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Introduction

Recently, research has increasingly focused on bullying and its recurring presence in schools and the workplace. One aspect of this research has explored the effects bullying has on the adolescent population. In 2009, 19.9% of students reported being bullied on school property within the previous twelve months, with the average being slightly higher for girls than for boys (Brener et al., 2010).

Definitions of bullying vary, yet there are overarching concepts between definitions that are present across prior studies. Olweus (2011), for example, identified three common concepts which he believes most practitioners have accepted: that bullying is (a) purposeful behavior which is adverse in nature, (b) usually takes place more than once, and (c) the intended victim is usually one who has trouble withstanding the bullying. The Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (2014) describes bullying as unsolicited behavior, combative in nature, experienced by a young person (or group) who is neither related to nor currently dating the aggressor(s). Bullying research to date has distinguished two categories of bullying, that of traditional bullying and cyberbullying, the latter identified by the use of technology to engage in bullying. Before the introduction and widespread use of cellular phones, the internet, and social media, cyberbullying was non-existent. Research has only recently identified cyberbullying as a new phenomenon (Carvalho, Fisher, Mahdavi, Russell, Smith, & Tippett, 2008).

There may be factors which increase an individual’s risk for bully victimization. For example, an individual who is at risk may feel socially isolated and lack basic support.
Adolescents who are at increased risk of being bully victims may have low self-esteem, have poor relationships with peers, or be described by others as “quiet” (CDC, 2014). People who do not possess these characteristics can also be bullied. Being the victim of bullying may put an individual at risk for negative outcomes including physical and psychological harm. Victims may also undergo emotional effects as well. Adolescents who are victimized may be at an increased risk for poor mental health functioning, headaches, anxiety, and depression (CDC, 2014). Bannink, Broeren, de Waart, Raat, & van de Looij-Jansen (2014) as well as the CDC (2014) also note the linkage between being an adolescent bully victim in relation to mental health concerns and suicide.

**Traditional Bullying**

Traditional bullying can be defined as repeated acts of aggression toward a person who feels unable to defend him or herself (Bannink et al., 2014; Sapouna & Wolke, 2013). There are four main types of traditional bullying that can occur. These include physical, verbal, relational, and indirect bullying (Carvalho et al., 2008).

Traditional bullying may result in negative psychological outcomes for victims of bullying. One study found that traditional bullying was associated with suicidal ideation and that traditional bullying only had a negative mental impact on adolescent girls (Bannink et al., 2014). Other studies have also identified gender differences in terms of bully victimization (Betts & Narayanan, 2014; Sapouna & Wolke, 2013; Brener et al., 2010; Arnold & Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2012). There have also been gender differences identified with regards to types of bullying, such as explicit and implicit. Explicit
bullying involves being more direct, whereas implicit bullying is often less direct. Girls are more likely to engage in or be a victim of relational aggression, whereas with boys the aggression is more likely to be physical (Arnold & Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2012). There is no universal understanding as to why these gendered results occur, although Brighi et al. (2012) proposed gender norms in reporting as a possible explanation. The discrepancy may be in relation to the victim’s willingness or likelihood to report being bullied or because of the differences in defining victimization. Brighi et al. (2012) concluded that there is a correlation between the type of bullying endured and how the victim reacts emotionally. This indicates that victims may react to their experiences differently and do so in accordance to what emotion they felt during the ordeal.

**Cyberbullying**

Technology is prominent in modern society. With increasing technological advancements, a larger part of the population has access to the internet. With increasing access to the internet, the realms where bullying may take place have also expanded. Cyberbullying is often described similarly to traditional bullying (Hinduja and Patchin, 2010) but uses technology (i.e. mobile phones, e-mail, the internet) to carry out harmful acts (Brighi et al., 2012). There are now a growing number of social media websites that could potentially act as an avenue for bullying activity including Facebook, Twitter, and Instagram. One factor which may encourage individuals to engage in cyberbullying rather than traditional bullying is that the interaction does not occur face to face. Cyberbullying combines both the anonymity of indirect bullying as well as the targeted attack seen with direct bullying (Carvalho et al., 2008). Carvalho et al. (2008) found that roughly five to
ten percent of students had been victims of cyberbullying within their last school term. Although their findings suggest cyberbullying occurs less frequently than traditional bullying, the authors note the possibility of underreporting by participants. Carvalho et al. (2008) pointed out that although the duration of cyberbullying is generally shorter than traditional bullying, this does not mean there is any less of a negative impact. The authors suggested that although cyberbullies are less likely to receive a response from the victim, they may receive some sort of gratifying response from their peers.

Measuring cyberbullying is a rather new phenomenon due to an abundance of technological advancements in a relatively short period of time. Bannink et al. (2014) point out that there is currently no universal way scientists measure cyberbullying. Brighi et al. (2012) utilize the DAPHNE questionnaire, a previously developed scale (as cited in Genta, M. L., Smith, P. K., Ortega, R., Brighi, A., Guarini, A., Thompson, F., & Calmaestra, J., 2012) which consists of a self-reported compilation of questionnaires about bullying and cyberbullying. Hinduja and Patchin (2010) developed a scale, *Cyberbullying*, which measures if, and how often, an individual is cyberbullied as well as the media used to bully them. Because of the increasing role technology plays in the lives of adolescents, further measures must be developed to investigate cyberbullying in greater detail.

**Traditional Bullying and Cyberbullying in Comparison**

Research notes a relationship between cyberbullying and traditional bullying (Brighti et al., 2012). Although bullying still occurs within homes and schools, it has
made its way to cyberspace (Arnold & Rockinson-Szapkiw, 2012). According to research, traditional bullying is still more prevalent than cyberbullying (Carvalho et al., 2008). In terms of where the bullying takes place, cyberbullying is more likely to take place off school property (Carvalho et al., 2008). With regards to the impact of one method of bullying versus another, Hinduja and Patchin (2010) found that victims of cyberbullying had lower self-esteem even after controlling for demographic factors. A study which employed the use of focus groups to collect data discovered that certain types of cyberbullying, utilizing pictures or videos, had more of a negative impact on the students than did traditional bullying (Carvalho et al., 2008). Conversely, some have questioned the impact of cyberbullying in comparison to traditional bullying. Some other avenues of cyberbullying were seen as not having a greater impact or having less of an impact than traditional bullying (Carvalho et al., 2008). With regards to impact between cyberbullying and traditional bullying, one study found negative feelings associated with cyberbullying were lower when compared with traditional bullying (Brighi et al., 2012). Although there may be some discrepancy regarding how impactful one type of bullying is in comparison to another, experiencing either type of bullying may have a negative impact on the adolescent. This warrants the need to identify how bully victims are impacted by their encounters. One way this impact can be assessed is by identifying resilience, comprised of strengths and weaknesses an individual possesses.
Resilience

There is no universal definition for the concept of resilience, although most definitions incorporate similar underlying concepts. As Kolar (2011) notes, definitions of resilience are often based on discipline. From the child psychology and psychiatry perspective, Rutter (2006) defines resilience as a positive outcome in a potentially risky or adverse situation. Friborg et al. (2006) define resilience in terms of the protective means that help an individual overcome potential risk for mental health issues. One definition is geared toward assessing resilience in terms of an outcome while the other identifies resilience in terms of the means used to cope rather than the final result produced. Although these definitions may be looking at two different points in time, they both take potential risk into account. Because definitions of resilience vary, researchers have generally established two main ways to categorize resilience from a process perspective and an outcome perspective. Resilience may be viewed as either a process or an outcome and it is important to establish the difference between the two (Bond et al., 2003). This research approaches resilience from a process perspective, as a combination of factors are taken into account in order to gauge resilience in the sample of adolescents.

Resilience as a process.

Resilience as a process suggests that resilience is ongoing; an individual is constantly adapting to his/her situation. As Rutter (2006) noted, there has been a call for the need to look at resilience over the course of an individual’s life span rather than at a single point in time. Identifying resilience as a process gives the ability to look at the
bigger picture. Bond et al. (2003) describe this being used to identify the way that an outcome may be altered through the use of risk and protective processes by the individual. Ongoing resilience has been assessed through identification of both risk and protective factors (Bond et al., 2003). This idea weighs the benefit of having protective factors present with vulnerability due to one or more identified risk. Protective factors can include individual characteristics, peer and family strengths and characteristics, and community and school resources (Bond, et al., 2003; Brownlee, Franks, & Rawana, 2013; Friborg, 2006). This research examines resilience as a process rather than an outlook, as it assesses several variables which may buffer the impact of being bullied rather than gauging the adjustment of the victim based on a single factor. Additionally, Bond et al. (2003) note that identifying resilience as an outcome may not give an accurate picture of how adolescence can overcome adversity. In regards to how resilience may be measured, Friborg et al. (2006) have recently developed a scale that specifically targets measuring resilience in the adolescent population, the Resilience Scale for Adolescence (READ). This scale uses specific variables to measure individual, family, and social factors (Friborg et al., 2006).

**Resilience and Bullying**

Because research regarding the topic is limited, it is unknown how some bully victims are able to overcome their negative experiences and function normally (Sapouna & Wolke, 2013). While it is important to draw attention to the seriousness of bullying, it is also important to remember that individuals possess characteristics individually,
through their family, or within the community that may help them overcome a bullying experience. For instance, Rutter (1981) argued the importance that individual factors played in how an individual views and overcomes a stressful event. He also argued that these individual characteristics are what cause differences in perception and outcomes of similarly stressful situations. With regards to family factors, Arseneault et al. (2010) suggested that although warm family relationships are important for all children, they may be especially beneficial for children dealing with bully victimization. Individual, family, and community factors may act as buffers for adolescence who have experienced bullying.

If an individual experiences bullying, it does not mean they are automatically going to experience a negative outcome. Regardless of gender, Donnon (2009) inferred that certain positive factors of resilience will increase the likelihood that individuals will choose to live more positive lifestyles. Furthermore, he found that individuals who reported having more strengths were less likely to engage in bullying behaviors as well as become a victim compared to individuals who reported fewer strengths (Donnon, 2009). This evidence suggests that possessing strengths can be beneficial for reducing both the number of victims as well as bullies.

It is also important to note that there has been some indication of gender differences in relation to protective factors. A study by Brownlee, Franks, and Rawana (2013) examined the relationship between strengths in the youth population in comparison to bully experiences and found that there were gender differences in reported strengths. Because research linking both bullying and resilience is scarce, it is difficult to
identify the extent to which these gender differences occur. This study seeks to identify predictive relationships between being bullied (both traditional and cyber) and individual resilience. The study aims to explore if bullying (both cyber and traditional) is predictive of resilience as measured by the Resilience Scale for Adolescents (READ).

These hypotheses are as follows:

- **Research Hypothesis 1** - Cyberbullying scores are a significant predictor of personal competence scores such that as cyberbullying scores increase, personal competence scores decrease.

- **Research Hypothesis 2** - Traditional bullying scores are a significant predictor of personal competence scores such that as traditional bullying scores increase, personal competence scores decrease.

- **Research Hypothesis 3** - Traditional bullying scores are a significant predictor of structured style scores such that as traditional bullying scores increase, structured style scores decrease.

- **Research Hypothesis 4** - Traditional bullying scores are a significant predictor of family cohesion such that as traditional bullying scores increase, family cohesion scores decrease.

- **Research Hypothesis 5** - Cyberbullying scores are a significant predictor of family cohesion such that as cyberbullying scores increase, family cohesion scores decrease.
Method

Procedure

The principals of two participating high schools agreed to allow potential student participation in the data collection process. A parental consent form was sent home with each student along with a child consent form. Additionally, one of the participating schools requested an additional letter be sent home to parents, stating similar information to the consent forms. Parents and students were informed that the survey was voluntary and all information collected was anonymous. In order for a student to participate in the study, both the parental and child consent forms had to be signed and returned to the researcher. Potential participants were informed that participation would enter them in a random drawing for a $25 gift card to local food establishments. Each school was allocated ten $25 dollar gift cards. Gift cards were distributed randomly to ten participants from each school that completed the survey in accordance with the Institutional Review Board (IRB). At both schools, the survey was conducted during the school day. All participating school personnel were informed of the procedure prior to the data collection.

