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Bullying is a serious concern with lasting effects. It involves the use of aggressive behaviors as a way to gain power and control over peers (Olweus, 1993). Teen involvement, in both traditional forms of bullying and cyberbullying, is significant. The present study attempted to better understand the relationship between traditional bullying victimization and cyberbullying behavior through the interplay of hurt reaction, poor social skills, and/or avoidant coping. One hundred and six high school students ranging from 14 to 18 years old participated in an online survey. While as many as 72% of the participants recognized cyberbullying occurring among their peers, only 4.7% of participants self-identified as having engaged in cyberbullying behaviors. The low number of self-identified cyberbullies made it difficult to conduct analyses. Therefore, the two primary hypotheses in this study could not be examined. Additional exploratory analyses examined the relationship between traditional bullying victimization and cyberbullying victimization. Gender differences among victims and non-victims of cyberbullying were not found to be significant. Analyses revealed that participants’ involvement in cyberbullying victimization was significant if they were also involved in more traditional forms of bullying victimization and used more than one coping strategy as a way to stop their victimization. In addition, cyberbullying victimization was found to be correlated with the amount of time participants spent online during the week. Finally, regression analyses revealed relational bullying victimization was the only predictor of cyberbullying victimization. Possible reasons for these study findings and
limitations are discussed further. The strong overlap between traditional forms of bullying and cyberbullying highlights the importance and need for continued study.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Teasing and social exclusion are often considered “part of the territory” of becoming an adolescent. As children age, peers become the primary source for guidance and understanding. Adolescents often face a struggle for social standing among their peers at school and consider social rejection to be one of the most traumatic events in their life (Lev-Wiesel, Nuttman-Shwartz, & Sternberg, 2006). Belonging to a peer group is likely to decrease teasing and social exclusion, but many individuals who lack social support at school are repeatedly subjected to intentional harm (Reijntjes, Stegge, & Terwogt, 2006). Individuals who become targets of peer aggressive behavior can be plagued by depressive symptoms and often respond to rejection in a manner that maintains or intensifies helpless feelings (Reijntjes et al, 2006). Although victims of bullying are often reluctant to seek help, individuals who believe seeking help will result in positive outcomes are more likely to talk with someone about the bullying situation (Banks, 1997; Hunter, Boyle, & Warden, 2004). For example, a victim who believes seeking help will eliminate the bullying situation will be more likely to seek support compared to a victim who believes getting a teacher involved will result in more bullying. While some victims decide to seek help, the majority of children fear provoking a bully and choose to remain silent; “telling a teacher may be an effective way to stop bullying, but it may also bring costs which, to the victim, outweigh the benefits” (Hunter & Boyle, 2002, p. 332). Thus, although help-seeking behavior has been recognized by researchers as an effective coping strategy, many victims rely on other forms of coping to overcome bullying.
The use of some coping strategies can further deteriorate a victim’s level of functioning. For example, a victim may use retaliation as a mode of coping. Research has shown that continuous harassment heightens a victim’s sense of frustration which may trigger the use of retaliation (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005b). While many victims have a preference for retaliation to counter bullying behaviors, they also lack a belief in being able to retaliate effectively (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005a). Retaliation may be used by victims who are not capable of behaving prosocially or who believe retaliation is a successful approach to defend against a bully (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005a). However, physical retaliation may not be wise since victims are often targeted due to vulnerability. Victims are usually unable to physically defend themselves against bullies (Salmivalli, Karhunen, & Lagerspetz, 1996; Salmivalli, Lappalainen, & Lagerspetz, 1998). Thus for those who do “fight back”, retaliation may lead to a worse bullying situation.

Technology may be a solution for some victims of bullying. Computer and cell phone availability and usage has become prevalent among adolescents and may serve many functions for adolescents who have been victimized. Technology may be a way to distract an individual from a bullying situation or be viewed as a method of problem-solving (Seepersad, 2004). While the internet has increasingly become a point of social contact for adolescents, electronic communication has also become a means to bully, threaten, or possibly retaliate against a peer (Berson & Berson, 2005).

Researchers have recently focused more attention to bullying over electronic media. According to Brown, Jackson, and Cassidy (2006), cyberbullying is a covert and psychological form of bullying. Electronic media can give an individual a sense of power they do not experience during a face-to-face encounter. Remaining anonymous online allows a victim to assert dominance over individuals who may be able to physically overtake the victim in person (Beran & Li, 2005). According to Li (2005) the greatest proportion of students who reported being a cyber-victim had no idea who had bullied them. Anonymity makes it difficult to target cyberbullies and stop the bullying. Prolonged bullying victimization may negatively influence coping abilities. Some victims may turn to the internet to overcome bullying and loneliness, but these victims are
not likely experiencing the positive impact of the internet if they are also ineffectively coping offline (Seepersad, 2004). Past bullying victimization and access to electronic media are important to consider when assessing the coping strategies victims use to deal with bullying. The purpose of this study is to assess the relationship between traditional bullying victimization and cyberbullying perpetration.

Bullying in Schools

Bullying is defined as the intentional infliction of injury or discomfort by one or more individuals (Olweus, 1993). Bullying is an extremely common form of violence among children and adolescents. Research indicates an estimated 10% to 30% of children are forced to endure teasing and bullying during the school day (Nansel et al, 2001). An aggressor may use direct or indirect acts to bully another. Direct bullying is an open attack on another through the use of physical or verbal aggression (Olweus, 1993). Indirect bullying is used by an individual to create social exclusion, such as through the spreading of rumors (Beran & Li, 2005). Indirect bullying can be just as harmful to an individual’s functioning as direct bullying (Coyne, Archer, & Eslea, 2006).

While direct and indirect bullying are terms that are often used in research, there are several ways to describe the two forms of bullying. For example, direct bullying may be used interchangeably with overt bullying. In this study, bullying will be described as either direct or indirect to be consistent with the research literature being discussed.

Developmental changes appear to influence the use of indirect and direct acts of aggression. Vitaro, Brendgen, and Barker (2006) completed a review of the current literature exploring the developmental course of aggressive behaviors in children and adolescents. They found that early childhood is a time when direct aggression is most often used against peers due to a lack of other expressive tools. Eventually, verbal and social cognitive skills develop and individuals begin to use indirect aggression against peers. Indirect aggression is often recognized as a more socially acceptable form of aggression (Vitaro et al, 2006). Indirect aggression tends to replace direct aggression as individuals develop. There is a clear trend toward less use of direct means of violence in higher grades.
Pellegrini and Long (2002) studied the occurrence of bullying and victimization as students transition from primary school to secondary school. They found an initial increase in bullying and aggression among children during the transition to secondary school followed by a decline in bullying and aggressive behaviors. Shifting from primary school to a larger and less supportive environment can result in greater use of aggression as a strategy for establishing status among a changing peer group. On the other hand, victimization was found to decline from primary to secondary school. The researchers propose individuals who are initially victims in primary school have learned to avoid, ignore, or retaliate against bullies. Another proposed explanation is that bullies target a specific smaller group of victims. For example, a bully may target a student with a low peer status, but not target the entire population of students in the school (Pellegrini & Long, 2002). Although these explanations appear reasonable, empirical support is still pending.

Distinct gender differences regarding the use of direct and indirect bullying behaviors have also been studied. Boys are often recognized as more frequently engaging in bullying behaviors and using more physical forms of bullying (Olweus, 1993; Houbre et al, 2006). However, school systems often fail to recognize girls’ involvement in bullying. Girls are more likely to engage in indirect acts to damage an individual’s peer relationships, feelings of acceptance, and inclusion in social groups (Merrell, Buchanan, & Tran, 2006). Indirect aggression can be an effective way for an aggressor to seek revenge or attention from a peer group (Merrell et al, 2006). The use of indirect aggression allows girls to become part of a group and feel a sense of importance among friends (Owens, Shute, & Slee, 2000). Indirect aggression often goes undetected in the school environment and can even remain undetected in the classroom with a teacher present through the passing of notes, rumors, or the exclusion of an individual from a group (Rivers & Smith, 1994).

Defining characteristics of bullies and victims has also contributed to the understanding of bullying. Bullies generally display aggressive, impulsive, and hostile tendencies and show insensitivity to the feelings of others (Olweus, 1993; Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). There are several theories regarding factors which may contribute to bullying behavior. Aggressive and
impulsive tendencies of bullies may have developed due to the exposure to parental models of aggression (Dodge & Schwartz, 1997). According to Dodge and Schwartz (1997), students who frequently use aggression misinterpret the behaviors of others and often rationalize that the victim deserved to get hurt. Bullies are thought to interpret the perceived weak stance of peers as an indication that they will receive positive outcomes (Fox & Boulton, 2006). Physical differences between a bully and victim can impact a bully’s ability to assert dominance and control and decreases the likelihood that a victim will retaliate. A study conducted by Atlas and Pepler (1998) assessed bullying behaviors based on observations of children’s interactions in the classroom. Height and weight ratings were coded for each episode of direct bullying that was observed. The relative estimates found bullies were often coded as being taller and heavier than victims in most instances of bullying. A power imbalance between a bully and victim is frequent in bullying situations (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). Additionally, once an individual has been victimized he or she becomes an easy target and is likely to submit to another peer’s control (Hunter & Boyle, 2002).

**Impact of Bullying**

An individual may be victimized due to physical difference or even achievement in school (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). Victimized individuals often feel responsible for the bullying situation (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). They are characteristically anxious, insecure, and cautious (Banks, 1997). Victims of frequent bullying are at risk of suffering depression, poor self-esteem, which may continue into adulthood, and a lack of engagement in school (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). They typically lack social support and are avoided by peers because others fear being bullied themselves or losing social status (Veenstra et al, 2005). The loss of peer support diminishes a victim’s ability to cope with bullying (Lev-Wiesel et al, 2006).

Victims typically fear attending school; 7% of U.S. eighth graders have stayed home from school at least one day a month because of bullying (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). Victims avoid school to diminish bullying, resulting in the deterioration of academic success (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005).
While some victims avoid bullying situations, some victims learn to retaliate productively against their bullying peer or peers. Victims who are likely to retaliate against peers are often considered to be highly aggressive and seem to provoke attacks from others (Bernstein & Watson, 1997). These individuals are often known to be bullies in one interaction and victims in another (Atlas & Pepler, 1998).

**Coping with Bullying**

Learning effective coping strategies to overcome bullying behaviors is important because the failure to cope with bullying can lead to devastating consequences and problems that persist into adulthood. Victims of bullying face a power imbalance which they seek to escape (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Schafer et al, 2005). While some victims are capable of overcoming bullying, other victims are unable to implement effective coping strategies to end bullying. Children who have been bullied over an extended period of time often have a negative belief in their ability to change the bullying situation to their advantage (Hunter & Boyle, 2002). The lack of confidence in being able to use nonviolent strategies and the lack of intention to use nonviolent strategies has been reported to be associated with higher occurrences of victimization (Bosworth, Espelage, & Simon, 1999). Victims may try to simply endure the plight as a result or to ignore the situation for fear of being blamed for the bullying or because they believe they should handle the problem on their own (Naylor, Cowie, & del Rey, 2001; Mischna & Alaggia, 2005). Mischna and Alaggia (2005) found that disclosure can be impeded for a number of reasons including: secrecy, powerlessness, victim self-blaming, retaliation, child vulnerabilities, and expectations regarding the effectiveness of an adult intervention. Victims may believe that reporting victimization to an adult will result in the situation being minimized or dismissed (Mischna & Alaggia, 2005). Ignoring the bullying situation and failing to disclose bullying to others represent ineffective ways to cope with bullying (Coyne et al, 2006). More assertive efforts appear to be helpful. Many victims believe assertiveness can stop bullying, even if they feel they are unable to carry it out (Camodeca & Goosens, 2005b).
The interpretation of the bullying situation may influence the coping styles used to resolve bullying. Individuals who interpret an ambiguous situation as hostile are more likely to use retaliation and have aggressive goals (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005a). These victims may decide to engage in aggressive behaviors toward the bully or bullies. According to aggressive victims, doing nothing implies they are weak (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005a). Salmivalli et al. (1996) found defending oneself, even attacking back, was not out of the question as a response to bullying. Counter-aggressive responses were surprisingly common for boy victims as evident through both self-reports and peer-reports. Counter-aggression may be a coping strategy used by victims of bullying; however, about 70% of all victims reported not retaliating aggressively toward the bully (Salmivalli et al, 1996).

