim/Does not like victim	23.3
It's exciting and fun	16.7
Bully's power and control	13.3
It's cool/To make friends	13.3

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 42

Henchmen Second Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Second Goal	
To gain power/To join with bully	22.6
Associated Motivations	
It's cool/To make friends	35.7
Mad at victim/Does not like victim	21.4
It's exciting and fun	21.4
It's cool/To make friends	21.4

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 43

Henchmen Third Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Third Goal	
Nothing to happen	16.1
Associated Motivations	
Bully's power and control	40.0
It's exciting and fun	20.0
Friends with the bully	20.0
It's cool/To make friends	10.0
Mad at victim/Does not like victim	10.0

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 44

Henchmen Fourth Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Fourth Goal	
To have fun/To have friends	12.9
Associated Motivations	
It's exciting and fun	50.0
Bully's power and control	12.5
It's cool/To make friends	12.5
Mad at victim/Does not like victim	12.5
Friends with the bully	12.5

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Appendix L

Active Bystanders' Goals and Associated Motivations

Active Bystanders' Motivations. Over half of the children (52%) indicated that active bystanders engage in bullying behaviors because they find the bullying situation fun to watch. Twenty-four percent of the children reported that active bystanders detest or were angry with the victim (24%). Finally, twenty-four percent of the children expressed that active bystanders' primary motivation for involvement in bully/victim incidents was centered on their established friendships with the bully. Children's perceptions of Active Bystanders goals and associated motivations are presented in Tables 45, 46, and 47.

Table 45

Active Bystanders' First Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

First Goal	
To join the bully/Have fun with the bully	52.0
Associated Motivations	
It's exciting and fun	76.9
Friends with bully/Bully's power and control	15.4
Mad at victim/Does not like victim	7.7

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 46

Active Bystanders' Second Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Second Goal	
Bother the victim/Hurt the victim	32.0
Associated Motivations	
Mad at victim/Does not like victim	37.5
It's exciting and fun	37.5
Friends with bully/Bully's power and control	25.0

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.

Table 47

Active Bystanders' Third Goal in Bullying Incidents and Associated Motivations (N=150).

Third Goal	
Nothing to happen	16.0
Associated Motivations	
Mad at victim/Does not like victim	50.0
Friends with bully/Bully's power and control	50.0

Note: Numbers reflect percentages of children's responses.