Participant Recruitment

The current study was conducted via paper and pencil survey at two local senior high schools (grades 9-12). Institutional Review Board approval was obtained prior to the
schools being contacted. All requests made by the schools were followed. In compliance
with the IRB, consent forms were given to the parents as well as the children. Students
were instructed to read over the consent form with their parent or guardian before
signing. Minor students were not given the survey unless both the parental and child
consent forms were signed. The consent form was given to students at least one day prior
to potentially taking the survey. Between the two participating schools, 62 students
completed the survey (N = 62).

Demographics

The first portion of the survey consisted of six demographic questions which
requested basic information about the student completing the survey. These questions
asked about age, grade, gender, grade point average, siblings (number/gender/age), and
perception of the family financial situation. A summary of these demographics is
presented in Table 1. Participants indicated their family’s financial situation by circling an
answer on a five point Likert-style question. Responses ranged from “We are in a bad
financial situation” to “We are in a good financial situation” as utilized originally in a
study by Hjemdal, Mossige, Stefansen, & von Soest (2010) and adapted for use in this
research.

The population for this study consisted of 62 middle adolescent students between
the ages of 14 and 18 years old. In regards to gender, 22 males and 40 females
participated in the survey. The average participant was 16.5 years of age and the average
grade point average was 3.35. The average number of siblings a survey participant
reported having two. Additionally, the average grade for participants was 10.9. The score for the demographic question indicating current financial situation yielded an average of 2.69. This score would suggest that the average student reported either being in an okay financial situation or being in a somewhat good financial situation. Table 1 presents a summary of the demographic information from the sample.

Measures

The survey consisted of three scales: The Gatehouse Bullying Scale (Bond et al., 2007) measured traditional bullying, a scale developed by Hinduja and Patchin (2010) was used to measure cyberbullying and the Resilience Scale for Adolescents (READ) (Friborg et al., 2006) was used to measure resilience. More information on each of these scales is presented in the following subsections.

The Gatehouse Bullying Scale.

The Gatehouse Bullying Scale, originally utilized in Bond et al. (2007), was used to measure traditional bullying. In this research, this scale was chosen due to the nature of its questions as well as the amount of time it took to complete. This scale consists of 12 closed-ended items (four yes or no questions and eight questions using a three point Likert scale) regarding traditional bullying victimization. Four items asked whether or not the victimization was recent (Yes or No). Four items asked about frequency of bully victimization (Most days, About once a week, or Less than once a week). The remaining
four items asked about emotional impact of experienced bullying (Not at all, A bit, or I was quite upset).

**Cyberbullying.**

Cyberbullying was measured by using a scale developed and utilized by Hinjuda and Patchin (2010). In this research, the scale was chosen due to the nature of questions about cyberbullying. The scale was also chosen due to the abbreviated amount of time it took to complete the scale. This scale consists of 10 items which are answered by using a five point Likert scale (Never, Once or Twice, A Few Times, Many Times, Every Day). One question (Table 2, 3rd item) was updated. The item previously read “Had something posted on Myspace that made you upset”. This item was changed to “Had something posted on Facebook that made you upset”. Additionally, an item was added which read, “Had something posted on Twitter that made you upset”. These items were adapted due to the shift in social media sites utilized by adolescents since the measure was developed. Brighi et al. (2012) describe cyberbullying as taking place in the context of various arenas of cyberspace, including social media websites.

**Resilience Scale for Adolescents.**

Adolescent resilience was measured using the Resilience Scale for Adolescence (READ) (Friborg et al., 2006), which was originally adapted from the Norwegian Resilience Scale for Adults (RSA) (Friborg, Hjemdal, Rosenvinge, & Martinussen, 2003). This scale was chosen to measure resilience due to: the descriptive nature of the questions, the ability to gather the most information in an abbreviated amount of time,
and reach the target population for the study. The scale consists of 28 items which use a 5 point Likert design (Totally Agree, Agree, Average, Disagree, or Totally Disagree). The scale measures five different factors including personal competence (items 1, 4, 7, 12, 17, 20, 23, & 26), social competence (items 6, 11, 16, 22, & 25), structured style (items 2, 8, 13, & 18), family cohesion (items 5, 10, 15, 21, 24, & 27), and social resources (items 3, 9, 14, 19, & 28) (Friborg et al., 2006). The authors note that personal competence, social competence, and structured style measure individual characteristics of resilience. Additionally, family cohesion measures family support factors, and social resources can be used to measure social support structure (Friborg et al., 2006).
Results

Data collected from the surveys was first explored through a bivariate correlational analysis. Results of the analysis showed that several variables of interest were significantly correlated. A table containing correlations for the study can be found in Table 2.

In order to address Hypothesis one, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between personal competence and cyberbullying. Table 3 summarizes the results of the analysis. The multiple regression analysis was significant, with $R^2 = .346$, $F(11, 50) = 2.402$, $p< .05$. Although the results of the ANOVA were significant, there were no individual variables with significant coefficients in the regression, suggesting that multicollinearity may be a factor in the analysis (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003). Due to the high correlation between predictor variables, the overall value of the ANOVA was significant without the presence of any individual statistically significant variables.

In order to address Hypothesis two, a multiple regression analysis was conducted to examine the relationship between personal competence and traditional bullying. Table 4 summarizes the results of the analysis. The multiple regression analysis was significant, with $R^2 = .444$, $F(8, 53) = 5.289$, $p< .001$. As can be seen in Table 4, “How often have you been left out?” had significant positive regression weight indicating that students who scored higher on the variable scored lower on the READ subscale of personal
competence. Specifically, as scores for how often an individual had been left out increased by a value of one, personal competence score decreased by .431. The predictor in the current regression did not exceed a VIF score of 2.5 used to determine collinearity.

To address Hypothesis three, a multiple regression analysis was conducted utilizing the independent variable of traditional bullying and the dependent variable of structured style. Table 5 summarizes the results of the analysis. The multiple regression analysis was significant, with $R^2 = .243$, $F(8, 53) = 2.132$, $p < .05$. Although results of the ANOVA were significant, there are no variables with significant coefficients in the regression, suggesting that multicollinearity may be a factor in the analysis. Due to the high correlation between predictor variables, the overall value of the ANOVA was significant without the presence of any individual statistically significant variables.

To address Hypothesis four, a multiple regression was conducted, with the independent variable of traditional bullying and the dependent variable of family cohesion utilized. Table 6 summarizes the results of the analysis. The multiple regression analysis was significant, with $R^2 = .263$, $F(8, 53) = 2.365$, $p < .05$. Although the results of the ANOVA were significant, there are no variables with significant coefficients in the regression, suggesting that multicollinearity may be a factor in the analysis. Due to the high correlation between predictor variables, the overall value of the ANOVA was significant without the presence of any individual statistically significant variables.

Hypothesis five was addressed by conducting a multiple regression analysis utilizing the independent variable of cyberbullying and dependent variable of family cohesion. The relationship between family cohesion and cyberbullying was examined by
conducting a multiple regression analysis. Table 7 summarizes the results of the analysis. The multiple regression analysis was significant, with $R^2 = .348$, $F(11, 50) = 2.422$, $p<.05$. As can be seen in Table 7, “Received an instant message that made you upset” had a positive regression weight indicating that students who scored higher on the variable “Received an instant message that made you upset” scored lower on the READ subscale of family cohesion. Specifically, as scores for an individual receiving an instant message that made them upset increased by one, their family cohesion score decreased by .371. The predictor used in the current regression did not exceed a VIF score of 2.5 used to determine collinearity.
Discussion and Limitations

As the avenues where bullying take place expand, the need to identify how bully victims are able to overcome their victimization expands as well. Prior research on bullying and resilience found there may be factors that will allow individuals to better overcome their experiences. This research study attempts to predict how being a victim of traditional bullying or cyberbullying are predictive of aspects of resilience.

**Traditional Bullying**

*Personal Competence*

When studying the relationship between traditional bullying and personal competence, one significant variable was identified, “How often have you been left out”. This would suggest that students who report being left out more often are more likely to have lower personal competence. Consistent with Donnon’s (2009) research, findings from this study suggest that individuals who indicated they had been left out scored lower on the personal competence scale. Donnon (2009) found that individuals who report having certain strengths were less likely to report partaking in or being a victim of bullying. Additionally, Rutter (1981) stresses the importance that individual factors of resilience play in overcoming an adverse experience. Both of these findings are consistent with the findings from the analysis of Research Hypothesis two.

There were also two variables that neared significance. The first variable was “How often has someone spread rumors about you”. The second variable nearing
significance was “How upsetting was it being threatened or hurt”. It is possible that if a larger sample of students were given the survey, the values for these variables may reach significance. It is also plausible that because of the small sample size, the full effect of these variables was not captured. Finally, analysis of the Variance Inflation Factors (VIF) noted that the generally accepted limit was not crossed for the variable “How often has someone spread rumors about you” but was crossed for the variable “How upsetting was it being threatened or hurt”, suggesting that collinearity among predictor variables may be influencing current results.

This finding further warrants the need to research factors of personal competence in adolescents which are linked to resilience. Family and community factors may play a protective role for adolescents, although individual factors may be the easiest to enhance. Factors that would be considered family or community may be more difficult to enhance, because an individual may not have the ability to change those factors. For instance, an individual may be better able to strengthen how they feel about themselves rather than change the environment in which they live. With this knowledge, it is possible that they then may be able to strengthen personal factors of resilience to potentially overcome adverse situations they face, such as a bullying experience.

**Structured Style**

When exploring the relationship between traditional bullying and structured style, the overall relationship appears significant, but there are no significant individual variables. This may suggest a problem with collinearity, but analysis of associated VIF
noted that the generally accepted limit was not crossed for any variables nearing significance, suggesting that for the current analysis collinearity is not influencing the results. Three variables neared significance. The first of these variables is “How often has someone spread rumors about you”. The second variable which neared significance is “How upsetting were these rumors”, and the third variable is “How often have you been left out”. Two of the three variables approaching significance have to do with rumor spreading. This would suggest that actions associated with the spread of speculative or unflattering information may be significant if a larger sample of students were to take the survey. It is also possible that if studied further, rumor spreading may have a relationship to structured style. Additionally, how often an individual reported being left out neared significance. It is possible that how often an individual is left out may reach significance in relation to structured style if a larger population were sampled from. How often an individual reports being left out may impact structured style scores, because factors of structured style can be considered individual characteristics and may be impacted by one being left out. All three of these factors can be considered indirect facets of bullying. Arnold & Rockinson- Szapkiw (2012) note that age and gender may have an impact on the type of bullying experienced. They argue that female adolescents are more likely to be involved in indirect aggression. These behaviors are more likely to manipulate feelings and relationships. If the results of this study are consistent with the suggestions of Arnold & Rockinson- Szapkiw (2012), it is likely that the majority of the population reporting the nearly significant variables for this analysis is female.
The idea that how often an individual has been left out is approaching significance yet no other variable regarding being left out is trending brings forth a possible issue with self-reporting. As Hinduja and Patchin (2010) point out, self-reporting may yield certain limitations. Unlike the variables regarding rumor spreading, the variable for how upsetting it was being left out was not significant. It is unclear as to whether this result is due to adolescents being less emotionally impacted by being left out in comparison to having rumors spread about them or if the students who reported being left out are less inclined to report being upset by the experience.