Gender differences and counter-aggression have also been explored. Kochenderfer and Ladd (1997) examined victimized children’s response to peers’ aggression and found that among young children, both girls and boys were equally likely to be targets of physical aggression. However, boys were likely to fight back to signify a tough and confrontational stance in response to bullying. The researchers found that fighting back was not associated with reduced victimization, but continued victimization (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997). Fighting back can escalate hostility between the victim and bully. Boss (2007) of the Columbus Dispatch, interviewed parents and victimized boys and girls who began taking martial arts classes in an attempt to counter bullying. Parents of victimized children believed martial arts would teach not only self-defense but also confidence, discipline, and respect. Children who are targets of bullying are being given the tools through martial arts to have the chance to defend themselves against a bully (Boss, 2007). Research has yet to determine if martial arts training does in fact reduce instances of victimization.

Additional coping strategies to overcome bullying are important to consider. Seeking social support may be an effective strategy, but many adolescents decide not to seek help (Hunter et al, 2004). Unnever and Cornell (2004) surveyed 2,437 students in six middle schools in order to assess factors that influence student’s decision to report instances of bullying. Of the students who were surveyed, 898 individuals were identified as being bullied. Of the bullied
students, 40% did not tell an adult about their victimization and 25% did not tell anyone about their victimization. Unnever and Cornell (2004) also found victims in lower grades to report more instances of bullying compared to victims in the higher grades, and when bullying was chronic or pervasive, students were more likely to seek help. There are distinct differences among victims in the likelihood of seeking help for bullying. While some individuals report bullying to adults, other individuals would rather discuss the bullying situation with a peer than a teacher or parent.

A victim’s perceived control about bullying influences help-seeking behavior. Hunter and Boyle (2002) make the suggestion that perceptions of control are greatest when bullying just begins and reduces as bullying continues over time. Individuals who are bullied over an extended period of time may believe they have an inability to control the situation, but a large proportion of children included in the study reported retaining a belief in their ability to change the situation. This finding suggests that once a situation is viewed, as one which the victim feels he or she has the ability to alter, then there is a greater likelihood of using constructive or support seeking coping strategies. Early interventions are necessary to encourage pro-active coping (Hunter & Boyle, 2002).

According to Olweus (1993), 85% of bullied students in secondary school said that the class teacher had not talked with them about bullying. Although class teachers were not likely to discuss bullying with students, peers less frequently intervened in bullying compared to teachers (Olweus, 1993). Atlas and Pepler (1998) found teachers were more likely to intervene than peers because teachers perceived classroom management as their responsibility. The presence of peer support systems can encourage victims to report their plight to at least one person (Naylor et al, 2001). One reason victims do not report instances of bullying may be because they have poor social skills and are not able to develop and maintain friendships (Fox & Boulton, 2005). Fox and Boulton (2005) assessed the extent to which individuals, peers, and teachers regard victims as having social skill problems. Victims with poor social skills were perceived by peers to be non-assertive, display a behavioral vulnerability, reinforce the bullying behavior, withdraw or act provocatively. A victim who cried or looked scared was recognized by peers as having social skill problems. Teachers also perceived victims with social skill problems to display non-assertive or
submissive behavior. Victims who had social skill deficits had greater difficulty in overcoming bullying victimization (Fox & Boulton, 2005).

Researchers have attempted to explain victimization and help-seeking behavior more fully by exploring gender differences and age among victims of bullying. Naylor et al (2001) studied how gender and age influence the likelihood that a victim will seek help to diminish bullying at school. The researchers found that in general, girls are more likely to tell someone that they were being bullied compared to boys. In addition, it was found that the likelihood to tell someone about bullying victimization increased or decreased with age. The researchers suggested that as girls get older, there is a great likelihood that they will tell an adult or peer about their victimization. The opposite is true with regard to boys as they get older, becoming less likely to seek support (Naylor et al, 2001).

The coping strategies used by victims of indirect bullying have also been explored by researchers. According to Baldry (2004), children who are victims of indirect bullying, such as being excluded or having rumors spread about them, are likely to cope with their victimization by withdrawing. Evidence for the use of avoidant coping strategies has been found for girls who have been victims of indirect bullying. Remillard and Lamb (2005) studied the coping strategies female victims found useful to overcome indirect aggression. Eight subscales on the survey (problem-focused coping; wishful thinking; detachment; seeking social support; focusing on the positive; self-blame; tension reduction; and keeping to self) represented both cognitive and emotional coping strategies used by victims of indirect bullying. The more hurt girls experienced, the more they engaged in wishful thinking, blamed themselves, engaged in tension reduction, and kept to themselves. Girls who sought social support were more likely to perceive that the bully still considered them a friend and they reported still feeling close to that person (Remillard & Lamb, 2005). In addition, Olafsen and Viemero (2000) explored coping strategies used by female victims of indirect bullying and found that girl victims of indirect bullying have a tendency to turn aggression toward themselves but not toward others. While the coping strategies used by female victims of indirect bullying have been well-researched, not as much is known about the coping strategies used by boy victims of indirect bullying.
Similarities between indirect bullying, cyberbullying behavior and victimization are evident. Indirect bullying and cyberbullying both are covert forms of aggression. The indirect bullies and cyberbullies ability to directly observe a victim’s reaction to bullying is often limited. For this reason, indirect bullies and cyberbullies may not realize the negative impact they have on the victim (Remillard & Lamb, 2005; Brignall & Van Valey, 2005). Cyberbullies may not be able to interpret how another person is reacting to their statements (Brignall & Van Valey, 2005). The inability to recognize an individual’s reaction to bullying statements decreases the likelihood that it will end. Thus, victims may have greater difficulty coping with indirect bullying and cyberbullying, because they may never discover the identity of the person or group responsible for their victimization. While the advantages of indirect bullying and cyberbullying may be apparent to the bully, victims are likely to have difficulty overcoming victimization when bullied indirectly.

Technology

Computers and cell phones have become prominent forms of communication. An estimated 97% of people in the United States between the ages of 12 and 18 years use the internet (Ybarra, 2004). Internet use has extended across the U.S. to include a large number of children, adolescents, and adults. Among a diverse sample of seventh-grade students in urban Southern California, Sun et al. (2005) found that 99% of the students reported that they had access to the internet at school and/or at home. Within the ethnically diverse sample of adolescents, individuals with a lower socioeconomic status reported lower rates of internet access and usage (Sun et al, 2005). Although the majority of individuals reported using computers, there are distinct differences among individuals in the amount of computer usage and online activities. According to Chou and Peng (2007), junior high students typically spend more time on the internet compared to their senior counterparts. Online games are one of several reasons adolescents go on the computer. Schoolwork, seeking entertainment on the computer, and communicating with friends are also recognized as key purposes for using the computer (Brignall & Van Valey, 2005). The majority of online communication among adolescents is through instant messaging (Lenhart, Madden, & Hitlin, 2005). Adolescents have found cell phones to be another way to socially connect with friends.
Cell phones have evolved from “a luxury for business to a facilitator of many users’ social relationships” (Wei & Lo, 2006). According to Faulkner and Culwin (2005) the heaviest users of text messaging are young women. Texting on cell phones is particularly common among those who already go online frequently and use other internet tools often (Lenhart et al, 2005). Text messaging can strengthen a pre-existing network of an individual or be used to reduce interactions with individuals one does not know very well or to whom one has little to say (Bryant, Sanders-Jackson, & Smallwood, 2006; Madell & Muncer, 2007). Text messaging gives an individual the advantage of having time to think before responding (Madell & Muncer, 2007). Like other forms of technology, there is also the possibility for text messages to be misunderstood or be sent to the wrong person.

Adolescents are incorporating technology-mediated communication more strongly into their social lives, allowing social connectivity to go beyond face-to-face interactions (Bryant et al, 2006). A study completed by Gross, Juvonen, and Gable (2002) found adolescents are spending most of their time online with friends who are also a part of their daily offline lives. Individuals who feel connected and comfortable with school-based peers use the internet to seek out additional opportunities to interact with them (Gross et al, 2002). On the other hand, researchers have also concluded adolescents who engage in online activities are often lonely and isolated. Adolescents may use the internet to avoid being alone and turn to people disconnected from their daily life (Gross et al, 2002). Individuals may show a preference for online social interactions because they feel more confident and comfortable during the encounter (Caplan, 2003).

Although an individual may show a preference for online interaction, there can be negative consequences to its use. Brignall and Van Valey (2005) explore the weaknesses of the internet when it comes to the development of social skills. The internet gives people the choice to interact with select individuals. This avoids the demand of getting along with others in real-world interactions. Avoiding individuals in real-world interaction limits the development of social skills. The researchers believe computers allow individuals to avoid uncomfortable situations. Computers also limit the capacity for detection of body cues important to conversation (Brignall & Van Valey, 2005). Individuals recognize emotions through face-to-face communication. Sole
reliance on the internet as a social resource is problematic. Gross et al. (2002) found few cases of close friendships developing online. A study conducted by Sun et al. (2005) concluded the use of the internet to build social relationships limits the ability to develop interpersonal skills necessary to form strong in-person social networks. Individuals tend to make online choices contrary to real-world behaviors (Berson & Berson, 2005). Survey results confirm adolescents are likely to increase nonconforming and aggressive interactions online. Adolescents often do not fear repercussions to online behavior (Berson & Berson, 2005).

Individuals who are embarrassed to confront someone face-to-face often feel more comfortable confronting the person online. In a study conducted by Lenhart et al (2005) a nationally representative sample of 1,100 teens 12 to 17 years old and their parents living in the continental US were interviewed about their teen’s computer and cell phone usage. Close to a third of teens reported writing something over instant messenger that they would not say to someone’s face. There appears to be a distinct difference in an individual’s face-to-face encounters and online interactions. Hurtful messages are more likely to be conveyed online. Instant messaging allows teens to have conversations that may be more difficult to have face-to-face, and allows teens to communicate with more than one person at one time (Lenhart et al, 2005). It remains questionable if the internet simply serves as an outlet to spend time and withdraw from real interactions, or if the internet does improve real-world interactions (Sun et al, 2005). Positive and negative behaviors occur online, and although technology can be a source of enjoyment for teens, negative aspects of technology are common (Barak, 2005).

Parental monitoring may help to limit the negative consequences of the internet. Indeed, less parental monitoring increases the likelihood that an adolescent will experience negative behaviors online (Wang, Bianchi, & Raley, 2005; Sun et al, 2005; Lenhart et al, 2005). Wang et al. (2005) assessed parental monitoring behaviors using 749 dyads of American parents and their teenage children with internet access. Although the majority of parents said they had rules about how long their children can go online or said they check the websites their children visited, teens had a lower response when asked about rules associated with the use of the internet. Parents who reported they use the computer were more likely to monitor their child’s
activity on the internet. Parental monitoring behavior decreased as their children aged (Wang et al., 2005). Another study conducted by Sun et al. (2005) found less parental monitoring and more unsupervised time to be related to more email use, chat room use, and home internet use but not related to internet use at school.

Online behavior is often hidden from parents. According to Lenhart et al. (2005) the majority of parents and teens said they think that teens do things online they would not want their parents to know about. Teens are often recognized as engaging in a variety of negative online behaviors. About one in five teens said they have sent an email, instant or text message to someone that they meant to be private, but which was forwarded on to others by the recipient (Lenhart et al., 2005). Almost two in five teens have played a trick on someone online by pretending to be someone else over instant messaging (Lenhart et al., 2005). Gross (2004) found the majority of participants who reported pretending to be someone else on the internet did so in the presence of friends. Individuals pretended to be someone else as a joke or prank. Other participants reported hiding their identity to protect themselves as well as their privacy (Gross, 2004). Playing a trick on someone online or pretending to be someone else online may eventually turn into cyberbullying. The internet can serve many important functions, but can also cause individuals to change how they would respond in a face-to-face interaction.

**Cyberbullying**

Cyberbullying is an invasive phenomenon which negatively impacts an individual (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). Cyberbullying involves harassing others through the use of electronic media (Li, 2005). For example, individuals may post or send harmful messages through the internet as well as leave threatening text messages on a cell phone (Li, 2005). While some individuals may believe a victim has the ability to escape from bullying by deleting messages or going offline, the ability to escape is not often possible (Brown et al., 2006; Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). Hurtful messages may be broadcast worldwide and are often irretrievable (Brown et al., 2006). Rumors or gossip may spread throughout the school (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). According to Brown et al. (2006) online harassment can occur at school and home. Students who are electronically
engaged can be cyberbullied at any time. As a result, individuals of cyberbullying experience a prolonged sense of victimization similar to other forms of bullying (Brown et al., 2006).

Li (2005) studied the extent of adolescents’ experience of cyberbullying and the relationship between traditional bullying and cyberbullying. Overall, almost 54% of the students reported being bully-victims and over a quarter of the students reported being cyberbullied. Almost one in three students had bullied other students in a traditional setting, and almost 15% had bullied other students using electronic tools. One third of traditional bully-victims reported being cyber-victims and 16.7% of traditional bully-victims reported they had cyberbullied others through electronic media (Li, 2005). Beran and Li (2005) surveyed 432 students from grades 7 to 9 to examine adolescents’ experiences of cyberbullying. The majority of students who experienced cyberbullying were also victimized at school. More than half of the students who were victims of cyberbullying also reported victimization by other forms of bullying. Many students also indicated being negatively impacted by cyberbullying. The majority of students who were victimized by cyberbullying reported feeling angry, hurt, or sad (Beran & Li, 2005).

In traditional bullying, a power differential exists between the bully and victim which is often physical. However, individuals who cyberbully gain a sense of power and control behind a keyboard they do not experience during face-to-face interactions (Brown et al., 2006; Beran & Li, 2005). Victims of traditional bullying may use the internet as a place to assert dominance over others as compensation for being bullied in person (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004b). On the internet there is no central power or real explanation of territory, and victims can take on a more aggressive persona (Brown et al., 2006; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a). As a result, victims recognize the advantages to using an electronic medium to bully. Individuals who are able to navigate and utilize technology are in a position of power relative to victims (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006).

Anonymity is often associated with online interactions and places an individual in a position of power as well as makes individuals less inhibited (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004b; Brown et al., 2006). According to Brown et al. (2006) the internet allows individuals to take on a new identity. Cyberbullies may open temporary accounts or use a false identity to make it difficult for victims to discover them (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). Victims never really know who is involved in
cyberbullying because cyberbullies deny or blame cyberbullying on someone else (Wiseman, 2007). Individuals who cyberbully often fail to see the harm they have caused or the consequences of their actions, which minimizes any feelings of remorse or empathy (MindOH! Foundation, 2007). Being anonymous limits cyberbullies’ fear of being detected and makes it difficult for school personnel and parents to step in and stop bullying (Brown et al, 2006; Li, 2005; Wiseman, 2007). Parents’ lack of knowledge and awareness of online activities can also make it difficult to resolve cyberbullying.

Although individuals involved in cyberbullying recognize other students engage in similar behavior and believe this behavior is acceptable, cyberbullies are negatively impacting cyber-victims (Brown et al, 2006). Cyber-victims experience the same feelings of powerlessness and hopelessness as other victims of traditional bullying encounters (Brown et al, 2006). Victims express anger, fear, anxiety, and sadness as a result of cyberbullying as well as other forms of bullying (Beran & Li, 2005; Banks, 1997). Self-esteem can be severely crippled from bullying experiences (Patchin & Hinduja, 2006). Other individuals who are victimized may not be severely impacted by cyberbullying (Beran and Li, 2005). An individual may consider the online behavior to be expected or normal or may not attribute the hostile intent to the message (Li, 2005). It seems the differences in victims’ emotional reactions to cyberbullying may be greatly impacted by the severity of the bullying situation. For example, a victim enduring years of cyberbullying death threats is going to be affected differently from someone receiving prank text messages for a week. Victims’ responses to instances of cyberbullying may also differ due to the interpretation of social cues. The lack of social cues on the internet makes it difficult for individuals to interpret incoming messages (Ybarra, 2004). A victim is more likely to perceive a message or situation as threatening when they also report depressive symptoms outlined in the DSM-IV (Ybarra, 2004). While the majority of victims of cyberbullying choose to remain quiet when they are cyberbullied or know someone being cyberbullied (Li, 2005), Ybarra (2004) found adolescents who indicate symptoms of depression are more than three times as likely to report an incident of bullying than adolescents with milder symptoms. These adolescents are considered more vulnerable to
negative experiences online. Thus, they are at risk for subsequent emotional distress which is likely to encourage help-seeking behavior (Ybarra, 2004).

While physical strength is important for direct bullying, cyberbullying involves emotional and psychological harm (Coyne et al, 2006; Merrell et al, 2006). Cyberbullying can harm victims by damaging feelings of acceptance or group inclusion (Coyne et al, 2006). For example, cyberbullies often gain power and control through humiliation (Beran & Li, 2005). Cyberbullying is secretive and may spread information rapidly from one person to another (Li, 2006). Results from a study conducted by Ybarra and Mitchell (2004a) found that aggressive adolescents frequently targeted people they knew in conventional environments; 84% of the aggressors indicated knowing the target in person. Cyberbullies may target individuals in their social group, knowing the target’s address, phone number, or email due to their past friendship which they use to send threatening messages (Besag, 2006; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a). Online and offline bullying are rooted in aggression, which may suggest that the internet may simply be an extension of school bullying (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a).

Cyberbullying is also similar to conventional bullying in its repetitive nature (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a). According to Ybarra and Mitchell (2004a), 55% of internet targets indicated they were harassed more than once by the same individual. Individuals who act as an aggressor/target and aggressor-only online viewed themselves as capable computer users (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a). Individuals who spend more time online have a greater chance of becoming involved in cyberbullying (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a). It was found that the average daily usage of the internet was similar for aggressor/targets and targets-only. According to Ybarra and Mitchell (2004a), the roles of aggressor and target online may not always be consistent with bully and victim roles in traditional settings. It was noted that some adolescents are exclusively involved in cyberbullying (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a). The researchers explain this finding based on the fact that the internet equalizes power and has the ability to keep an identity unknown (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004a).
Similar to victims of more traditional bullying, victims of cyberbullying often do not have the social support or ability to resolve difficulties (Brown et al, 2006; Ybarra, 2004). Although students believed they knew safety strategies to use online, it has been suggested that many students may not know that reporting incidents of cyberbullying to an adult can also be an effective strategy (Li, 2005). In a study conducted by Li (2005) students' open-ended responses in a survey indicated they equate safety strategies with staying away from chat rooms.

Although females have been recognized in the research as more likely to be indirect bullies and males have been recognized in the research as more likely to be direct bullies, it is not yet clear how gender plays a role in cyberbullying (Li, 2006; Remillard & Lamb, 2005). Li (2006) found that compared to females, males were more likely to be bullies and cyberbullies. An earlier study conducted by Li (2005) found 60% of the cyber-victims were females, while 52% of the cyberbullies were males (Li, 2005). An additional finding was that female victims of cyberbullying were more likely to report instances of cyberbullying to adults compared to male victims (Li, 2006). Although gender differences are evident in cyberbullying behavior, both females and males are likely to be involved in cyberbullying (Li, 2005; Li, 2006).

**Summary**

Traditional bullying and cyberbullying involve the use of aggressive behaviors as a way to gain power and control over peers (Olweus, 1993). While cyberbullying has become more prevalent with technological advances, direct and indirect bullying continue to occur at school. Traditional bullies may physically attack another peer, socially exclude a particular person from a peer group, or send threatening messages (Olweus, 1993; Beran & Li, 2005). Cyberbullying also occurs frequently among adolescents. Teens are likely to report that they have written something over instant messaging they would not say to someone's face or have played a trick on someone online by pretending to be someone else (Lenhart et al, 2005). Hurtful messages or rumors may be spread throughout the school without a teacher or parent being aware of who is responsible (Brown et al, 2006). The failure of adults to detect bullying is likely to leave many victims exposed to prolonged victimization. Repeated victimization is also likely due to the reluctance of victims of traditional bullying to seek help (Banks, 1997; Hunter et al, 2004). Victims often do not
report instances of bullying even though they experience depression and poor self-esteem (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005).

Gender differences are also evident among bullies and victims. Females are more likely to be cyber-victims and males are more likely to be cyberbullies. While females are more likely to be involved in indirect bullying and males are more likely to be involved in direct bullying, both females and males are engaging in cyberbullying (Li, 2005; Li, 2006). The fact that many adolescents are involved in cyberbullying is problematic because negative consequences have been found to be associated with continued victimization.

Coping strategies vary among victims of bullying. Ignoring the situation or using counter-aggression may be considered by a victim in order to overcome bullying or cyberbullying. Victims often believe they are responsible for bringing bullying on themselves, resulting in the use of maladaptive coping strategies (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). With the advances in technology, researchers are beginning to explore how technological devices may also serve as a coping strategy for victims of bullying. It has been suggested that computers allow victims to avoid real-world interactions with peers (Brignall & Van Valey, 2005). In addition, victims of traditional bullying may find the internet a useful way to confront a peer compared to a face-to-face encounter (Lenhart et al, 2005; Berson & Berson, 2005). On the internet that is no real division of territory. Victims of traditional bullying may feel safe online and use the internet as a way to compensate for being bullied in person. Typically, physical difference is of importance in most instances of traditional bullying and victims are often at a disadvantage compared to bullies (Atlas & Pepler, 1998). While victims are recognized as being small and weak in traditional bullying situations, they are able to assert themselves online.

Victims of traditional bullying may decide to retaliate by fighting back directly. The use of retaliation against a bully is much more common among male victims than female victims of bullying (Olweus, 1993; Houbre et al, 2006). More constructive coping strategies may also be used by victims of bullying. Children and adolescent victims of traditional bullying may decide to tell someone about their situation. Seeking social support has been recognized as one of the most useful constructive coping strategies, decreasing instances of bullying. Having social
support decreases occurrences of traditional bullying and may serve as a protective factor against traditional bullying and cyberbullying (Hunter et al, 2004). While research has helped parents and schools become better informed about traditional bullying and cyberbullying, the present study will hopefully uncover new information that is needed to end prolonged victimization and distress.