*Family Cohesion*

Although results of the analysis are significant, no individual variables of family cohesion are predicted by traditional bullying. This may suggest an issue with collinearity, yet the analysis of associated VIF noted that the generally accepted limit for both of the variables nearing significance was not crossed. A similar result was found in the analyses between traditional bullying and personal competence as well as cyberbullying and personal competence. These results indicate that the specific type of bullying reported by students may have an impact on reported resilience. The previous section comparing Traditional Bullying and Cyberbullying gives some insight into the discussion between which type of bullying can be predicted in the study. For the current results, it seems the type of bullying may depend on the individual and their perception of harmfulness. For example, the analysis between traditional bullying and family cohesion did not produce a significant variable, but the analysis between cyberbullying and family
cohesion did (“Received an instant message that made you upset”). Although the bullying scales between the analyses are different, the variables of resilience remain the same. Therefore, one type of bullying may be more impactful than the other based on the individual’s experience.

The regression utilizing traditional bullying and family cohesion also produced two variables that neared significance. The first variable was “How upsetting were these rumors”, and the second variable was “How upsetting was it being left out of things”. Both variables were found to be nearing significance in this analysis, and both relate to the emotional impact of victimization. There may be an explanation as to why this result occurred. It is possible that the emotional impact of bullying may be moderated by positive family cohesion. According to Arseneault et al. (2010), positive family relationships help a victim of bullying better adjust. This finding may help explain why some students who reported being bullied scored lower on the family cohesion scale. It is possible that these students may not have the family support they feel is needed to buffer the effects of being bullied. This may explain why the variables which neared significance are both related to the emotional aspect of being bullied in relation family cohesion. Additionally, Brownlee, Franks, & Rawana (2013) suggest having a strong relationship with family members as well as with peers could be beneficial for an individual engaged in a bullying situation. This may also indicate the importance of not only having supportive family members but having positive peer relationships as well. The authors suggest that these positive relationships may be indicative of strong individual characteristics an individual possesses (Brownlee, Franks, & Rawana, 2013).
Cyberbullying

Family Cohesion

The relationship between cyberbullying and family cohesion identified one significant predictor, “Received an instant message that made you upset”. This finding is similar to that of Arseneault et al. (2010), which suggests that warm family relationships (family cohesion) may be especially beneficial for victims of bullying. In particular, the authors suggest that victims who have a close sibling relationship may have a less negative experience when that sibling acts as a positive outlet for the bully victim. It is possible that those who reported receiving the instant message that made them upset did not feel as if they could express those concerns to a family member. It is unknown as to whether this is because they simply do not have a relationship which allows for this or if it because they do not wish to share they are being victimized. Nevertheless, this finding suggests a potential benefit to strong family relationships in relation to bullying victimization. Parents may act as a source of knowledge and protection for their adolescent, therefore it may be important to establish relationships which allow the adolescent to feel comfortable enough to request help from parents if they are being victimized. Therefore, close family ties may be important for an individual who is the victim of cyberbullying. Further research must be undertaken in order to identify how best to strengthen cohesion among family members and in what specific ways they impact resilience. Additionally, future research should seek to identify how parental involvement differs between traditional and cyberbullying. Generational differences may
have an impact on how one type of bullying is perceived over another (if identified at all) and how the family becomes involved in the situation.

*Personal Competence*

Although the analysis between traditional bullying and personal competence yielded one statistically significant variable, the analysis between cyberbullying and personal competence produced no variables of significance. Two variables from the analysis neared significance. The first variable nearing significance was “Received an instant message that made you upset”, and the second was “Had something posted on your twitter that made you upset”. The analysis of associated VIF noted that the variable “Received an instant message that made you upset” did not cross the generally accepted limit of 2.5, whereas “Had something posted on your twitter that made you upset” did exceed the accepted limit, indicating a potential issue with collinearity among predictor variables. Both of the factors found to be nearly significant in the analysis are questions related to the emotional impact of cyberbullying, unlike the analysis between traditional bullying and personal competence where only one nearly significant variable involved emotional impact. Further research on the emotional impact between traditional bullying and cyberbullying is needed.

Also noteworthy is that the second variable which neared significance: “Had something posted on your twitter that made you upset”, which takes place in the context of a social media site. This is the only variable that involves bullying in the context of social media. Although cyberbullying is found to occur less often than traditional
bullying (Carvalho et al., 2008), today’s youth has access to increasing technological advancements. Due to the availability of social media sites to adolescents, the impact of cyberbullying via social media requires further research and investigation in order to identify how adolescents are targeted and how they can protect themselves.

**Gender, Bullying, and Resilience**

It is important to note that all three analyses which used the traditional bullying scale indicated factors related to relational aggression which were nearing significance. These factors include “How often has someone spread rumors about you”, “How upsetting were these rumors”, “How often have you been left out”, and “How upsetting was it being left out of things”. Additionally, the variable “Received an instant message that made you upset” was significant in the analysis between cyberbullying and family cohesion and nearing significance in the analysis between cyberbullying and personal competence. All of the variables mentioned fall under the category of relational or indirect bullying. According to Carvalho et al. (2008), cyberbullying shares similar characteristics with indirect bullying. The authors suggest that cyberbullying, like indirect bullying, does not occur face to face and thus may share common attributes with it.

Almost two thirds of the sample consisted of female adolescents. It is possible that the majority of the variables of statistical interest represent relational aggression, due to the high number of female participants in the study. This may help to explain why certain results were present. First, because cyberbullying is similar to relational aggression, females may also be more likely to engage in cyberbullying (Carvalho et al.,
2008). Because this study did not focus on the aggressor, it is unclear whether these results are directly related to the literature. However, a study conducted by Carvalho et al. (2008) found that girls were more likely to be the victim of cyberbullying than were boys. This suggests that the majority of the victims who reported the cyberbullying may be female. The second reason girls may be reporting the majority of the relational aggression deals with the issue of self-reporting. Brighi et al. (2012) found that responses to victimization were guided by gender norms, where boys attempt to appear less impacted by their victimization. This finding may suggest that boys are more reluctant to report being emotionally impacted by their bullying experience.

**Limitations**

There are several limitations to this study. First, a limited number of students chose to partake between the two schools which participated in this study. This limited the number of potential students who could participate in the survey. Future studies should attempt to recruit more schools and thus more potential students for a more robust analysis. Next, there was a larger female population took the survey compared to males, which may bias the results of the study. Future studies should attempt to recruit a more heterogeneous sample of students, making the data more generalizable. Also, the overall sample for the study limits the generalizability of the results. It is noteworthy that the participating schools were demographically similar. A larger and more diverse sample would have allowed for greater insight as to the relationship between bullying and resilience. Finally, statistical issues must be taken into consideration when viewing the
results. Issues of multicollinearity can lead to significant regression findings without statistically significant individual variables being identified (Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003). Collinearity is most often diagnosed using the VIF statistic, where a value exceeding 2.50 denotes issues of collinearity among variables used in the analysis. In the current study, this appeared in the analyses between traditional bullying and personal competence as well as cyberbullying and personal competence. Additionally, multiple regressions typically utilize predictors for which at least ten cases are present. In the current analysis, this rule of thumb was not followed and may contribute to additional statistical errors.

Prior research has also identified methodological issues in studies on bullying where students may underreport the emotions associated with being a victim of bullying. As suggested by Brighi et al. (2012), there may be some discrepancy in determining whether students are actually impacted by being victimized given their answer. For instance, several students reported being victimized but reported that it did not upset them. This brings forward the question as to why the individuals who answered that way may have done so. Brighi et al. (2012) suggest that this could be because they are either resilient or they are used to being bullied and are no longer effected by it. Brownlee, Franks, & Rawana (2013) offer a possible explanation as to why students may indicate certain answers over others. They argue that social desirability may persuade a student to answer in a way that is specific to their experience rather than taking the whole truth into account. Discrepancies of self-reporting must be considered in future studies, although these discrepancies cannot be completely eliminated. Future studies should seek to
identify why some students who indicate being bullied suggest it does not upset them, and how emotional impact is associated with bullying victimization. Future studies should also consider social desirability when identifying limitations to self-reporting.

**Conclusions**

This study contributes to the research regarding bullying and resilience among adolescents. Specifically, this research identifies two variables which are predictors of resilience. How often an individual reported being left out was a significant predictor of personal competence. Furthermore, receiving an instant message that reportedly made the individual upset was a significant predictor of family cohesion.

Although bullying can be detrimental to an adolescent, it is important to identify the factors that may be strengthened to help the adolescent overcome the experience. When combined with existing research regarding resilience to bullying victimization, the results of this study contribute to the scientific literature by identifying potential aspects of traditional and cyber bullying which are predictors of resilience among adolescents. School personnel may also benefit from this research when looking at preventative measures to reduce bullying in the school setting. Schools may partner with their students to create programs which strengthen personal factors of resilience and help to reduce the impact of future bully victimization experiences. This research may help schools heighten awareness of bully victimization and strengthen the likelihood that its students will overcome and bullying encounters they experience.
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### Table 1. Demographic information for participants

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>16.50</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Point Average</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Siblings</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade Level</td>
<td>10.90</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Financial Situation</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are in a bad financial situation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are in a somewhat bad financial situation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are in an okay financial situation</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are in a somewhat good financial situation</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>21.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are in a good financial situation</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Correlations among variables of interest (N = 62)

| Measure | 1   | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   | 20   | 21   | 22   | 23   | 24   |
|---------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Personal Competence | .684* | .637* | .741* | .596* | .647* | .805* | .776* | .688* | .757* | .578* | .828* | .466* | .659* | .450* | .694* | .769* | .371* | .456* | .598* | .644* | .491* | .555* | .544* | .587* |
| 2. Social Competence | .737* | .455* | .521* | .544* | .477* | .688* | .567* | .628* | .604* | .516* | .688* | .711* | .589* | .446* | .398* | .310* | .192* | .871* | .404* | .544* | .308* | .544* | .448* | .508* |
| 3. Structured Style | .461* | .656* | .557* | .551* | .552* | .546* | .596* | .619* | .577* | .410* | .568* | .707* | .513* | .647* | .575* | .574* | .103* | .341* | .623* | .587* | .628* | .664* | .664* | .699* |
| 4. Social Resources | .584* | .659* | .793* | .795* | .769* | .814* | .805* | .788* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* | .786* |
| 5. Family Cohesion | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* | .551* |

Note. * p<.05. ** p<.01
Table 3. Regression analysis predicting personal competence from traditional bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often have you been teased?</td>
<td>1.023</td>
<td>1.204</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>1.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it when you were teased?</td>
<td>-1.236</td>
<td>1.702</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>3.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often has someone spread rumors about you?</td>
<td>3.184</td>
<td>1.875</td>
<td>.229</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting were these rumors?</td>
<td>-2.174</td>
<td>1.360</td>
<td>-.240</td>
<td>2.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you been left out of things?</td>
<td>-4.976</td>
<td>1.513</td>
<td>-.431**</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it being left out of things?</td>
<td>1.310</td>
<td>1.227</td>
<td>.143</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you threatened physically or actually hurt often?</td>
<td>5.024</td>
<td>5.774</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>3.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it being threatened or hurt?</td>
<td>-5.061</td>
<td>2.700</td>
<td>-.414</td>
<td>4.645</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model summary statistics</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted $R^2$</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$ value for model</td>
<td>5.289***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.f. for model</td>
<td>8, 53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$
Table 4. Regression analysis predicting structured style from traditional bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often have you been teased?</td>
<td>-.421</td>
<td>.843</td>
<td>-.079</td>
<td>1.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it when you were teased?</td>
<td>-.538</td>
<td>1.191</td>
<td>-.104</td>
<td>3.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often has someone spread rumors about you?</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>1.312</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting were these rumors?</td>
<td>-1.597</td>
<td>.951</td>
<td>-.294</td>
<td>2.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you been left out?</td>
<td>-2.081</td>
<td>1.059</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it being left out of things?</td>
<td>-.509</td>
<td>.859</td>
<td>-.093</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you threatened physically or actually hurt often?</td>
<td>-1.006</td>
<td>4.040</td>
<td>-.055</td>
<td>3.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it being threatened or hurt?</td>
<td>.350</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>4.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model summary statistics