Present Study

The purpose of this study is to assess whether past traditional bullying victimization is associated with cyberbullying perpetration. Individuals who are victims of direct bullying are often recognized as being weak and small, but the internet may allow victims to be less fearful of retaliating against bullies. Cyberbullying may serve as a coping strategy for individuals who have been victimized and may be related to other types of coping. The hypothesis of this study is separated into two parts. The first part of the hypothesis being examined by this research is that victims of traditional bullying who experience hurt feelings are more likely to bully through electronic media compared to those who do not experience hurt feelings following traditional bullying victimization.

It is also important to consider the coping strategies used by victims of traditional bullying that may influence future cyberbullying behavior. Avoidance in response to traditional bullying victimization may increase the likelihood that a person uses electronic media (Seepersad, 2004). Seepersad (2004) found a strong relationship between avoidant coping strategies and internet use, and similarities were found between coping strategies adolescents’ use offline and online. The second part of the hypothesis being examined by this study is that victims of traditional bullying who also have poor social skills are more likely to engage in cyberbullying behavior if they also use avoidant coping strategies to overcome their victimization. Research has suggested that cyberbullies may have poor social skills, preferring to interact online rather than face-to-face (Brignall & Van Valey, 2005; Fox & Boulton, 2005).

Finally, additional questions will be explored in the present study. The literature has not yet clearly identified personal factors of bullies and victims of cyberbullying. For example, questions regarding social awareness and social information processing of victims and
cyberbullies will be investigated in the study. Some research findings have suggested that bullies often misinterpret the behavior of other individuals, which results in impulsive or aggressive behavior (Dodge & Schwartz, 1997; Bernstein & Watson, 1997). Furthermore, aggression may be used by bullies who are hypersensitive to situations. In addition, cyberbullies may fail to acknowledge how hurtful their actions are online because they are not directly observing the consequences of their behaviors. Questions regarding gender differences in cyberbullying behavior will also be investigated in the study. Some findings suggest that males are more likely to report being a cyberbully, whereas females more often report being a cyber-victim online (Li, 2005; Li, 2006). The questions being explored in this study will allow adults to more accurately predict children and adolescents who are involved in traditional bullying and cyberbullying, and take action to alleviate personal distress of victims.
CHAPTER II

METHODS

Participants
Participants were drawn from several Midwestern, suburban high schools and volunteered in exchange for an opportunity to be in a raffle to win one of two gift cards. Approximately 8 school districts were contacted to recruit high school students to participate in this research study. Five school districts gave permission to recruit and distribute information. A few high schools utilized an email database to distribute information. It is not clear how many students were part of this system. A total of 138 youth were given permission by their legal guardians to participate. One hundred and six actually completed the survey, which based on the enrollment of these schools, represents 3% of all the high school students recruited to participate. The present study included 65 female participants, 38 male participants, and 3 participants who did not specify a gender. All participants were between the ages of 14 to 18 years, with a mean of 16.42 and a standard deviation of 1.11 for age. All participants had access to electronic media through either home or school. Several responses were received from parents concerned about bullying taking place in their child’s high school. In completing the permission form, a number of parents volunteered that their child had been a victim of bullying, but some of these students chose not to participate in the study.

Measures

Demographic information. Demographic information was collected from adolescents and included age, gender, grade level, and information pertaining to electronic media access and usage. Participants were asked how often they go online during the day and specific reasons for internet use. The daily length of time spent online was assessed by a single nominal measure in
which participants choose from the following: none, 30 minutes or less, 1 hour, 2-3 hours, 4 hours or more (Gross, Juvonen, & Gable, 2002). Internet use was assessed by a single nominal measure in which participants choose from the following: chat rooms, instant messaging, email, education, or work (Maxwell, 2001). The demographic information survey is in Appendix A.

**Social Experience Questionnaire (SEQ; Crick & Grotpeter, 1996).** The Social Experience Questionnaire was designed to assess peer victimization (Crick & Grotpeter, 1996). The questionnaire consists of two victimization subscales: overt victimization (three items) which assesses the frequency with which peers attempt to physically harm another and relational victimization (five items) which assesses the frequency with which peers attempt to harm a person’s relationships. In addition, a third scale assesses the receipt of prosocial acts from peers (five items). An example of an item from the SEQ asks participants, “How often do you get hit by other students?” All items on the SEQ are rated on a five-point Likert scale anchored by 1 = never to 5 = always. An average score was obtained for each subscale; higher scores indicated greater reception of the behaviors (Storch et al, 2005; Crick & Grotpeter, 1996).

Storch et al. (2005) explored the psychometric properties of the SEQ with an adolescent sample. The Cronbach’s alpha reliability coefficients were found to be acceptable for the relational victimization and prosocial behavior subscales (range of 0.82–0.77) and were consistent across gender. Lower internal consistencies were found with the overt victimization subscale, particularly for females (0.50). The data obtained in the study conducted by Storch et al. (2005) supported the three-factor model previously found by Crick and Grotpeter (1996). This finding provides further evidence that distinct factors represent unique constructs of peer victimization among adolescents and the exposure to both overt and relational forms of aggression. In addition, Storch et al. (2005) found the intercorrelations among the three SEQ subscales ranged from −0.12 to 0.45. The highest intercorrelation of 0.45 occurred between overt victimization and relational victimization for males and the lowest intercorrelation of −0.12 occurred between overt victimization and prosocial behavior for females. After 12 months following the baseline assessment, the SEQ was readministered and test-retest rates for each
subscale were determined, 0.57 for overt victimization, 0.53 for relational victimization, and 0.73 for prosocial behavior (Storch et al, 2005). The current study generated Cronbach’s alpha of 0.86 for the relational bullying victimization subscale, an alpha of 0.48 for the overt bullying victimization subscale, and 0.81 was found for all forms of traditional bullying victimization. The SEQ is included in Appendix B.

Cyberbullying Questionnaire (Smith, Mahdavi, Carvalho & Tippett, 2005). The Cyberbullying Questionnaire was devised by the research team at Goldsmiths College, University of London, partly following the structure of Olweus’ bully/victim questionnaire (1996). A modified version of the Cyberbullying Questionnaire was included in this study, incorporating only questions pertaining to bullying through computer outlets. The original version of the Cyberbullying Questionnaire has 88 multiple-choice questions, which cover 7 sub-categories of cyberbullying (text message bullying, mobile phone call bullying, picture/video-clip bullying, email bullying, chat room bullying, bullying through instant messaging, bullying through websites) and include some other general questions (Smith et al, 2005). The modified version of the Cyberbullying Questionnaire included in this study had 57 multiple-choice questions, covering 4 sub-categories of cyberbullying (email bullying, chat room bullying, bullying through instant messaging, and bullying through websites). Some items on the questionnaire had qualitative aspects, where participants were asked to provide more detailed answers. The inclusion of the definition of bullying prior to the survey items was kept in the original format. Bullying was defined for participants as experiencing mean and hurtful things said to or about you repeatedly and the inability to defend oneself. Several items on the Cyberbullying Questionnaire target cyberbullying victimization. In order to assess cyberbullying perpetration, new items were added to the questionnaire. The new items follow the original format of the Cyberbullying Questionnaire. An example of an item from the Cyberbullying Questionnaire asks participants, “How often have you been cyberbullied in the past couple of months?” (Smith et al, 2005).

Scores were determined on the Cyberbullying Questionnaire by tallying the endorsed items across the sample. Several items on the questionnaire asked participants to state how often they had cyberbullied or been cyberbullied through computer outlets. Scores on these items
were obtained by ranking responses from 0 to 4, 0 meaning the respondent had not been cyberbullied or cyberbullied others, to 4 where the respondent had been cyberbullied or cyberbullied others several times a week. In the original study by Smith et al. (2005), an impact factor was included to gauge the effect of cyberbullying on victims compared to more traditional methods. The impact factor was calculated by assigning values to the severity respondents believed each form of cyberbullying had on the victim compared to traditional bullying (less harmful = -1; the same = 0; more harmful = +1). Thus, a more positive score means that the impact of this form of cyberbullying was seen as high, a negative score as low (Smith et al, 2005). The Cyberbullying Questionnaire is included in Appendix C.

Hurt Dispositions Scale (HDS; Negel, 2002). The Hurt Dispositions Scale was designed to assess individuals’ reactions to experiencing hurt feelings. The HDS measures two distinct emotional and behavioral reactions to having one’s feelings hurt, introjection and retaliation. The introjective hurt reaction subscale assesses a self-punitive style of responding, characterized by the internalization of hurt and self-blame. The retaliatory hurt reaction subscale assesses an aggressive style of responding, characterized by the externalization of hurt experience. The HDS contains forty statements, with twenty-items denoting the introjective pattern and twenty-items depicting the retaliatory pattern. An example of an introjective hurt reaction item from the HDS asks participants to what extent they are overly sensitive. An example of a retaliatory hurt reaction item from the HDS asks participants to what extent they can be spiteful when they need to be. Each item on the HDS is scored on a five-point Likert scale format (1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neither Disagree nor Agree; 4 = Agree; 5 = Strongly Agree). Higher scores on the HDS indicate greater hurt reactivity (greater introjective hurt and/or retaliatory hurt). Seven items are reversed scored on the introjective hurt subscale, while three items are reversed scored on the retaliatory hurt subscale (Negel, 2002).

Negel (2002) investigated the psychometric properties of the HDS. The coefficient alpha of the twenty-item introjective hurt scale was .92 and the mean inter-item correlation was .38. In addition, the coefficient alpha of the twenty-item retaliatory hurt scale was .92 and a mean inter-item correlation was .35. Test-retest reliability over several months for the introjective hurt scale
was .87 and the retaliatory hurt scale was .85. Thus, the HDS was found to be internally reliable and temporarily stable. The introjective hurt scale is positively related to conceptually-similar constructs. For example, similar constructs include rejection sensitivity and guilt. The retaliatory hurt scale is positively associated with grudge-holding, anger, and vengeance. Both the introjective hurt scale and retaliatory hurt scale have strong construct validity, convergent validity, and discriminant validity. These results suggest that introjective and retaliatory hurt are two separate dimensions of hurt reactivity (Negel, 2002). The current study generated Cronbach’s alpha of 0.94 for the introjective hurt reaction subscale and 0.93 for retaliatory hurt reaction subscale. The HDS is provided in Appendix D.

**Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS; Silvera, Martinussen, & Dahl, 2001).** The TSIS is a self-report measure of social intelligence and consists of twenty-one questions structured around three factors: (1) social information processing, (2) social skills, and (3) social awareness. The social information processing factor measures an individual’s ability to understand and predict other people’s feelings and behavior. The social skills factor measures an individual’s ability to enter new social situations and socially adapt. The social awareness factor measures the tendency to be unaware or surprised by events in social situations. Each of the factors on the TSIS consists of seven items. An example of an item on the TSIS asks participants how true the statement “I can predict others’ behavior” is to them. All items on the TSIS are scored on a four-point Likert scale format (1 = False/Not True At All; 2 = Slightly True; 3 = Mainly True; 4 = Very True). Higher scores indicate greater social intelligence. A total of eleven items on the TSIS are reversed scored because they are negatively worded (Silvera et al, 2001).

Silvera et al. (2001) developed and investigated the psychometric properties of the TSIS. The researchers found that the factors on the TSIS showed acceptable internal reliability after an evaluation using Cronbach’s alpha coefficient ($r = .81$; $r = .86$; $r = .79$ for SIP, SS, and SA respectively). The three TSIS subscales were significantly correlated with each other (0.16 to 0.39) and were found to be unbiased with regard to both age and gender. Andreou (2006) also found similar correlations between the three factors of social intelligence as observed in Silvera et al. (2001) original study. The current study generated Cronbach’s alpha of 0.86 for the social
skills subscale, 0.77 for the social awareness subscale, and 0.81 for the social information processing subscale. The TSIS can be found in Appendix E.

**What I Would Do (WIWD; Ladd & Polasky, 2008).** The WIWD was used to assess traditional bullying victim coping strategies. The WIWD is a twenty-seven item measure designed to evaluate children's coping responses to peer victimization. The WIWD is divided into six subscales: tell a parent or teacher, involve a friend, seek revenge, minimize and ignore, passive coping, and figure out what to do. The minimize and ignore scale and involve a friend scale are both represented by four items on the WIWD. On the WIWD, seek revenge scale is represented by five items, figure out what to do is represented by seven items, passive coping scale is represented by three items, and tell a parent or teacher scale is represented by six items. All items on the WIWD are scored using a four-point Likert scale format (1 = Never; 2 = Sometimes; 3 = Most of the Time; 4 = Every time). An example of an item from the WIWD asks participants to rate how often they would act like nothing happened if someone was mean to them. Higher scores on the WIWD indicate greater use or higher endorsement of the coping style/behaviors associated with each item. A single, "global coping" score associated with all 27 items was not developed (Ladd & Polasky, 2008).

The WIWD is in the early stages of development. Ladd and Polasky (2008) recently assessed the reliability of each of the subscales by having children complete the measure each school year. Children first completed the WIWD when they were in the first grade. The same children have continued to complete the WIWD up until the eighth grade. Results have suggested that the measure is more reliable with older children. For example, tell a parent or teacher scale had a reliability of .80 when children completing the measure were in the first grade and had a reliability of .91 when children completing the measure were in the eighth grade. Furthermore, all subscales have shown good reliability. Confirmatory factor analysis to provide support for the 6-factor model is currently being explored with the measure (Ladd & Polasky, 2008). The current study generated Cronbach’s alpha of 0.87 for the telling someone coping subscale, 0.79 for the having a friend coping subscale, 0.81 for the revenge subscale, 0.52 for the minimizing/ignoring coping subscale, 0.77 for the passive coping subscale, 0.66 for the figure it
out subscale. An avoidant coping subscale was also included. This incorporated items from the minimizing/ignoring coping subscale and passive coping subscale. A Cronbach's alpha of 0.55 was found for the avoidant coping subscale. The WIWD is provided in Appendix F.

Procedure

After permission slips were distributed and collected from students, participants were emailed a web link to the survey. Participants completed surveys online regarding their involvement in traditional bullying and cyberbullying. All participants were informed that their answers would be kept confidential upon completion of the surveys. The demographic measure was assessed first, followed by the SEQ, HDS, WIWD, TSIS and the Cyberbullying Questionnaire. The presentation sequence of the SEQ, HDS, and WIWD measures is of particular importance for this study. The SEQ measure requires participants to re-visit past bullying experiences, which is likely to elicit an emotional reaction. These emotional reactions can be directly assessed by the HDS measure and WIWD measure that follow. After all measures were completed by the participants, they were thanked and debriefed.
Participants were asked about their involvement in cyberbullying. The following table reveals the participants’ self-identified involvement in cyberbullying.

Table 1
Report of cyberbullying involvement by adolescent internet users

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cyberbullying</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Victim only</td>
<td>3 (2.8%)</td>
<td>13 (12.3%)</td>
<td>17 (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying only</td>
<td>4 (3.8%)</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
<td>5 (4.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Both</td>
<td>6 (5.7%)</td>
<td>8 (7.5%)</td>
<td>15 (14.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>25 (23.6%)</td>
<td>43 (40.6%)</td>
<td>69 (65.1%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>38 (35.9%)</td>
<td>65 (61.3%)</td>
<td>106 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. 3 participants did not specify a gender (1-Victim; 1-Both; 1-None)

While a small number of participants self-identified as a victim and/or cyberbully, many more participants stated that they had heard of cyberbullying taking place among their classmates. Of the total number of participants who completed the online survey, 49% had heard of bullying through email taking place among other students, 41% had heard of bullying in chat rooms, 55% had heard of bullying through instant messaging, and 38% had heard of bullying through websites. Across all forms of cyberbullying studied, it was revealed that 72% of participants recognized cyberbullying occurring among students, while 28% of participants did not recognize cyberbullying taking place.
Participants reported the amount of time they spend online during the week and on the weekend. The following table reveals the results that were found.

Table 2
The frequency of participant internet use during the week and over the weekend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>None</th>
<th>30 min. or less</th>
<th>1 hr.</th>
<th>2-3 hrs.</th>
<th>4 hrs. or more</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Week day</td>
<td>1 (0.9%)</td>
<td>17 (16.0%)</td>
<td>25 (23.6%)</td>
<td>41 (38.7%)</td>
<td>22 (20.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weekend</td>
<td>2 (1.9%)</td>
<td>23 (21.7%)</td>
<td>32 (30.1%)</td>
<td>29 (27.4%)</td>
<td>20 (18.9%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyses were generated to explore the relationship between cyberbullying and the amount of time participants stay online. Week day internet use was significantly correlated with cyberbullying victimization ($r = .198$, $p < .05$) and the involvement in cyberbullying as either a victim or bully ($r = .204$, $p < .05$). Week day internet use and weekend internet use was also correlated ($r = .465$, $p < .01$). No additional correlations were found to be significant.

A Fisher’s exact test was conducted to examine independence between gender and victim/bully status. No significant results were found ($p = .379$). Thus, the data were collapsed across gender for the remaining analyses.

**Tests of hypotheses**

The first part of the hypothesis in this research study proposed a meditational role of hurt feelings on the relation between traditional bullying victimization and cyberbullying perpetration. First, correlations were generated to determine which relationships were significant among the variables. It was found that the traditional bullying victimization variable represented by a combined total on the SEQ was significantly correlated with overt ($r = .448$, $p < .05$) and relational ($r = .954$, $p < .01$) bullying victimization subscales. No significant correlations were found between the variable representing all forms of traditional bullying victimization and cyberbullying perpetration. In addition, there were no significant correlations between the introjective hurt reaction subscale, retaliatory hurt reaction subscale, the variable representing all forms of traditional bullying victimization, and cyberbullying perpetration (see Table 3). Therefore, a meditational role was not supported.
The second part of the hypothesis examined the moderating effect of avoidant coping on the relation between victim social skills and cyberbullying perpetration. Correlations were generated in order to determine which relationships were significant among the variables. It was found that avoidant coping significantly correlated with minimizing/ignoring coping strategy ($r = .805, p < .01$), passive coping ($r = .731, p < .01$), and social awareness ($r = -.587, p < .01$). In addition, passive coping was significantly correlated with social skills ($r = -.543, p < .05$) and social awareness ($r = -.592, p < .01$). No significant correlations were found among cyberbullying perpetration, avoidant coping, and social skills. Therefore, the hypothesis was not supported.

Table 3
Correlations between hurt reaction, traditional bullying victimization, and cyberbullying perpetration to understand the mediating effect of hurt reaction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>HDS</th>
<th>SEQ</th>
<th>CBQ</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Introjective</td>
<td>Retaliatory</td>
<td>Traditional</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introjective</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.113</td>
<td>.177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliatory</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyberbullying</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed). The variables included in the table are abbreviated as follows: HDS = hurt dispositions scale, SEQ = social experience questionnaire, CBQ = cyberbullying questionnaire, Introjective = introjective hurt reaction subscale, Retaliatory = retaliatory hurt reaction subscale, Traditional = traditional bullying victimization - total score on the SEQ measure, Overt = overt bullying victimization subscale, Relational = relational bullying victimization subscale, Cyberbullying = cyberbullying perpetration.

Additional exploratory analyses were conducted. Since only a small number of participants self-identified as cyberbullies, the relationship between traditional bullying victimization and cyberbullying victimization was examined. A victim status variable was incorporated in the study by tallying incidence scores for all the participants who reported any instance of cyberbullying victimization. Correlations were generated among the research variables. No significant correlations were found between cyberbullying victimization and the other variables in the study. In addition, the Tromso scales were found to be unrelated to the victimization and bullying measures. Several correlations were found between traditional bullying
victimization, the various coping strategies, hurt reaction, and the social intelligence variables (see Table 4).

Next, a MANOVA was conducted to examine the differences between victims of cyberbullying (n = 32) and those who have not been victims of cyberbullying (n = 74). It was found that victims of cyberbullying were more likely to report hurt feelings, victimization through traditional means, and a wider use of coping strategies compared to non-victims. No significant differences were found for retaliatory hurt reaction, having a friend coping strategy, seeking revenge, minimize/ignoring coping strategy, social skills, and social information processing (see Table 5). The following table presents the results from a MANOVA analysis.