Adjusted $R^2$ : .129

$F$ value for model : 2.132*

d.f. for model : 8, 53

* $p < .05$, ** $p < 0.01$, *** $p < .001$
Table 5. Regression analysis predicting family cohesion from traditional bullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How often have you been teased?</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>1.604</td>
<td>.005</td>
<td>1.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it when you were teased?</td>
<td>1.412</td>
<td>2.266</td>
<td>.142</td>
<td>3.743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often has someone spread rumors about you?</td>
<td>-.199</td>
<td>2.496</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>1.727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting were these rumors?</td>
<td>-3.432</td>
<td>1.811</td>
<td>-.328</td>
<td>2.149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How often have you been left out?</td>
<td>-2.630</td>
<td>2.015</td>
<td>-.197</td>
<td>1.636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it being left out of things?</td>
<td>-3.126</td>
<td>1.635</td>
<td>-.296</td>
<td>1.720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are you threatened physically or actually hurt often?</td>
<td>-1.285</td>
<td>7.690</td>
<td>-.036</td>
<td>3.367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How upsetting was it being threatened or hurt?</td>
<td>-.464</td>
<td>3.596</td>
<td>-.033</td>
<td>4.645</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model summary statistics

* Adjusted $R^2$: .152
* $F$ value for model: 2.365*
* d.f. for model: 8, 53

* $p<.05$, ** $p<0.01$, *** $p<.001$
Table 6. Regression analysis predicting family cohesion from cyberbullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>( B )</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an e-mail from someone you know.</td>
<td>-1.697</td>
<td>2.749</td>
<td>-1.39</td>
<td>3.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an instant message that made you upset.</td>
<td>-2.158</td>
<td>.973</td>
<td>-2.719*</td>
<td>2.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted on your Facebook that made you upset.</td>
<td>-.775</td>
<td>1.359</td>
<td>-.101</td>
<td>2.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted on your twitter that made you upset.</td>
<td>.699</td>
<td>1.357</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>2.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been made fun of in a chat room.</td>
<td>-.639</td>
<td>2.162</td>
<td>-.073</td>
<td>4.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an upsetting e-mail from someone you did not know.</td>
<td>-1.672</td>
<td>1.555</td>
<td>-2.08</td>
<td>2.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted about you on another web page that made you upset.</td>
<td>-1.166</td>
<td>1.590</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>2.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something had been posted about you online that you did not want others to see.</td>
<td>.500</td>
<td>1.479</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>3.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been picked on or bullied online.</td>
<td>-2.701</td>
<td>1.689</td>
<td>-3.91</td>
<td>4.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been afraid to go on the computer.</td>
<td>4.939</td>
<td>3.714</td>
<td>.420</td>
<td>7.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one of the above, two or more times.</td>
<td>.959</td>
<td>2.109</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>6.543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model summary statistics

\( Adjusted R^2 \)  
2.04

\( F \) value for model  
2.422*  

d.f. for model  
11, 50  

* \( p<.05 \), ** \( p<0.01 \), *** \( p<.001 \)
Table 7. Regression analysis predicting personal competence from cyberbullying

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>VIF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an e-mail from someone you know.</td>
<td>-3.169</td>
<td>2.380</td>
<td>-.300</td>
<td>3.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an instant message that made you upset.</td>
<td>-1.450</td>
<td>.842</td>
<td>-.288</td>
<td>2.143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted on your Facebook that made you upset.</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>1.176</td>
<td>.106</td>
<td>2.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted on your twitter that made you upset.</td>
<td>2.299</td>
<td>1.174</td>
<td>.363</td>
<td>2.624</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been made fun of in a chat room.</td>
<td>.297</td>
<td>1.872</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>4.672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an upsetting e-mail from someone you did not know.</td>
<td>.707</td>
<td>1.346</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>2.872</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted about you on another web page that made you upset.</td>
<td>- .744</td>
<td>1.376</td>
<td>- .106</td>
<td>2.939</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something had been posted about you online that you did not want others to see.</td>
<td>- .031</td>
<td>1.280</td>
<td>- .005</td>
<td>3.385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been picked on or bullied online.</td>
<td>- .868</td>
<td>1.462</td>
<td>- .146</td>
<td>4.591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been afraid to go on the computer.</td>
<td>-1.984</td>
<td>3.215</td>
<td>- .195</td>
<td>7.652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one of the above, two or more times.</td>
<td>- .434</td>
<td>1.826</td>
<td>- .070</td>
<td>6.543</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model summary statistics

Adjusted $R^2$                                                    | .202  |

$F$ value for model                                               | 2.204*  |

d.f. for model                                                   | 11, 50  |

* $p<.05$, ** $p<.01$, *** $p<.001$
Table 8. Bullying and resilience survey

This survey consists of four sections. Please answer all of the questions honestly and to the best of your ability. All your answers will be kept anonymous and confidential. You may choose to withdraw from the study at any time. After the survey is complete, please return it to the proper faculty or staff member. **If you have been physically threatened or harmed or need to talk about your experience, please seek out an adult you trust.**

**Section 1**

1) Age: ____

2) Grade:_____

3) Gender: M  F__

4) Current GPA:______

5) Siblings:
   a. Brother –   How many? _____   How old are they? _____
   b. Sister -   How many? _____   How old are they? _____
   c. Stepbrothers - How many? ____  How old are they? ____
   d. Stepsisters -  How many? ____  How old are they? ____

6) Indicate your family’s current financial situation by **circling** one of the following:

- We are in a bad financial situation
- We are in a somewhat bad financial situation
- We are in an okay financial situation
- We are in a somewhat good financial situation
- We are in a good financial situation

**Section 2: Please circle** the answer that best describes your situation.

1a. Has anyone TEASED YOU or CALLED YOU NAMES recently?

- No (skip to 2a)

- YES

1b. How often?

- Most days

- About once a week
Less than once a week

1c. How upsetting was it when you were teased?

Not at all
A bit
I was quite upset

2a. Has anyone spread RUMOURS ABOUT YOU recently?

No (skip to 3a)
YES

2b. How often?

Most days
About once a week
Less than once a week

2c. How upsetting were the rumors?

Not at all
A bit
I was quite upset

3a. Have you been DELIBERATELY LEFT OUT OF THINGS recently?

No (skip to 4a)
YES

3b. How often?
Most days

About once a week

Less than once a week

3c. How upsetting was it being left out of things?

Not at all

A bit

I was quite upset

4a. Have you been THREATENED PHYSICALLY OR ACTUALLY HURT by another student recently?

No (you’re finished with the survey, please go to the next section on page 4.)

YES

4b. How often?

Most days

About once a week

Less than once a week

4c. How upsetting was it being threatened or hurt?

Not at all

A bit

I was quite upset
**Section 3:** Please **put an “X”** in the box that describes your experience(s).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once or Twice</th>
<th>A Few Times</th>
<th>Many Times</th>
<th>Every Day</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Received an upsetting e-mail from someone you know.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an instant message that made you upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted on your Facebook that made you upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted on your Twitter that made you upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been made fun of in a chat room.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Received an upsetting e-mail from someone you did not know (not spam).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Had something posted about you on another Web page that made you upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Something has been posted about you online that you did not want others to see.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been picked on or bullied online</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been afraid to go on the computer.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At least one of the above, 2 or more times</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

IRB LOG NUMBER

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

EXEMPT FROM ANNUAL REVIEW APPLICATION (Level I)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THIS SECTION FOR USE BY IRB</th>
<th>IRB OFFICE USE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>REVIEWER INFORMATION</td>
<td>Date Received:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline Specific Reviewer:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>AGENDA DATE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Log # notification email</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Date of final Approval:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INSTRUCTIONS for INVESTIGATORS:**

1. Complete this form to request an exemption determination for your study.
2. Review the Categories of Research Activities that are Exempt document prior to completing this application. ALL procedures and instruments used in your study must meet the exemption criteria to receive the exemption determination. If your study does not meet the exemption criteria, you will be asked to complete the USE OF HUMAN SUBJECTS IN RESEARCH application.
3. Submit this completed document any needed Appendices via email attachment to an IRB discipline specific reviewer. To submit the form with a typed signature, the form must be submitted from the Investigator's @kent.edu email account. If completed form is signed and then scanned as a PDF attachment, the @kent.edu email requirement does not apply.
4. Do NOT begin data collection prior to receiving notification from the KSU IRB that the study meets the exemption criteria.

**DEFINITIONS**

**Minimal risk:**
The probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.

**Prisoner**
An individual involuntarily confined or detained in a penal institution (e.g., prison, jail, or juvenile offenders facility), with restricted ability to leave the institution. The term is intended to encompass individuals sentenced to such an institution under a criminal or civil statute, individuals detained in other facilities by virtue of statutes or commitment procedures that provide alternatives to criminal prosecution or incarceration in a penal institution, and individuals detained pending arraignment, trial, or sentencing.

**To complete this form:** Single left-click to complete text fields. To check a box, double left-click on the box, then click "checked". Click OK.

Title of Study: **Association Between Resilience and Bully Victimization Among Middle Adolescence Students**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section 1 – INVESTIGATOR INFORMATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Last Name: Tobias</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email: <a href="mailto:stobias4@kent.edu">stobias4@kent.edu</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Status:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faculty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Only faculty members and professional staff who are full-time university employees are eligible for PI status. Students conducting research for their dissertation or master's thesis research can still have primary responsibility for the intellectual content, conduct of the research, or primary authorship in publications by serving as co-investigators or key personnel on IRB applications. If you are a KSU employee conducting research involving human subjects as part of your graduate or undergraduate program, your faculty advisor must serve as the PI of record for IRB protocols. Please review IRB policy for PI eligibility and responsibilities.

a. Are there any Kent State University affiliated co-investigators or key personnel on this protocol?
   *Key personnel* are defined as individuals who participate in the design, conduct, or reporting of human subjects research. At a minimum, include individuals, who recruit participants, obtain consent or, who collect study data.
   √ Yes → Complete Appendix A
   □ No

b. Are there any external (non-Kent State University affiliated) co-investigators or key personnel engaged in the research?
   *Engaged* individuals are those who intervene or interact with participants in the context of the research or who will obtain individually identifiable private information for research funded, supervised, or coordinated by Kent State University. See OHRP Engagement Guidance or contact ORC for more information.
   □ Yes → Complete Appendix B
   √ No

c. Has the Principal Investigator (PI) completed the required web-based course years (CITI, or equivalent) in the protection of human research subjects?
   Educational requirements (initial and continuing) should be satisfied prior to submitting the application for IRB review. See Human Subjects Protection Training policy for more information. Final approval from the IRB will not be obtained until all requirements are fulfilled.
   √ Yes → Attach Copy of completion certificate
   □ No

d. Are there other person(s) (e.g., research manager, study or regulatory coordinator, research assistant, etc.) that we should contact if further information about this application is needed?
   □ Yes
   √ No

If Yes → Name: __________ Phone: __________ Email: __________

Section 2 – FUNDING INFORMATION

a. Does this research have external funding or have you requested external funding for this research?
   □ Yes
   √ No

If Yes → Specify sponsor: __________

Protocol/Proposal #: __________

Institution (if not KSU): __________

Have all Kent State University investigators and key personnel completed the required COI disclosure for externally funded research for the purposes of this research project?
   □ Yes
   √ No

b. Is any support other than monetary (e.g., drugs, equipment, supplies, etc.) being provided for the study?
   □ Yes
   √ No

If Yes → Specify support and provider: __________

Attach a copy of the grant application or funding proposal.

The university is required to verify that all funding proposals and grants (new or renewals) have been reviewed by the IRB before funds are awarded. If the research funded by a federal agency and involves a subcontract to or from another entity, an IRB Authorization Agreement may be required. Contact the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) for more information.
c. Does the PI for this research or their immediate family members (i.e., spouse, domestic partner, or dependent children) have a financial interest that would reasonably be affected by the research, or a financial interest in any entity whose financial interest would reasonably appear to be affected by the research?  
Financial interests include (but are not limited to) salary or other payments for services (e.g., consulting fees or honoraria), equity interests (e.g., stocks, stock options, or other ownership interests), and intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights, and royalties from such rights).