Table 5  
Multivariate analysis of variance examining differences between victims and non-victims of cyberbullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introjective</td>
<td>869.814</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.959</td>
<td>.049*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliatory</td>
<td>224.336</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.148</td>
<td>.287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional</td>
<td>405.115</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>31.426</td>
<td>&lt; .0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overt</td>
<td>6.879</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8.168</td>
<td>.005**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relational</td>
<td>306.416</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.172</td>
<td>&lt; .0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure</td>
<td>60.223</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.627</td>
<td>.020*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Passive</td>
<td>39.631</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>13.881</td>
<td>&lt; .0001**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tell</td>
<td>87.482</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.407</td>
<td>.008**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Friend</td>
<td>16.547</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.185</td>
<td>.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revenge</td>
<td>1.725</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.272</td>
<td>.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Min/ignore</td>
<td>2.601</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.759</td>
<td>.386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SA</td>
<td>80.890</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.635</td>
<td>.011*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>34.015</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.594</td>
<td>.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIP</td>
<td>11.951</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.891</td>
<td>.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td>62.538</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.786</td>
<td>.002**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed); ** correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed). The variables included in the table are abbreviated as follows: Introjective = introjective hurt reaction subscale, Retaliatory = retaliatory hurt reaction subscale, Traditional = traditional bullying victimization - total score on the SEQ measure, Overt = overt bullying victimization subscale, Relational = relational bullying victimization subscale, Figure = figure it out subscale, Passive = passive coping subscale, Tell = tell someone subscale, Friend = involve a friend subscale, Revenge = seek revenge subscale, Min/Ignore = minimize-ignore subscale, SA = social awareness subscale, SS = social skills subscale, SIP = social information processing subscale, and Avoid = avoidant coping - combined score from minimizing-ignoring and passive coping subscales.
Table 4
Correlational analyses of traditional bullying, cyberbullying, and coping strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Traditional</th>
<th>Overt</th>
<th>Relational</th>
<th>CyberVic</th>
<th>Introject</th>
<th>Retaliat</th>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Passive</th>
<th>Tell</th>
<th>Friend</th>
<th>Revenge</th>
<th>Min/Ignore</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>SIP</th>
<th>Avoid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.445*</td>
<td>.963**</td>
<td>.326*</td>
<td>.355*</td>
<td>.366*</td>
<td>.564**</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>-.018</td>
<td>.020</td>
<td>-.304</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>.188</td>
<td>-.028</td>
<td>-.024</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>-.120</td>
<td>-.019</td>
<td>-.067</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>-.343</td>
<td>-.186</td>
<td>.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.299</td>
<td>.397*</td>
<td>.398*</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.598**</td>
<td>.286</td>
<td>-.015</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.271</td>
<td>-.284</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.183</td>
<td>.550**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.187</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.289</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>-.203</td>
<td>-.147</td>
<td>-.027</td>
<td>-.253</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.276</td>
<td>-.232</td>
<td>-.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.462**</td>
<td>.094</td>
<td>.791**</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>-.451**</td>
<td>-.489**</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.500**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>.359*</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.177</td>
<td>-.591**</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>-.058</td>
<td>.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.238</td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.339</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.403*</td>
<td></td>
<td>.269</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>-.560**</td>
<td>-.479**</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td></td>
<td>.813**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>.339</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.403*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.343</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>.403*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.182</td>
<td>.026</td>
<td>.424*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.151</td>
<td>.424*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.289</td>
<td>.784**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.399</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td>.784**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.356</td>
<td>.140</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. * correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (two-tailed); ** correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (two-tailed). The variables included in the table are abbreviated as follows: Introject = introjective hurt reaction subscale, Retaliat = retaliatory hurt reaction subscale, Traditional = traditional bullying victimization - total score on the SEQ measure, Overt = overt bullying victimization subscale, Relational = relational bullying victimization subscale, CyberVic = cyberbullying victimization, Figure = figure it out subscale, Passive = passive coping subscale, Tell = tell someone subscale, Friend = involve a friend subscale, Revenge = seek revenge subscale, Min/Ignore = minimize-ignore subscale, SA = social awareness subscale, SS = social skills subscale, SIP = social information processing subscale, and Avoid = avoidant coping - combined score from minimizing-ignoring and passive coping subscales.
Finally, a step-wise regression analysis was conducted to explore which variables best predicted cyberbullying victimization. The predictor variables (relational bullying victimization, figure it out coping strategy, social skills, traditional bullying victimization, minimizing/ignoring strategy, passive coping, social information processing, tell someone coping strategy, introjective hurt reaction, retaliatory hurt reaction, having a friend coping strategy, social awareness, overt bullying victimization, seeking revenge, and avoidant coping) were entered in sequence based on their correlation to cyberbullying victimization with the higher correlations entered first. Relational bullying victimization (F = 26.760, p < .001) was found to be the only predictor of cyberbullying victimization. About 20.5% of cyberbullying victimization could be explained by relational bullying victimization.
CHAPTER IV
DISCUSSION

The current study attempted to examine the relationship between traditional bullying victimization and cyberbullying perpetration. It was hypothesized that due to the indirect nature of cyberbullying, victims of traditional bullying would utilize cyberbullying as a coping strategy and as a method of engaging in bullying themselves. However, the low number of participants who self-identified as a cyberbully and/or victim created some difficulties in examining the proposed hypotheses. Interestingly, while only a few revealed their role in cyberbullying, a number of students stated that they had heard about cyberbullying taking place among their classmates. It was found that as many as 72% of students surveyed had heard of cyberbullying occurring between students from their high school. These findings are fairly consistent with research conducted by Li (2005) who found that over half of the students surveyed knew someone who had been cyberbullied and over a quarter of students had been cyberbullied. This suggests that cyberbullying continues to be a serious and under-reported problem among students and involves a large number of students who may be unwilling to disclose their participation.

There are a number of reasons research participants may feel uncomfortable disclosing their involvement in bullying and/or cyberbullying. According to Mischna and Alaggia (2005), students who fail to disclose their role in bullying are more attuned to how disclosure might escalate bullying behavior. Students may be fearful of the consequences or feel shame, preventing them from dealing with their situation. They may feel a need to respond to questions about bullying in a socially desirable way to minimize their involvement (Dehue, Bolman, & Vollink, 2008; Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007). According to Bosworth et al. (1999), participants may be uncomfortable describing their behavior as bullying, which prevents them from answering
honestly. This makes it difficult to determine exactly how many students have a role in bullying and cyberbullying.

In a study conducted by Kert (2008), self-report rate of bullying was assessed based on exposure to the definition of bullying on the survey. It was found that the self-reported rate of bullying behavior was lower for the group in the study exposed to the definition and repeated use of the word bullying compared to the control group (Kert, 2008). This research finding highlights an important point for the present study. Participants may have had higher self-reporting if the definitions of bullying and cyberbullying were not included as part of the online survey.

On the other hand, it was important to include a definition of cyberbullying in the present study due to difference in interpretation. Providing a definition is likely to be helpful to participants who have to distinguish between threatening and merely joking situations (Lenhart, 2007). The social cues that drive face-to-face interactions are not present through the computer (Ybarra, 2004). Additionally, many students consider some of the behavior surveyed to be normal or expected online, so providing a definition helps students understand what constitutes cyberbullying (Beran & Li, 2005). In addition, several electronic forms can be recognized under the topic of cyberbullying. Individuals may be exposed to cyberbullying through email, websites, or text messaging. Thus, having a definition included in the present study helped to target individuals who are cyberbullying online.

Text messaging as a modality for cyberbullying has been recognized as increasingly widespread among teens. Raskauskas and Stoltz (2007) found that text messaging was the most common form of electronic bullying and victimization. This is not surprising given the large number of teens who have their own cell phone and the difficulty to monitor use and intervene. While the current study defined cyberbullying in terms of computer use, text messaging trends are also important to consider. Item number 60 ("are there any other forms of bullying you have experienced, involving the internet or other electronic devices, which have not been mentioned?") on the cyberbullying questionnaire asked participants to describe other forms of cyberbullying they have experienced. Of the participants who took part in this study, 18% reported cell phones and text messaging were alternative forms of cyberbullying. This further demonstrates that
under-reporting may have been an issue in the present study. The inclusion of text messaging as a form of cyberbullying may have increased participant response rate. Exploring text messaging among high school students may be an appropriate future research area to investigate.

Gender differences among victim and non-victims of cyberbullying were also explored during the study, but no significant differences were found. Li (2006) had similar findings, stating that no gender differences were found in relation to victimization. Examining the gender differences among those who are involved in cyberbullying continues to be an important area to explore since other findings reveal that males are more likely to cyberbully compared to their female counterpart (Li, 2006). This seems to suggest that gender differences in traditional bullying behavior and cyberbullying follow a similar pattern (Li, 2006). On the other hand, it has been recognized that females are just as likely as males to be involved in electronic media. As many as 97% of teens use the internet, suggesting a significant number of females may also be engaging in cyberbullying (Ybarra, 2004). The internet removes any difference in physical strength between peers and offers an indirect approach to interacting with others. While it was once believed adolescents would engage in gender-stereotypical preferences online (e.g. boys playing online games), it was found that boys and girls devote most of their time to private communication (Gross, 2004). The similarity in online interaction between boys and girls may also help explain the likelihood that both females and males are involved in cyberbullying.

The purpose of the present study was to investigate the relation between traditional bullying victimization and cyberbullying perpetration. No support was found. Past researchers have found that adolescents who are victimized at school are also perpetrators of electronic bullying because they use the anonymity of electronic devices to retaliate against bullies from a distance (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004b). The researchers suggest that the internet allows individuals to feel less constrained and assert themselves (Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004b). As the present study indicates, findings on the relationship between traditional bullying and cyberbullying have been inconsistent. Raskauskas and Stoltz (2007) conducted a similar study, finding their hypothesis that traditional victims would be internet bullies was not supported.
While it was believed that victims of traditional bullying would be more likely to cyberbully others, the opposite was actually found. Victims of traditional bullying were more likely to report victimization through the internet. This is consistent with other research findings. According to Beran and Li (2005), victims of cyberbullying also reported victimization by other forms of bullying. More than half (64%) of the students who were victims of cyberbullying also experienced other forms of victimization (Beran & Li, 2005). In addition, Raskauskas and Stoltz (2007) found that those who reported being victims of internet or text message bullying were also involved in other forms of victimization. The researchers determined that victims of bullying through the internet or cell phone also tended to report being victims of teasing and rumor spreading (Raskauskas & Stoltz, 2007). All these research findings clearly indicate a strong overlap exists between various forms of bullying. Students who are victims of bullying at school are also likely being victimized in their own home through the internet. Bullying must be taken seriously if communities hope to diminish the continuous difficulties victims of aggressive behaviors are experiencing.

Finally, the coping strategies of students who reported victimization were explored. The research results determined that victims of cyberbullying carry out a number of strategies to try and overcome their circumstance. These strategies include passive coping, telling someone, figuring out the situation, and avoidant coping. While some of these coping strategies have been recognized by researchers as helpful ways to stop bullying (i.e. telling someone), it appears that victims in this study may not be implementing coping strategies effectively because they also reported victimization across other settings (Hunter & Boyle, 2002; Bosworth et al, 1999; Baldry, 2004; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997).

Students may believe that utilizing any strategy would be good enough to make bullying stop (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005b). This is not always the case. The implementation of different strategies may also suggest that a particular strategy is not meeting the needs of the victim (Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997). In a study conducted by Hunter et al. (2004), 12% of participants said telling someone was the best strategy to make them feel better about their bullying situation; however, this was much lower than those who thought telling someone would
stop bullying (Hunter et al, 2004). Victims are often encouraged to tell an adult about bullying, but many victims are still suffering. According to Kochenderfer-Ladd and Skinner (2002), positive coping strategies, like problem-solving, may not always be adaptive strategies because victimized children who reported using these coping strategies appeared to be at greater risk for peer rejection. The researchers concluded that this may be due to their inability to be influential in their peer interactions or their likelihood to provoke conflicts rather than solve them (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002).

The wide availability of resources through the internet may help explain victim use of many coping strategies to stop bullying. Victims of cyberbullying are likely to be involved in an array of activities online (Lenhart et al, 2005). It was also found in the present study that the longer participants were online during the week the more their involvement in cyberbullying as a victim and as both a victim and bully was likely to increase. Teens who go online often report that the internet’s ability to help them learn new things was one of its best features (Lenhart, Simon, & Graziano, 2001). The computer may provide victims of cyberbullying with the opportunity to explore and learn about ways to deal with bullying. They may learn about a number of strategies to use against bullies, but while the internet may be providing victims with new opportunities, it will not necessarily have a positive impact on those already ineffectively coping offline (Seepersad, 2004). Victims may have difficulty utilizing the coping strategies they have discovered online. The failure to implement proper coping strategies limits an individual’s ability to overcome bullying. Efforts must be made to ensure individuals are provided with appropriate coping skills.

**Limitations**

Limitations can be recognized in this study. The low number of self-identified cyberbullies made it difficult to drawn conclusions on the topic of cyberbullying. As discussed above, there are a number of reasons to believe that students were reluctant to self-identify as “cyberbullies.” The inclusion of the definition of bullying on the cyberbullying questionnaire may have increased the likelihood of receiving social desirable responses to questions (Kert, 2008). Thus, the results may not accurately represent the number of participants involved in
cyberbullying. Finally, the exclusion of text messaging as a modality of cyberbullying may have impacted reporting rates. Text messaging is often assumed under the heading of cyberbullying, so focusing on internet use may have limited the findings. In addition, modifications to the cyberbullying questionnaire may have impacted the results in the study. The cyberbullying questionnaire was validated as a whole. Several items were added to the questionnaire, which may have caused significant changes.