☐ Yes ➔ Complete Appendix Z
☐ No

SECTION 3 - Qualifying Statements

You must indicate an answer to each of the following (5) statements

1. The research will not expose participants to discomfort or distress beyond that normally encountered in daily life.
   ☐ True ☐ Not True

2. The research will not include collection of data where the responses, if disclosed outside of the research, would place the participants at risk of criminal or civil liability or be damaging to participants’ financial standing, employability, or reputation.
   ☐ True ☐ Not True

3. The research will not involve individuals that are prisoners (voluntarily confined or detained in a penal institution), with restricted ability to leave the institution.
   ☐ True ☐ Not True

4. If there is interaction with subjects there will be a verbal consent process or a document that is given to participants to disclose the information:
   - That the activity involves research
   - Subject rights
   - The procedures/what they are being asked to do
   - Duration of subject’s participation
   - That participation is voluntary
   - Confidentiality statement
   - Incentives or payments (if applicable)
   - Name and contact information for the investigator
   - Contact information for the KSU IRB (330-672-2704)
   ☐ True ☐ Not True

5. The research is not subject to FDA regulations.
   ☐ True ☐ Not True

SECTION 4 - Category of Research

1. Check one or more categories of exemption for which you are applying.

☐ All categories
☐ Category A
☐ Category B
☐ Category C
☐ Category D
☐ Category E

2. Answer all of the questions for each category that you choose.

To be considered for the Exemption your research can involve only procedures listed in one or more of these categories.

Category 1 - Educational Settings

1. The research will only be conducted in established or commonly-accepted educational settings including, but not limited to, schools and colleges. (May include other sites where educational activities regularly occur. For example, boy scout meetings, dance classes)
   ☐ True ☐ Not True

2. The research will involve only normal educational practices, such as
   (i) research on regular and special education instructional strategies, or
   (ii) research on the effectiveness of or the comparison among instructional techniques, curricula, or classroom management methods.
   ☐ True ☐ Not True
### Category 2 - Educational Tests, Surveys, Interviews, Public Behavior Observation

1. The subject population includes ADULTS (≥18 years old) and the research will involve only the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior. *(If your research does not involve adults, check N/A)*

   - a. The information will be recorded in such a manner that human subjects CANNOT be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

2. The subject population includes CHILDREN (<18 years old) and the research procedures will be limited to the observation of public behavior where the investigator will NOT participate in the activities being observed. *(If your research does not involve children, check N/A)*

   - a. The information will be recorded in such a manner that human subjects CANNOT be identified, directly or through identifiers linked to the subjects.

### Category 3 - Educational Tests, Surveys, Interviews, Public Behavior Observation of PUBLIC OFFICIALS

1. The research will involve only the use of educational tests (cognitive, diagnostic, aptitude, achievement), survey procedures, interview procedures or observation of public behavior.

2. **AND** (one of the following is true)

   - a. The human subjects are elected or appointed public officials or candidates for public office. *(Applies to senior officials such as mayor or school superintendent rather than a police officer or teacher)*

   - b. Federal statute(s) require without exception that the confidentiality of the personally identifiable information will be maintained throughout the research and thereafter.

### Category 4 - Existing Data, Documents, Specimens

1. The research will involve only the collection or study of existing data, documents, records, pathological specimens, or diagnostic specimens. *("Existing" means existing before the research is proposed to the IRB to determine whether the research is exempt. All materials to be reviewed currently exist at the time of this exemption request.)*

2. The sources of the existing data, documents, records or specimens are publicly available or the information will be recorded by the investigator in such a manner that participants cannot be readily identified either directly or through identifiers (such as a code) linked to them.
Category 5 – For Public Benefit or Service Programs (Federal)
The project is a research or demonstration project conducted by or subject to the approval of a (federal) Department or Agency head and which is designed to study, evaluate, or otherwise examine:
(i) public benefit (e.g., financial or medical benefits as provided under the Social Security Act) or service programs (e.g., social, supportive, or nutrition services as provided under the Older Americans Act);
(ii) procedures for obtaining benefits or services under those programs;
(iii) possible changes in or alternatives to those programs or procedures; or
(iv) possible changes in methods or levels of payment for benefits or services under those public benefit or service programs.

Category 6 – For Taste and Food Quality and Consumer Acceptance Studies
The research involves only a taste and food quality evaluation or a food consumer acceptance study in which
i. wholesome foods without additives will be consumed OR
ii. food will be consumed that contains a food ingredient, agricultural chemical or environmental contaminant that is at or below the level found to be safe by the Food and Drug Administration or is approved by the Environmental Protection Agency or the Food Safety and Inspection Service of the U.S. Department of Agriculture.

If you have checked Not True to ANY of the questions in the category you have checked above, your research is NOT EXEMPT FROM ANNUAL REVIEW. Do not complete this application. You must submit a Use of Human Subjects in Research Application.

Section 5 – RESEARCH DESIGN
a. Will any members of the research team be conducting or coordinating study activities at a site other than Kent State University
   Yes ➔ Complete Appendix Q
   No

b. Is any of this research being conducted outside of the U.S.A?
   Yes ➔ Complete Appendix U
   No

c. What are the estimated beginning and end dates of the project? 9/1/14 to 12/20/14

d. Briefly summarize the purpose of the proposed research using non-technical language that can be readily understood by someone outside the discipline. Use complete sentences (limit 300 words).

The purpose of this research is to explore associations between adolescents who have (or have not) been bullied and measures of resilience. Using existing measures, the study will assess two types of bullying (cyber and physical/emotional) as well as resilience in an effort to identify potential differences between those who have been previously bullied and those who have not.

Section 6 - PARTICIPANT IDENTIFICATION, RECRUITMENT, & SELECTION
a. Specify the recruitment methods for this study and attach copies of written documents to this application
   Personal contact
   Flyers
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b. Who will approach or recruit potential participants?

☒ Principal Investigator
☐ Research Staff
☒ Other → please describe: Co-Principal Investigator

Once IRB approval is obtained recruitment flyers and parental consent forms will be distributed to students in classrooms identified by participating schools. One follow-up reminder will be provided with another recruitment flyer and parental consent document.

d. Where will participants be recruited? (e.g., doctor’s office, classroom, online)

Classrooms approved by participating schools.

e. What steps will be taken to avoid coercion or undue influence in the recruitment of research participants? (e.g., will the potential participants be afforded the opportunity to take material home and discuss the study with family members and/or primary care providers?)

Students will be informed that the study is volunteer, and that they may choose to ask their parents if they wish to participate. The students will be assured that they will not be penalized for not participating in the research. Likewise, those who do participate will be assured that all information is anonymous and confidential and will be used for the sole purpose of research.

Section 7 - PARTICIPANT POPULATION

a. What is the total number of participants (or number of participant records, specimens, etc.):
The number of participants is defined as the number of individuals who agree to participate (i.e., those who provide consent or whose records are accessed, etc.) even if all do complete the study. The total number of research participants may be increased only with prior IRB approval.

Approximately 150.

b. Describe the individuals who may participate in the research:

Adolescent middle/high school students

Age(s): 16-17

Section 8 - CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA

a. What format will be used to store participant information? Check all that apply.

☒ Hardcopy paper documentation
☐ Database system
☐ Disk (CD ROM, floppy disk, flash drive)
☐ Audio Tapes
☐ Video Tapes
☐ Other
b. How will the participant information be kept secure and confidential?

No identifiers will be collected. Only the investigators will have access to the documents, kept under lock and key at the principal investigator’s office.

Yes ☐  No ☒

If Yes → Describe what information will be retained. The information must also be described in the consent form.

Section 9: ASSURANCE: PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

I agree to follow all applicable policies and procedures of Kent State University and federal, state, and local laws and guidance regarding the protection of human subjects in research, as well as professional practice standards and generally accepted good research practice guidelines for investigators, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Perform the research as approved by the IRB under the direction of the Principal Investigator (or Advisor) by appropriately trained and qualified personnel with adequate resources;
- Understand that the parameters of the research cannot be modified without approval by the KSU IRB (except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants);
- Agree to maintain research-related records (and source documents) in a manner that documents the validity of the research and integrity of the data collected, while protecting the confidentiality of the data and privacy of participants;
- Will retain research-related records for audit for a period of at least three years after the research has ended (or longer, according to sponsor or publication requirements) even if I leave the University;
- Will contact the Office Research Compliance for assistance in amending (to request a change in Principal Investigator) or terminating the research if I leave the University or am unavailable to conduct or supervise the research personally (e.g., sabbatical or extended leave);
- Agree to inform all Co-Investigators, research staff, employees, and students assisting in the conduct of the research of their obligations in meeting the above commitments.

I verify that the information provided in this Use of Human Subjects in Research application is accurate and complete.

Scott Tobias 8/28/14
Signature of Principal Investigator Date

Scott Tobias, Ph.D., CFLE
Printed name of Principal Investigator
Use of Human Subjects in Research Application  
(LEVEL II or LEVEL III projects)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>THIS SECTION FOR USE BY IRB</th>
<th>IRB LOG #:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Name of discipline-specific reviewer:</td>
<td>Date Received by Office of Research Compliance:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level of review (please choose either Expedited or Full board)</td>
<td>Agenda date:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Level II – Expedited Review</td>
<td>Date of Log # notification email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Please specify one or more category:</td>
<td>Date of Final Approval:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] - #1 - Clinical Studies</td>
<td>Reminder of Annual review email:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] - #2 - Collection of Blood Samples</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] - #3 - Pros collection of Bio Specimens</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] - #4 - Data through non-invasive procedures.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] - #5 - Materials (Data, documents, records or specimens collected for non-research purposes)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] - #6 - Data from voice, video, digital or image recordings</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] - #7 - Individual or group characteristics</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[ ] Level III – Full Board Review</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reason:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Signature of IRB Chairperson | Date | Signature of IRB Admin. or Designee | Date |

INSTRUCTIONS FOR INVESTIGATORS:
1. Submit this completed document with any needed attachments via email attachment to an IRB discipline specific reviewer.
2. To submit the form with a typed signature, the form must be submitted from the investigator’s @kent.edu email account. If completed form is signed and then scanned as a PDF attachment, the @kent.edu email requirement does not apply.
3. Submission of incomplete forms or failure to include all of the needed attachments will most likely result in delays for IRB review/approval. Handwritten forms are not accepted.

*Single left-click to complete text fields. To check a box, double left-click on the box, then click “checked”. Click OK.

Section 1 – TITLE & PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR (PI) INFORMATION

Title of Study: Association Between Resilience and Bully Victimization in Middle Adolescence Students

Estimated begin and end dates for the project: October to March

Name: Scott Tobia, Ph. D, CFLE

Phone: (330) - 244 - 3388 or extension 53388

Department: HDFS

Purpose of Research

- Faculty Research
- Student Thesis/Dissertation Complete Appendix A
- Other: Specify:

PI Email: stobias4@kent.edu

tchapan@kent.edu

Only faculty members and professional staff who are full-time university employees are eligible for PI status. Students conducting research for their dissertation or master’s thesis research can still have primary responsibility for the intellectual content, conduct of the research, or primary authorship in publications by serving as co-investigators or key personnel on IRB applications. If you are a KSU employee conducting research involving human subjects as part of your graduate or undergraduate program, your faculty advisor must serve as the PI of record for IRB protocols. Please review IRB policy for PI eligibility and responsibilities.
a. Are there any Kent State University affiliated co-investigators or key personnel on this protocol?

"Key personnel" are defined as individuals who participate in the design, conduct, or reporting of human subjects research. At a minimum, include individuals who recruit participants, obtain consent or, who collect study data. Students conducting research for their dissertation or master's thesis research can still have primary responsibility for the intellectual content, conduct of the research, or primary authorship in publications by serving as co-investigators or key personnel on IRB applications.