Conclusions

The present study highlights the need to investigate the topic of cyberbullying, which remains somewhat unknown. Adolescents are growing up in a cyberworld. Parents, teachers, and the community must become more knowledgeable about the occurrence of cyberbullying. Examining the association between bullying victimization and cyberbullying will hopefully encourage teens to be more cautious online. Teens experiencing difficulties offline are likely to also have trouble online. For this reason, the need to monitor bullying not only in traditional settings but across media is important. Vulnerable teens should be encouraged to stay off certain websites or use privacy features when they are made available. It is important that adolescents are engaging in appropriate behaviors online and across other technology-mediated devices. Although it does not seem possible to eliminate all negative interactions through technology-mediated devices, victims who are equipped with appropriate coping skills are likely to overcome difficulties. The community, school, and parents must make every effort to resolve the issue of bullying by introducing efficient coping strategies for individuals who are suffering. Research on the topic of bullying and cyberbullying must remain a priority.
APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SURVEY

1. Sex: Male Female

2. Grade Level:

3. Age:

4. How much time do you spend on the internet during a single week day (circle one)?
   None  30 minutes or less  1 hour  2-3 hours  4 hours or more

5. How much time do you spend on the internet during a Saturday or Sunday (circle one)?
   None  30 minutes or less  1 hour  2-3 hours  4 hours or more

6. What do you use the internet for (you may circle more than one)?
   Chat rooms  Instant messaging  Email  Education  Work
SOCIAL EXPERIENCE QUESTIONNAIRE

1. I am a __________________________
   Male (1)  Female (2)

2. I am in the _____________
   Ninth grade (1)  Tenth grade (2)  Eleventh (3)  Twelfth (4)

Please answer each of the following questions as well as you can. Darken the number indicating the word or words that best answer the question for you.

**Example:**

3. How often do you sit down to watch TV right after getting home from school?
   Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

4. How often do you sit down to read a book right after getting home from school?
   Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

5. How often do you get help from other students when you need it?
   Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

6. How often do students tell lies about you so that other students won’t like you anymore?
   Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

7. How often do other students tell you that they won’t like you unless you do what they say?
   Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

8. How often do other students cheer you up when you are feeling sad or upset?
   Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)
9. How often do students say mean things about you so that other students won’t like you anymore?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

10. How often do you get hit by other students?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

11. How often do other students say nice things to you?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

12. How often do other students leave you out on purpose?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

13. When another student is mad at you, how often do they get back at you by not letting you be in their group anymore?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

14. How often does another student do something that makes you feel happy?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

15. How often do you get pushed or shoved by other students?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

16. How often do you get kicked or have your hair pulled by other students?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)

17. How often do other students let you know that they care about you?

Never (1)  A little (2)  Sometimes (3)  Most of the Time (4)  All of the time (5)
APPENDIX C

CYBERBULLYING QUESTIONNAIRE

Most of the questions are about your life in and out of school in the past 2 or 3 months. So when you answer, you should think of how it has been during the past couple of months and not only how it is just now. Before we start with questions about bullying, we will first define or explain the word bullying. We say a student is being bullied when another student, or several other students:

- say mean and hurtful things or make fun of him or her and call him or her mean and hurtful names.
- completely ignore or exclude him or her from their group of friends or leave him or her out of things on purpose.
- hit, kick, push, shove around, or lock him or her inside a room.
- tell lies or spread false rumors about him or her or send mean notes and try to make other students dislike him or her.

When we talk about bullying, these things happen repeatedly, and it is difficult for the student being bullied to defend himself or herself. We also call it bullying, when a student is teased repeatedly in a mean and hurtful way. But we don’t call it bullying when the teasing is done in a friendly and playful way. Also, it is not bullying when two students of about equal strength or power argue or fight.

Today, we would like to look at a special kind of bullying: Cyberbullying. This includes bullying

- through text messaging
- through pictures/photos or video clips
- through phone calls
- through email
- in chat rooms
- through instant messaging
- through websites

Bullying can happen through text messages/pictures/clips/email/messages etc sent to you, but also when text messages/pictures/clips/email/messages etc are sent to others about you.
1. Have you been bullied in the past couple of months (any kind of bullying, including cyberbullying)?
   _____ I haven’t been bullied in the past couple of months
   _____ It has only happened once or twice
   _____ 2 or 3 times a month
   _____ About once a week
   _____ Several times a week

2. How often have you been cyberbullied in the past couple of months?
   _____ I haven’t been cyberbullied in the past couple of months
   _____ It has only happened once or twice
   _____ 2 or 3 times a month
   _____ About once a week
   _____ Several times a week

3. How often have you cyberbullied others in the past couple of months?
   _____ I haven’t cyberbullied in the past couple of month
   _____ It has only happened once or twice
   _____ 2 or 3 times a month
   _____ About once a week
   _____ Several times a week

**Email Bullying**

4. How often have you been bullied through email in the past couple of months **in school**?
   _____ I haven’t been bullied through emails in the past couple of months in school
   _____ It has only happened once or twice
   _____ 2 or 3 times a month
   _____ About once a week
   _____ Several times a week
   _____ Other: __________________

5. How often have you been bullied through email in the past couple of months **outside of school**?
   _____ I haven’t been bullied through emails in the past couple of months outside of school
   _____ It has only happened once or twice
   _____ 2 or 3 times a month
   _____ About once a week
   _____ Several times a week
   _____ Other: __________________

6. Have you bullied others through email in the past couple of months **in school**?
   _____ I haven’t bullied through email in the past couple of months in school
   _____ It has only happened once or twice
   _____ 2 or 3 times a month
   _____ About once a week
Several times a week
Other: ______________

7. Have you bullied others through email in the past couple of months outside of school?
   _____ I haven’t bullied through email in the past couple of months outside of school
   _____ It has only happened once or twice
   _____ 2 or 3 times a month
   _____ About once a week
   _____ Several times a week
   _____ Other: ______________

8. Have you heard of bullying taking place through email in your school or circle of friends in the past couple of months?
   _____ Yes
   _____ No

9. Do you think email bullying compared to “normal, traditional, conventional” bullying…
   _____ Has less of an effect on the victim
   _____ Has the same effect on the victim
   _____ Has more of an effect on the victim
   _____ Don’t know
   *Reason: __________________________________________________________________________

10. In which classes is the student or students who bully/bullies you through emails?
    _____ I haven’t been bullied through email in the past couple of months
    _____ In my class
    _____ In a different class but same grade/year
    _____ In a higher grade
    _____ In a lower grade
    _____ In different grades
    _____ Not in my school
    _____ I do not know who sends me those emails

11. In which classes is the student or students who you bully through emails?
    _____ I haven’t bullied through email in the past couple of months
    _____ In my class
    _____ In a different class but same grade/year
    _____ In a higher grade
    _____ In a lower grade
    _____ In different grades
    _____ Not in my school

12. Have you been bullied through email by boys or girls?
    _____ I haven’t been bullied through email in the past couple of months
    _____ Mainly by one girl
    _____ By several girls
    _____ Mainly by one boy
    _____ By several boys
    _____ By both boys and girls
    _____ I do not know who sends me those emails
13. Have you bullied boys or girls through email?

_____ I haven’t bullied through email in the past couple of months
_____ Girls
_____ Boys
_____ Both boys and girls

14. By how many students have you usually been bullied through emails?

_____ I haven’t been bullied through email in the past couple of months
_____ Mainly by one student
_____ By a group of 2-3 students
_____ By a group of 4-9 students
_____ By a group of more than 9 students
_____ By several different students or groups of students
_____ I do not know who sends me those emails

15. With how many students do you typically engage in bullying through emails?

_____ I haven’t bullied through email in the past couple of months
_____ Mainly by myself
_____ With one other person
_____ With a group of 2-4
_____ With a group of 5 or more

16. How long has the bullying by email lasted?

_____ I haven’t bullied or been bullied through email in the past couple of months
_____ It lasted one or two weeks
_____ It lasted about a month
_____ It has lasted about six months
_____ It has gone on for several years

17. Have you told anyone (that you have been bullied or bullied others through email)?

_____ I haven’t bullied or been bullied through email in the past couple of months
_____ Your class teacher
_____ Another adult at school
_____ Your parents/guardians
_____ Your friends
_____ Someone else: _______________________
_____ I have told nobody

Chat room Bullying

18. How often have you been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months in school?

_____ I do not use chat rooms
_____ I haven’t been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months in school
_____ It has only happened once or twice
_____ 2 or 3 times a month
_____ About once a week
_____ Several times a week
_____ Other: _______________________

19. How often have you been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months outside of school?

_____ I do not use chat rooms
_____ I haven't been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months outside of school
_____ It has only happened once or twice
_____ 2 or 3 times a month
_____ About once a week
_____ Several times a week
_____ Other: __________________

20. Have you bullied others in chat rooms in the past couple of months in school?

_____ I do not use chat rooms
_____ I haven't bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months in school
_____ It has only happened once or twice
_____ 2 or 3 times a month
_____ About once a week
_____ Several times a week
_____ Other: __________________

21. Have you bullied others in chat rooms in the past couple of months outside of school?

_____ I do not use chat rooms
_____ I haven't bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months outside of school
_____ It has only happened once or twice
_____ 2 or 3 times a month
_____ About once a week
_____ Several times a week
_____ Other: __________________

22. Have you heard of bullying taking place in chat rooms in your school or circle of friends in the past couple of months?

_____ Yes
_____ No

23. Do you think bullying in chat rooms compared to "normal, traditional, conventional" bullying...

_____ Has less of an effect on the victim
_____ Has the same effect on the victim
_____ Has more of an effect on the victim
_____ Don't know

*Reason: ______________________________________________________________

24. In which classes is the student or students who bully you in chat rooms?

_____ I haven't been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months
_____ In my class
_____ In a different class but same grade/year
_____ In a higher grade
_____ In a lower grade
_____ In different grades
_____ Not in my school
_____ I do not know who sends me those messages
25. In which classes is the student or students who you bully in chat rooms?  
    _____ I haven’t bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months  
    _____ In my class  
    _____ In a different class but same grade/year  
    _____ In a higher grade  
    _____ In a lower grade  
    _____ In different grades  
    _____ Not in my school  
    _____ I do not know who sends me those messages

26. Have you been bullied in chat rooms by boys or girls?  
    _____ I haven’t been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months  
    _____ Mainly by one girl  
    _____ By several girls  
    _____ Mainly by one boy  
    _____ By several boys  
    _____ By both boys and girls  
    _____ I do not know who sends me those messages

27. Have you bullied boys or girls in chat rooms?  
    _____ I haven’t bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months  
    _____ Girls  
    _____ Boys  
    _____ Both boys and girls

28. By how many students have you usually been bullied in chat rooms?  
    _____ I haven’t been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months  
    _____ Mainly by one student  
    _____ By a group of 2-3 students  
    _____ By a group of 4-9 students  
    _____ By a group of more than 9 students  
    _____ By several different students or groups of students  
    _____ I do not know who sends me those messages

29. With how many students do you typically engage in bullying in chat rooms?  
    _____ I haven’t bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months  
    _____ Mainly by myself  
    _____ With one other person  
    _____ With a group of 2-4  
    _____ With a group of 5 or more

30. How long has the bullying in chat rooms lasted?  
    _____ I haven’t bullied or been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months  
    _____ It lasted one or two weeks  
    _____ It lasted about a month  
    _____ It has lasted about six months  
    _____ It has gone on for several years

31. Have you told anyone (that you have been bullied or bullied others in chat rooms)?
I haven’t bullied or been bullied in chat rooms in the past couple of months
Your class teacher
Another adult at school
Your parents/guardians
Your friends
Someone else: ______________________
I have told nobody

Instant Messaging Bullying

32. How often have you been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months in school?

I do not use instant messaging
I haven’t been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months in school.
It has only happened once or twice
2 or 3 times a month
About once a week
Several times a week
Other: ______________

33. How often have you been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months outside of school?

I do not use instant messaging
I haven’t been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months outside of school.
It has only happened once or twice
2 or 3 times a month
About once a week
Several times a week
Other: ______________

34. Have you bullied others through instant messaging in the past couple of months in school?

I do not use instant messaging
I haven’t bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months in school.
It has only happened once or twice
2 or 3 times a month
About once a week
Several times a week
Other: ______________

35. Have you bullied others through instant messaging in the past couple of months outside of school?

I do not use instant messaging
I haven’t bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months outside of school.
It has only happened once or twice
2 or 3 times a month
About once a week
Several times a week
Other: ______________
36. Have you heard of bullying taking place through instant messaging in your school or circle of friends in the past couple of months?