☐ Yes □ Complete Appendix A
□ No

b. Are there any external (non-Kent State University affiliated) co-investigators or key personnel engaged in the research?

"Engaged" individuals are those who intervene or interact with participants in the context of the research or who will obtain individually identifiable private information for research funded, supervised, or coordinated by Kent State University. See OHRP Engagement Guidance or contact ORC for more information.

☐ Yes □ Complete Appendix B
□ No

c. Has the Principal Investigator (PI) completed the required web-based course years (CITI, or equivalent) in the protection of human research subjects?

Educational requirements (initial and continuing) should be satisfied prior to submitting the application for IRB review. See Human Subjects Protection Training policy for more information. Final approval from the IRB will not be obtained until all requirements are fulfilled.

☐ Yes □ Attach Copy of completion certificate
□ No

d. Are there other person(s) (e.g., research manager, study or regulatory coordinator, research assistant, etc.) that we should contact if further information about this application is needed?

□ Yes
□ No

If Yes □ Name: ___________ □ Phone: ___________ □ Email: ___________

Section 2 – FUNDING INFORMATION

a. Does this research have external funding or have you requested external funding for this research?

□ Yes
□ No

If Yes □ Specify sponsor:

Protocol/Proposal #: ___________ Institution (if not KSU): ___________

Have all Kent State University investigators and key personnel completed the required COI disclosure for externally funded research for the purposes of this research project?

□ Yes
□ No

b. Is any support other than monetary (e.g., drugs, equipment, supplies, etc.) being provided for the study?

□ Yes
□ No

If Yes □ Specify support and provider: ___________

Attach a copy of the grant application or funding proposal.

The university is required to verify that all funding proposals and grants (new or renewals) have been reviewed by the IRB before funds are awarded. If the research funded by a federal agency and involves a subcontract to or from another entity, an IRB Authorization Agreement may be required. Contact the Office of Research Compliance (ORC) for more information.
c. Does the PI for this research or their immediate family members (i.e., spouse, domestic partner, or dependent children) have a financial interest that would reasonably be affected by the research, or a financial interest in any entity whose financial interest would reasonably appear to be affected by the research?  
Financial interests include (but are not limited to) salary or other payments for services (e.g., consulting fees or honoraria), equity interests (e.g., stocks, stock options, or other ownership interests), and intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights, and royalties from such rights).

☐ Yes ➔ Complete Appendix Z
☐ No

d. Does the PI for this research or their immediate family members (i.e., spouse, domestic partner, or dependent children) have a non-financial Conflict of Interest that would reasonably be affected by the research?  
A non-financial conflict of interest is an interest, other than monetary, of an individual (or his/her immediate family) in the design, conduct, or reporting of the research or other interest that competes with the obligation to protect research participants and potentially compromises the objectivity and credibility of the research process.

☐ Yes ➔ Complete Appendix Z
☐ No

Section 3 – RESEARCH DESIGN

a. Will research activities be conducted at a site where approval from an additional IRB (other than KSU IRB), or authority (i.e., school principle or superintendent) is needed?  
In some cases research conducted at locations other than Kent State University (i.e., other universities, hospitals, prisons) may require another institution’s IRB approval, a letter of support (as in the case of elementary or high schools), or the execution of an IRB Authorization or Individual Investigator Agreement. See OHRP Engagement Guidance or contact ORC for more information.

☐ Yes ➔ Complete Appendix O
☐ No

b. Is any of this research being conducted outside of the U.S.A?  

☐ Yes ➔ Complete Appendix U
☐ No

c. Briefly summarize the purpose of the proposed research using non-technical language that can be readily understood by someone outside the discipline. Use complete sentences (limit 300 words).

The purpose of this study is to explore potential connections between victims of bullying and aspects of individual resilience.

d. List the scientific or scholarly aims of the research study

- Explore the connection between bully victimization and resilience
- Compare resilience between victims of bullying and those who have not been bullied.

e. Summarize existing knowledge and previous work that support the expectation of obtaining useful results without undue risk to human subjects. Use complete sentences (limit 300 words).

In previous studies, bullying victims have been given surveys which explore the main topics of this study, although not in the same study. These surveys have been successful in obtaining information from participants in a way that is non-evasive and not harmful to the participant. Previous research studying bully victims that have utilized surveys to collect data have yielded significant results with no notable negative consequences.

f. Identify and describe (in order of occurrence, if applicable) all interventions and interactions that are to be
performed solely for the research study. Attach a copy of materials to be used (e.g., interview/focus group questions, instruments, data collection forms, etc.).

A brief announcement regarding the survey will be conducted. Upon return of parental consent forms, a questionnaire will be given to the students in hard copy form via the Principle investigator and the co-investigator. Any potential questions regarding the survey will be answered, with interactions ceasing once the survey is returned.

g. Check all research activities that apply. Attach a copy of materials to be used (e.g., interview/focus group questions, instruments, data collection forms, etc.).

- [ ] Anesthesia (general or local) or sedation
- [ ] Audio, video, digital, or image recordings
- [ ] Biohazards (e.g., rDNA, infectious agents, select agents, toxins)
- [ ] Biological sampling (other than blood)
- [ ] Blood drawing, injections, surgical procedures (including biopsies) → Complete Appendix Q
- [ ] Coordinating Center
- [ ] Data, not publicly available
- [ ] Data, publicly available
- [ ] Data/Specimen storage/repository → Complete Appendix C
           (future unspecified use, including research databases for purposes of sharing data or specimens collected with other researchers/studies in the future)
- [ ] Deception → Complete Appendix D & Appendix M
- [ ] Devices → Complete Appendix E
- [ ] Diet, exercise, or sleep modifications
- [ ] Drugs or biologics → Complete Appendix F
- [ ] Emergency research
- [ ] Focus groups
- [ ] Food supplements
- [ ] Gene transfer
- [ ] Genetic testing → Complete Appendix G
- [ ] Internet or e-mail data collection
- [ ] Magnetic Resonance Imaging (MRI)
- [ ] Materials that may be considered sensitive, offensive, threatening, or degrading
- [ ] Non-invasive medical procedures (e.g., EKG, Doppler)
- [ ] Observation of participants (including field notes)
- [ ] Oral history (does not include medical history)
- [ ] Placebo
- [ ] Pregnancy testing
- [ ] Radiation (e.g., CT or DEXA scans, X-rays, nuclear medicine procedures) → Complete Appendix V
- [ ] Record review (which may include PHI)
- [ ] Specimen research
- [ ] Stem cell research
- [ ] Surveys, questionnaires, or interviews (one-on-one)
- [ ] Other:
- [ ] Specify:

h. Estimate the time required from each participant, including individual interactions, total time commitment, and long-term follow-up, if any.

All interactions, including completion of the survey, should take approximately ten minutes to complete.
Section 4 - PARTICIPANT POPULATION

a. What is the total number of participants (or number of participant records, specimens, etc.) for whom you are seeking Kent State IRB approval?

The number of participants is defined as the number of individuals who agree to participate (i.e., those who provide consent or whose records are accessed, etc.) even if all do not prove eligible or complete the study. The total number of research participants may be increased only with prior IRB approval.

128

b. Explain how this number was derived (e.g., statistical rationale, attrition rate, etc.).

An a priori power analysis was conducted which indicated 128 participants were needed to achieve a power level of .80 for the study.

c. Specify the age(s) of the individuals who may participate in the research:

Age(s): 16-17

d. Specify the participant population(s) to be included (check all that apply):

☐ Adults

☐ Adults with decisional impairment → Complete Appendix W.

☒ Children (< 18 years) → Complete Appendix I.

Research involving minors must adhere to University policy 5-39.

☐ Neonates (uncertain viability/nonviable) → Complete Appendix K.

☐ Non-English speaking → Complete Appendix J.

☐ Pregnant women/fetuses → Complete Appendix K.

(Only if pregnant women are intentionally recruited and/or studied)

☐ Prisoners → Complete Appendix L.

☐ Student research pools (e.g., psychology, sociology, communication) → Complete Appendix Y.

☐ Unknown (e.g., research using secondary data/specimens, non-targeted surveys)

☐ Other Specify: 

The regulations require that, "When some or all of the subjects are likely to be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence, such as children, prisoners, pregnant women, mentally disabled persons, or economically or educationally disadvantaged persons, additional safeguards have been included in the study to protect the rights and welfare of these subjects." 45 CFR 46.111(b). There are additional, explicit regulatory requirements regarding pregnant women and fetuses (45 CFR 46 Subpart B), prisoners (45 CFR 46 Subpart C) and children (45 CFR 46 Subpart D and 21 CFR 50 Subpart D). The questions in the applicable appendices address these additional requirements.

e. Describe the characteristics of the proposed participants, and explain how the nature of the research requires/justifies their inclusion.

 Adolescents ages 14-17 will be included in the study. The study will explore adolescent bully victims in relation to resilience, building on prior research on this age group.

f. Will any participants be excluded based on age, gender, race/ethnicity, pregnancy status, language, education, or financial status? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes → Explain the criteria and reason(s) for each exclusion. Consider the study's scientific or scholarly aims and risks.
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g. Are any of the participants likely to be vulnerable to coercion or undue influence? Consider students, employees, terminally ill persons, or others who may have limited autonomy. Yes ☐ No ☒

The regulations require that, “An investigator shall seek such consent only under circumstances that provide the prospective subject or the representative sufficient opportunity to consider whether or not to participate and that minimize the possibility of coercion or undue influence.”

If Yes → Describe additional safeguards to protect participants’ rights and welfare. Consider strategies to ensure voluntary participation.

Section 5 - RISK/BENEFIT ASSESSMENT

a. Do you think that the probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated for the participants are greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests?

Yes ☐ No ☒

If Yes → Describe the plan to oversee and monitor data collected to ensure participant safety and data integrity. Include the following:

- The information that will be evaluated (e.g., incidence and severity of actual harm compared to that expected);
- Who will perform the monitoring (e.g., investigator, sponsor, or independent monitoring committee);
- Timing of monitoring (e.g., at specific points in time, after a specific number of participants have been enrolled); and
- Decisions to be made as a result of the monitoring process (e.g., provisions to stop the study early for unanticipated problems).

b. Describe all reasonably expected risks, harms, and/or discomforts that may apply to the research. Discuss severity and likelihood of occurrence. As applicable, include potential risks to an embryo or fetus if a woman is or may become pregnant. Consider the range of risks, including physical, psychological, social, legal, and economic.

Students will undergo no more than minimal risk while participating in this study. However, because students must recall their victimization experiences, they may undergo some psychological discomfort.

c. Describe how risks, harms, and/or discomforts will be minimized. If testing will be performed to identify individuals who may be at increased risk (e.g., pregnant women, individuals with HIV/AIDS, depressive disorders, etc.), address timing and method of testing; include how positive test results will be handled.

A disclaimer has been included on the survey sheet in the instruction section as well as on the student consent sheet which directs students to seek out an adult if they undergo any discomfort. Students will also be informed that they can choose to refrain from the study or cease participation at any time without penalty.

d. List the potential benefits that individual participants, society or both may expect as a result of this research study. State if there are no direct benefits to individual participants. Compensation is not to be considered a benefit.

Although there are no individual benefits for participants, there are potential societal benefits,
including linking aspects of resilience to victims of bullying. Additionally, professionals who work with students who are at risk for victimization may be better informed when approaching previously bullied students.

e. Discuss how risks to participants are reasonable when compared to the anticipated benefits to participants (if any) and the importance of the knowledge that may reasonably be expected to result.

Potential findings from this study far outweigh the psychological discomfort students may encounter from recalling victimization experiences. Specifically, findings may aid practitioners in the future by informing practice in helping bullied students to develop increased resilience.

f. Is it possible that this study will discover a previously unknown condition such as a disease, suicidal intentions or genetic predisposition in a participant as a result of the study procedures?

☐ Yes  ❌ No

If Yes ➔ Explain how you will manage the situation.


g. Will this study collect information about research participants’ family history that includes personal identifiers (e.g., secondary subjects)?