_____Yes
_____No

37. Do you think instant messaging bullying compared to “normal, traditional, conventional” bullying...

_____Has less of an effect on the victim
_____Has the same effect on the victim
_____Has more of an effect on the victim
_____Don’t know

*Reason: _______________________________________________________

38. In which classes is the student or students who bully/bullies you through instant messaging?

_____I do not use instant messaging
_____I haven’t been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months
_____In my class
_____In a different class but same grade/year
_____In a higher grade
_____In a lower grade
_____In different grades
_____Not in my school
_____I do not know who sends me those messages

39. In which classes is the student or students who you bully through instant messaging?

_____I do not use instant messaging
_____I haven’t bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months
_____In my class
_____In a different class but same grade/year
_____In a higher grade
_____In a lower grade
_____In different grades
_____Not in my school

40. Have you been bullied through instant messaging by boys or girls?

_____I do not use instant messaging
_____I haven’t been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months
_____Mainly by one girl
_____By several girls
_____Mainly by one boy
_____By several boys
_____By both boys and girls
_____I do not know who sends me those messages

41. Have you bullied boys or girls through instant messaging?

_____I do not use instant messaging
_____I haven’t bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months
_____Girls
Boys
Both boys and girls

42. By how many students have you usually been bullied through instant messaging?
   ___ I do not use instant messaging
   ___ I haven't been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months
   ___ Mainly by one student
   ___ By a group of 2-3 students
   ___ By a group of 4-9 students
   ___ By a group of more than 9 students
   ___ By several different students or groups of students
   ___ I do not know who sends me those messages

43. With how many students do you typically engage in bullying through instant messaging?
   ___ I do not use instant messaging
   ___ I haven't bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months
   ___ Mainly by myself
   ___ With one other person
   ___ With a group of 2-4
   ___ With a group of 5 or more

44. How long has the bullying through instant messaging lasted?
   ___ I do not use instant messaging
   ___ I haven't bullied or been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months
   ___ It lasted one or two weeks
   ___ It lasted about a month
   ___ It has lasted about six months
   ___ It has gone on for several years

45. Have you told anyone (that you have been bullied or bullied others through instant messaging)?
   ___ I do not use instant messaging
   ___ I haven't bullied or been bullied through instant messaging in the past couple of months
   ___ Your class teacher
   ___ Another adult at school
   ___ Your parents/guardians
   ___ Your friends
   ___ Someone else: _________________________
   ___ I have told nobody

Website Bullying (for example: setting up a negative website about someone, revealing personal details, etc).

46. How often have you been bullied through websites in the past couple of months in school?
   ___ I haven't been bullied through websites in the past couple of months in school.
   ___ It has only happened once or twice
   ___ 2 or 3 times a month
   ___ About once a week
47. How often have you been bullied through websites in the past couple of months outside of school?

- I haven’t been bullied through websites in the past couple of months outside of school
- It has only happened once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- About once a week
- Several times a week
- Other: ______________________

48. Have you bullied others through websites in the past couple of months in school?

- I haven’t bullied through websites in the past couple of months in school
- It has only happened once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- About once a week
- Several times a week
- Other: ______________________

49. Have you bullied others through websites in the past couple of months outside of school?

- I haven’t bullied through websites in the past couple of months outside of school
- It has only happened once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- About once a week
- Several times a week
- Other: ______________________

50. Have you heard of bullying taking place through websites in your school or circle of friends in the past couple of months?

- Yes
- No

51. Do you think website bullying compared to “normal, traditional, conventional” bullying...

- Has less of an effect on the victim
- Has the same effect on the victim
- Has more of an effect on the victim
- Don’t know

*Reason: __________________________________________________________________________

52. In which classes is the student or students who bully/bullies you through websites?

- I haven’t been bullied through websites in the past couple of months
- In my class
- In a different class but same grade/year
- In a higher grade
- In a lower grade
- In different grades
- Not in my school
53. In which classes is the student or students who you bully through websites?

- I haven’t bullied through websites in the past couple of months
- In my class
- In a different class but same grade/year
- In a higher grade
- In a lower grade
- In different grades
- Not in my school

54. Have you been bullied through websites by boys or girls?

- I haven’t been bullied through websites in the past couple of months
- Mainly by one girl
- By several girls
- Mainly by one boy
- By several boys
- By both boys and girls
- I do not know who set up the website

55. Have you bullied boys or girls through websites?

- I haven’t bullied through websites in the past couple of months
- Girls
- Boys
- Both boys and girls

56. By how many students have you usually been bullied through websites?

- I haven’t been bullied through websites in the past couple of months
- Mainly by one student
- By a group of 2-3 students
- By a group of 4-9 students
- By a group of more than 9 students
- By several different students or groups of students
- I do not know who set up the website

57. With how many students do you typically engage in bullying through websites?

- I haven’t bullied through websites in the past couple of months
- Mainly by myself
- With one other person
- With a group of 2-4
- With a group of 5 or more

58. How long has the bullying through websites lasted?

- I haven’t bullied or been bullied through websites in the past couple of months
- It lasted one or two weeks
- It lasted about a month
- It has lasted about six months
- It has gone on for several years
59. Have you told anyone (that you have been bullied or bullied others through websites)?

- I haven’t bullied or been bullied through websites in the past couple of months
- Your class teacher
- Another adult at school
- Your parents/guardians
- Your friends
- Someone else: ______________
- I have told nobody

Other forms of cyberbullying

60. Are there any other forms of bullying you have experienced, involving the internet or other electronic devices, which we have not mentioned?

- No
- Yes (please describe):

***If you have cyberbullied or been cyberbullied in any way (email, chat rooms, instant messaging, or other), what sort of comments/remarks (for example: about your looks or race) were made?

_____________________________________________________________________________

_____________________________________________________________________________
APPENDIX D

HURT DISPOSITIONS SCALE

Listed below are a number of statements that describe attitudes that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. Read each item and decide whether you agree or disagree and to what extent.

1 = Strongly Disagree  2 = Disagree  3 = Neither Disagree nor Agree  4 = Agree  5 = Strongly Agree

___ 1. I am overly sensitive.
___ 2. I can be spiteful when I need to be.
___ 3. I am often overwhelmed by my feelings.
___ 4. I don’t have much of a temper.
___ 5. I take rejection well.
___ 6. I am hostile to those who have recently betrayed me or hurt my feelings.
___ 7. I am stung by just about any harsh or unkind word directed toward me.
___ 8. People who criticize me are likely to get more than they bargained for.
___ 9. I am not overly sensitive.
___ 10. I am not irritable.
___ 11. I am easily hurt.
___ 12. I can be spiteful when my feelings are hurt.
___ 13. I take everything to heart.
___ 14. When someone hurts me, I have a difficult time controlling my temper.
___ 15. I am not easily hurt by others.
___ 16. People who know me would say that I have a short fuse.
___ 17. I feel a constant need for reassurance.
___ 18. I can be mean in response to offenses by others.
___ 19. I don’t let the words and actions of others get to me.
___ 20. My temper often gets the best of me.
___ 21. People who know me well think that I am emotionally fragile.
___ 22. I tend to “lash out” when someone says or does something to hurt me.
___ 23. I have a low threshold for being hurt.
Listed below are a number of statements that describe attitudes that different people have. There are no right or wrong answers, only opinions. Read each item and decide whether you agree or disagree and to what extent.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1 = Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>2 = Disagree</th>
<th>3 = Neither Disagree nor Agree</th>
<th>4 = Agree</th>
<th>5 = Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>If someone hurt me, I’d probably retaliate before I had time to think about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>I fall apart when someone hurts me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>I often become enraged over the slightest offense.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>I am usually devastated when someone hurts my feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>I often seek revenge against those who have hurt me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>It takes a lot to hurt my feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>If someone says something to hurt me, I’ll say something to hurt them back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>I don’t let things bother me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>My quick temper often makes me do things which I later regret.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>It takes a lot to upset me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>I rarely “fly off the handle.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>The smallest problem can ruin my day.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>When I get my feelings hurt, I act first and think later.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>People don’t realize how easily I can be hurt.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>When someone offends me, I get “hot under the collar.”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>The slightest hint of rejection wounds me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>I can be vindictive when provoked.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TROMSO SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE SCALE

Below is a group of statements that people might use to describe themselves. For each statement, choose the best description of how that statement applies to you.

1. I can predict other peoples’ behavior.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

2. I often feel that it is difficult to understand other’s choices.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

3. I know how my actions will make others feel.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

4. I feel uncertain around new people who I don’t know.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

5. People often surprise me with the things they do.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

6. I understand other people’s feelings.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

7. I fit in easily in social situations.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

8. I have often hurt others without realizing it.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

9. I understand others’ wishes.
   False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

10. Other people become angry with me without being able to explain why.
    False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)
11. I am good at entering new situations and meeting people for the first time.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

12. I have a hard time getting along with other people.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

13. It takes me a long time to get to know others well.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

14. I can often understand what others are trying to accomplish without the need for them to say anything.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

15. I am often surprised by other’s reactions to what I do.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

16. I find people predictable.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

17. I can predict how others will react to my behavior.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

18. I am good at getting on good terms with new people.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

19. I often understand what others really mean through their expressions, body language, etc.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

20. I frequently have problems finding good conversation topics.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)

21. It seems as though people are often angry or irritated with me when I say what I think.

False/Not True At All (1)  Slightly True (2)  Mainly True (3)  Very True (4)
APPENDIX F

WHAT I WOULD DO MEASURE

Please mark the box that shows how often you would do these things.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When kids are being mean to me….</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Most of the time</th>
<th>Every time</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I act like nothing happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I try to think of ways to stop it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I tell a friend what happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I do something mean right back to them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I get help from a teacher.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I forget the whole thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I ask a friend what I should do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I tell my mom or dad (or another adult at home) what happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I hurt the kid who was mean to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I become so upset I can't talk to anyone.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I tell myself it doesn't matter.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would think about what I would do the next time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would work it out on my own.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When kids are being mean to me....</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Most of the time</td>
<td>Every time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would get mad and throw or hit something</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I feel like crying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. I get help from a friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. I try to find out why it happened, so it won't happen again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. I tell the teacher what happened.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. I yell at the kid who is being mean.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. I don’t know what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. I tell the mean kids I don’t care.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. I change things to keep it from happening again.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. I ask my mom or dad (or another adult at home) what to do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. I hurt the kid back.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. I get help from my mom or dad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26. I ask the teacher what I should do.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27. I talk to a friend about it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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