☐ Yes ➔ Complete Appendix P  ❌ No

h. Is this a double blind randomized study in which neither the participants nor the research team knows the assignment to the study drug or placebo?

☐ Yes  ❌ No

If Yes ➔ Describe the unblinding plan


Section 6 - PARTICIPANT IDENTIFICATION, RECRUITMENT, & SELECTION

a. Specify the recruitment methods for this study and attach a copy of recruitment material(s): ☑

☐ Personal contact  ☑ Flyers

☒ Contact or approach letters  ☐ Internet

☐ Telephone calls (include script)  ☐ Home visits

☐ Brochures  ☐ Radio or TV (include written text of the advertisement and brief layout of images)

☐ Printed advertisements  ☐ Email (include copy of text to be used)

□ Other Specify: ☐

Who will approach or recruit potential participants?

☒ Principal Investigator and/or Co-Investigator

☐ Research Staff

☐ Other ➔ please describe:

b. When/how often will participants be recruited? (e.g., before/after a counseling visit, via email with 3 reminders sent at specific intervals)
The participants will be recruited 4 times. The first visit will consist of distributing parental consent and child assent forms. The second and third visits will consist of a reminder to students regarding returning the consent forms to the designated faculty/staff member and initial survey completion for those whose parental consent forms have been returned. The fourth visit will be for survey completion of those who had returned parental consent forms since visit three.

c. Where will participants be recruited? (e.g., doctor’s office, classroom, online)

The participants will be recruited in either their school study hall or home room.

d. What steps will be taken to avoid coercion or undue influence in the recruitment of research participants? (e.g., will the potential participants be afforded the opportunity to take material home and discuss the study with family members and/or primary care providers?)

Parental and child consent/assent forms will be distributed so that students are able to take them home and discuss participation with their family members. Additionally, students will be informed that they will encounter no penalty for opting out of the study.

Section 7. INCENTIVES or COMPENSATION TO PARTICIPATE

Will participants receive compensation or other incentives (e.g., free services, cash payments, gift certificates, parking, classroom credit, travel reimbursement) to participate in the research study?  

☐ Yes  ☐ No

Compensation plans should be pro-rated (not contingent upon study completion) and should consider participation withdrawals, as applicable.

If Yes ➔ Describe the compensation/incentive. Include the amount and timing of all payments.

Students who participate in the study will be entered into a random gift card drawing. Each school will receive six, $25 gift cards which will then be distributed to the winning students. The drawing will not take place until after all visits to schools have been completed.

a. Have you reviewed and complied with the Procedures for Compensating Research Participants policy that is available on our website at http://www.kent.edu/research/researchsafetyandcompliance/irbforms.cfm?

☐ Yes  ☐ No
Section 8 - INFORMED CONSENT PROCESS

The human subject protection regulations at 45 CFR 46:
- List ten basic elements of information that must be provided to subjects when investigators are seeking informed consent from subjects to participate in research (unless the IRB approves a request for a waiver/alteration of any/all of the basic elements for consent.) The basic elements of consent are:
  - Purpose, procedures and expected duration of the research
  - Risks and discomforts
  - Potential benefits
  - Alternative procedures or treatments (if any)
  - Compensation for participation in the research (if any)
  - Provisions for confidentiality
  - Management of research related injury
  - Contacts for additional information
  - Voluntary participation and the right to discontinue participation without penalty
- Require that participants sign a consent form (unless the IRB approves a request for a waiver of documented consent.)

If participants cannot give informed consent, it must be obtained from their legal representatives. For example, when subjects are minors (under 18) or when they are mentally incapacitated, consent from a legal representative (such as a parent or legal guardian) is required.

To develop a consent form, begin by using the consent form template that is available from our website at

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Who will discuss and obtain consent from participants?</th>
<th>☑ Principal Investigator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Research key personnel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ Other: Specify</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>b. Are you requesting approval for a waiver/alteration of any/all of the basic elements of consent (see information above) for any part of the research? (e.g., investigators conducting research that involves deception might request a waiver/alteration of the basic elements of consent so that the true purpose of the research is not disclosed in the consent form.)</th>
<th>☐ Yes → Complete Appendix M1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☑ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>c. Are you requesting a waiver of the requirement for participants to sign a consent document? (e.g., an investigator conducting research that only involves the use of anonymous surveys might request a waiver of signed consent.)</th>
<th>☐ Yes → Complete Appendix M2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>☐ No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| d. Describe who will provide consent or permission (i.e. participant, legally authorized representative, parent and/or guardian)? | ☐ N/A                      |

A parent of legal guardian of the student who is participating is required to fill out the parental consent form. Students will not be permitted to participate in the study if parental permission is not obtained.
e. Check all that apply:

- ☒ Informed Consent – Signed Form: Provide copies of document. Please use website template
- ☐ Assent – Form
- ☐ Assent – Verbal/Online/Unsigned
- ☐ Not Applicable (existing data or specimens)
- ☒ Parental Permission – Form
- ☐ Parental Permission – Verbal Script/Online/Unsigned
- ☐ Translated Consent/Assent – Form(s), Script(s), etc. (Provide copy of English version with description the qualifications of the translator.)
- ☐ Photograph/video/audio taping consent form (or permission for photographs/video/audio taping included as section on informed consent)
- ☐ Other (Specify):

f. Describe the consent process. Explain when and where consent will be obtained and how subjects and/or their legally authorized representatives will be provided sufficient opportunity (e.g., waiting period, if any) to consider participation.

Students will be given a parental consent form to take home to their parents. Additionally, students will be required to sign an informed consent form. Students may consult with their parents before consenting to participate. Students will be informed that their participation in the study is not mandatory, and no penalty will incur upon refusal.

g. Will any other tools (e.g., quizzes, visual aids, information sheets) be used during the consent process to assist participant comprehension?

- ☐ Yes → Provide copies of these tools
- ☒ No

Section 9 - HIPAA RESEARCH AUTHORIZATION

a. Will individually identifiable Protected Health Information (PHI) subject to the HIPAA Privacy Rule requirements be accessed, used, or disclosed in the research study?

- ☒ No
- ☐ Yes → Check all that apply:
  - ☐ Written Authorization: Provide a copy of the Authorization Form
  - ☐ Partial Waiver of authorization (recruitment purposes only; preparatory to research): Complete Appendix N
  - ☐ Full Waiver of authorization (limited data set with no direct identifiers and with a data use agreement; information on descendant’s): Complete Appendix N

Section 10 - PRIVACY OF PARTICIPANTS

a. Describe the provisions to protect the privacy interests of the participants. Consider the circumstances and nature of information to be obtained, taking into account factors (e.g., age, gender, ethnicity, education level, etc.) that may influence participants’ expectations of privacy.

All information collected will be kept under lock and key in the Principle Investigator’s office. No identifiable information will be collected.
b. Does the research require access to personally identifiable private information?  

☐ Yes  
☒ No

If Yes  Describe the personally identifiable private information involved in the research. List the information source(s) (e.g., educational records, surveys, medical records, etc.).

☐

c. Explain any circumstances (ethical or legal) where it would be necessary to break confidentiality.  

☒ N/A

d. Will this study obtain IDENTIFIABLE information from students’ educational records?  

☐ Yes  
☒ No

If Yes  Does the individual obtaining the information have legitimate access (e.g. as the student’s teacher/professor)?  

The FERPA (Family Educational Rights and Privacy Act) applies when student educational records are used for research. FERPA requires a signed permission when IDENTIFIABLE information from student records is released to anyone who did NOT already have legitimate access.

Section 11 - CONFIDENTIALITY OF DATA

a. What format will be used to store participant information? Check all that apply.

☒ Hardcopy paper documentation  
☐ Audio Tapes
☐ Database system  
☐ Video Tapes
☐ Disk (CD ROM, floppy disk, flash drive)  
☐ Other

Specify: ☐

b. How will the participant information be kept secure and confidential? Check all that apply.

☒ File cabinets with combination or key lock  
☐ Biometric authentication (e.g. fingerprints, voice, retinal/iris scan
☐ Locked room with cardkey access  
☐ Freezer with a padlock
☐ Off-site backup vendor  
☐ NIH Certificate of Confidentiality
☐ Electronic records with user identification/password  
☐ Other

Specify: ☐

c. Will you be retaining identifying information for purposes of another research project (e.g. keeping participants’ contact information to recruit them for future research)?  

☐ Yes  
☒ No

If Yes  Describe what information will be retained. The information must also be described in the consent form.

☐

d. How will access to participant information be revoked when a staff member leaves the study?  

Not applicable

e. Will you be sharing or receiving research data for this project with/from researchers outside of Kent State University?  

☐ Yes  
☒ No

If Yes  provide copy of Data Use Agreement, if applicable.
f. Will you be sharing or receiving materials or specimens for the purposes of this project with/from researchers outside of Kent State University?  
☑ Yes  ☒ No

If Yes → complete a Materials Transfer Agreement.

g. Indicate what will happen to the identifiable data at the end of the study. Research data should be retained for a minimum of three years after final project closeout (i.e., no further data collection, long term follow-up, re-contact, or analysis of identifiable/coded data.)

☐ Identifiers will be permanently removed from the data and destroyed (de-identified)
☐ Identifiable/coded (linked) data will be retained and stored confidentially
☐ Identifiable data will be retained and may be made public with participant consent (e.g., ethnographic research)
☒ Identifiable data were not collected

Section 12 – COST TO PARTICIPANTS or REIMBURSEMENTS

a. Are there any potential costs that participants (or their insurers) will incur as a result of study participation (e.g., parking, study drugs, diagnostic tests, etc.).

If Yes → ☐ Yes  ☒ No

b. Are there any costs to participants that will be covered/reimbursed by the research study.

If Yes → ☐ Yes  ☒ No

Section 13 - ASSURANCE: PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR

I agree to follow all applicable policies and procedures of Kent State University and federal, state, and local laws and guidance regarding the protection of human subjects in research, as well as professional practice standards and generally accepted good research practice guidelines for investigators, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Perform the research as approved by the IRB with appropriately trained and qualified personnel with adequate resources;
- Initiate the research only after written notification of IRB approval has been received;
- Obtain and document (unless waived) informed consent and HIPAA research authorization from human subjects (or their legally authorized representatives) prior to their involvement in the research using the currently IRB-approved consent form(s) and process;
- Promptly report to the IRB events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others;
- Provide significant new findings that may relate to the subjects willingness to continue to participate;
- Inform the IRB of any proposed changes in the research or informed consent process before changes are implemented, and agree that no changes will be made until approved by the KSU IRB (except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants);
- Complete and submit a Continuing Review of Human Subjects Research application before the deadline for review at intervals determined by the IRB to be appropriate to the degree of risk (but not less than once per year) to avoid expiration of IRB approval and cessation of all research activities;
- Maintain research-related records (and source documents) in a manner that documents the validity of the research and integrity of the data collected, while protecting the confidentiality of the data and privacy of participants;
- Retain research-related records for audit for a period of at least three years after the research has ended (or longer, according to sponsor or publication requirements) even if I leave the University;
- Contact the Research Compliance for assistance in amending (to request a change in Principal Investigator) or terminating the research if I leave the University or am unavailable to conduct or supervise the research.
personally (e.g., sabbatical or extended leave);
• Provide a Final Study Report to the IRB when all research activities have ended (including data analysis with individually identifiable or coded private information); and
• Inform all Co-Investigators, research staff, employees, and students assisting in the conduct of the research of their obligations in meeting the above commitments.

I verify that the information provided in this Use of Human Subjects in Research application is accurate and complete.

Scott Tobias, Ph.D., CLFE
Signature of Principal Investigator

10/01/2014
Date
INSTRUCTIONS for INVESTIGATORS:

1. Complete this form to add KSU-affiliated Co-Investigator's or Key Personnel to research that involves human subjects.

2. Submit this completed document with your application via email attachment. To submit the form with a typed signature, the form must be submitted from the investigator's @kent.edu email account. If completed form is signed and then scanned as a PDF attachment, the @kent.edu email requirement does not apply.

3. Do NOT begin data collection prior to receiving notification from the KSU IRB that the study/modification has been fully approved.

DEFINITIONS

Key personnel:

Individuals who participate in the design, conduct, or reporting of human subjects research. At a minimum, include individuals who recruit participants, obtain consent, or who collect study data.

Conflict of Interest is a financial interest or other opportunity for tangible personal benefit of an individual or his/her immediate family that may exert a substantial and improper influence on the individual's professional judgment in exercising any institutional duty or responsibility, including the conduct or design of research.

Financial Conflict of Interest:

An interest of an individual (or his/her immediate family) of monetary value that would reasonably appear to be affected by the research or an individual's interest in any entity whose financial interests would reasonably appear to be affected by the research. Financial interests include (but are not limited to) salary or other payments for services (e.g., consulting fees or honoraria), equity interests (e.g., stocks, stock options, or other ownership interests), and intellectual property rights (e.g., patents, copyrights, and royalties from such rights).

Non-Financial Conflict of Interest:

An interest other than monetary of an individual (or his/her immediate family) in the design, conduct, or reporting of the research or other interest that competes with the obligation to protect research participants and potentially compromises the objectivity and credibility of the research process.

Immediate Family:

An Investigator's or Key personnel's spouse or domestic partner and dependent children.

To complete this form: Single left-click to complete text fields. To check a box, double left-click on the box, then click "checked". Click OK.

Section I - KSU PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR INFORMATION

Last Name: Tobias  First Name: Scott

Title or, IRB log number of Research (should match Human Subjects Research Application)

Adolescent Bullying and Resilience Among Middle School Students
KSU CO-INVESTIGATOR(S) and/or KEY PERSONNEL (#1)

☐ Co-Investigator  Status:
☐ Key Personnel  ☐ Faculty  ☐ Graduate Student  ☑ Undergraduate Student  ☐ Staff

Name (Last, First, M.I.): Chaparan, Taylor, M.
E-mail: tchapana@kent.edu
Phone: 330-865-0650

a. Have Co-Investigator(s)/Key personnel completed the CITI online (or equivalent) training?
   ☑ Yes  attach copy of completion certificate.
   ☐ No

b. Describe the role/activities that this Co-investigator or Key Personnel will perform for this study (e.g., subject recruitment, informed consent):
   Subject recruitment, informed consent, survey dispersal, data collection, data analysis and interpretation

c. Where will the Co-investigator or Key Personnel perform the research activities?
   ☐ at KSU
   ☑ at external research site  complete Appendix Q


d. Does Co-Investigator or Key personnel have a Conflict of interest related to the research?
   ☑ Yes  provide explanation below.
   ☐ No

Explanation:

e. Does Co-Investigator or Key personnel have a patent or, pending patent, or current patent idea that could be conceivably related to this research project?
   ☐ Yes  provide explanation below.
   ☑ No

Explanation:

f. Has/will Co-Investigator or Key personnel receive funds or, other resources (including equipment, devices, etc...) from a Sponsor or funding agency/entity for purposes of this research project?
   ☐ Yes  provide explanation below.
   ☑ No

Explanation:

I agree to follow all applicable policies and procedures of Kent State University and federal, state, and local laws and guidance regarding the protection of human subjects in research, as well as professional practice standards and generally accepted good research practice guidelines for investigators, including, but not limited to, the following:
APPENDIX A1 – Co-Investigator(s) or Key Personnel

IRB LOG NUMBER ____________________________

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

KSU Co-Investigator(s) or Key Personnel

- Perform the research as approved by the IRB under the direction of the Principal Investigator (or Advisor) by appropriately trained and qualified personnel with adequate resources;
- Initiate the research after written notification of IRB approval has been received;
- Obtain and document (unless waived) informed consent and HIPAA research authorization from human subjects (or their legally authorized representatives) prior to their involvement in the research using the currently IRB-approved consent form(s) and process;
- Promptly report to the IRB events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others;
- Provide significant new findings that may relate to the subjects willingness to continue to participate;
- Inform the IRB of any proposed changes in the research or informed consent process before changes are implemented, and agree that no changes will be made until approved by the KSU IRB (except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants);
- If applicable, complete and submit a Continuing Review of Human Subjects Research application before the deadline for review at intervals determined by the IRB to be appropriate to the degree of risk (but not less than once per year) to avoid expiration of IRB approval and cessation of all research activities;
- Maintain research-related records (and source documents) in a manner that documents the validity of the research and integrity of the data collected, while protecting the confidentiality of the data and privacy of participants;
- Retain research-related records for audit for a period of at least three years after the research has ended (or longer, according to sponsor or publication requirements) even if I leave the University;

I verify that the information provided in this form is accurate and complete.

Signature ____________________________  Date __8/28/14____________________

KSU CO-INVESTIGATOR(S) and/or KEY PERSONNEL (#2)

☐ Co-Investigator Status:
☐ Key Personnel ☐ Faculty ☐ Graduate Student ☐ Undergraduate Student ☐ Staff

Name (Last, First, MI): ____________________________

E-mail: @kent.edu

Phone:

g. Have Co-Investigator(s)/Key personnel completed the CITI online (or equivalent) training?
   ☐ Yes attach copy of completion certificate.
   ☐ No

h. Describe the role/activities that this Co-investigator or Key Personnel will perform for this study (e.g., subject recruitment, informed consent):

i. Where will the Co-Investigator or Key Personnel perform the research activities?
   ☐ at KSU
   ☐ at external research site complete Appendix 0

j. Does Co-Investigator or Key personnel have a Conflict of Interest related to the research?
   ☐ Yes provide explanation below
   ☐ No
APPENDIX A1 – Co-Investigator(s) or Key Personnel

IRB LOG NUMBER ________________________________

KENT STATE UNIVERSITY

Refer to definitions above.

Explaination:

k. Does Co-Investigator or Key personnel have a patent or, pending patent, or current patent idea that could be conceivably related to this research project?

☐ Yes → provide explanation below. ☐ No

Explanation:

l. Has/will Co-Investigator or Key personnel receive funds or, other resources (including equipment, devices, etc...) from a Sponsor or funding agency/entity for purposes of this research project?

☐ Yes → provide explanation below. ☐ No

Explanation:

I agree to follow all applicable policies and procedures of Kent State University and federal, state, and local laws and guidance regarding the protection of human subjects in research, as well as professional practice standards and generally accepted good research practice guidelines for investigators, including, but not limited to, the following:

- Perform the research as approved by the IRB under the direction of the Principal Investigator (or Advisor) by appropriately trained and qualified personnel with adequate resources;
- Initiate the research after written notification of IRB approval has been received;
- Obtain and document (unless waived) informed consent and HIPAA research authorization from human subjects (or their legally authorized representatives) prior to their involvement in the research using the currently IRB-approved consent form(s) and process;
- Promptly report to the IRB events that may represent unanticipated problems involving risks to subjects or others;
- Provide significant new findings that may relate to the subjects willingness to continue to participate;
- Inform the IRB of any proposed changes in the research or informed consent process before changes are implemented, and agree that no changes will be made until approved by the KSU IRB (except where necessary to eliminate apparent immediate hazards to participants);
- If applicable, complete and submit a Continuing Review of Human Subjects Research application before the deadline for review at intervals determined by the IRB to be appropriate to the degree of risk (but not less than once per year) to avoid expiration of IRB approval and cessation of all research activities;
- Maintain research-related records (and source documents) in a manner that documents the validity of the research and integrity of the data collected, while protecting the confidentiality of the data and privacy of participants;
- Retain research-related records for audit for a period of at least three years after the research has ended (or longer, according to sponsor or publication requirements) even if I leave the University;

I verify that the information provided in this form is accurate and complete.

Signature ___________________________ Date __________

Copy and Paste table if additional Co-Investigators/Key Personnel.
APPENDIX I - Children

INSTRUCTIONS for INVESTIGATORS:

1. Complete this form to request inclusion of participants who are considered children.

2. Submit this completed document with the Human Subjects Research application via email attachment. To submit the form with a typed signature, the form must be submitted from the Investigator’s @kent.edu email account. If completed form is signed and then scanned as a PDF attachment, the @kent.edu email requirement does not apply.

3. Do NOT begin data collection prior to receiving notification from the KSU IRB that the IAA agreement has been fully approved.

DEFINITIONS

Children/Child - Person(s) who have not attained the legal age for consent to treatments or procedures involved in the research, under the applicable law of the jurisdiction in which the research will be conducted.

Minimal risk:
The probability and magnitude of harm or discomfort anticipated in the research are not greater in and of themselves than those ordinarily encountered in daily life or during the performance of routine physical or psychological examinations or tests.

To complete this form: Single left-click to complete text fields. To check a box, double left-click on the box, then click “checked”. Click OK.

Section I - KSU Investigator Information

Last Name: Tobias  First Name: Scott

Title of Study (should match Human Subjects Research Application)

Adolescent Bullying and Resilience Among Middle School Students

1. Select the category that best describes the research and provide the corresponding information:

☐ Not greater than minimal risk → Go to Question #2

☐ More than minimal risk is presented by an intervention or procedure that holds the prospect of direct benefit for the individual child, or by a monitoring procedure that is likely to contribute to the child’s well-being

   a. Explain how the risk is justified by the anticipated benefit to the individual child.

   b. Explain how the relation of the anticipated benefit to the risk is at least as favorable to the child as that which would be presented by available alternative approaches (e.g., other treatments).

☐ More than minimal risk is presented by an intervention or procedure that does not hold the prospect of direct benefit for the individual child, or by a monitoring procedure that is not likely to contribute to the child’s well-
APPENDIX I - Children

being.

a. Explain how the risk represents a minor increase over minimal risk.

b. Explain how the intervention or procedure presents experiences to children that are reasonably commensurate with those inherent in their actual or expected medical, dental, psychological, social, or educational situations.

c. Explain how the intervention or procedure is likely to yield generalizable knowledge about the child’s disorder or condition that is of vital importance for the understanding or amelioration of the child’s disorder or condition.

2. Explain the process of obtaining informed consent/assent from children and their parents (i.e., will parents and children be approached separately or together?). Students will be given an informed consent form for their parents to sign and return to the school.

3. Will the parents or guardians be present with the child during other discussions of the research? ☐ Yes ☒ No

4. Will incentives be offered to the research participants? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, complete the following:

a. Specify the incentives:

b. The incentives will be offered to:

☐ Child
☐ Parent

5. Will sensitive or private information (e.g., questionnaires, test results) be shared with the parents/guardians? ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes → Explain

6. If participation is to continue beyond the time that the child is 18 years of age, describe the process to be used to re-consent the participant. ☒ N/A

Page 2 of 3 Email: Researchcompliance@kent.edu Revision 1.0
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7. Is there a possibility that any of the research participants will be wards of the State or any other agency or institution?

☐ Yes
☐ No
Research Conducted at Multiple Sites

INSTRUCTIONS for INVESTIGATORS:

1. Complete this form to include performance sites outside of Kent State University for your research activity (e.g., obtaining consent, conducting research procedures, obtaining or accessing identifiable data for research purposes, etc.)

OR

Any component of your research will be conducted by collaborators outside of Kent State University and you are responsible for coordinating the conduct of all or part of this research (e.g., you are running the study at multiple locations; you are conducting or coordinating parts of the research such as follow-up at multiple locations; your data analysis work is being done at an outside institution.)

2. Submit this completed document via email along with the Human Subjects Research application.

3. Retain a copy of the Human Subjects application and applicable attachments.

4. Do NOT begin data collection prior to receiving notification from the KSU IRB that your application has been fully approved or determined by the IRB to be exempt from annual review.

DEFINITIONS

Engaged in Research - an institution is considered engaged in research when its employees or agents for the purposes of the research project obtain: (1) data about the subjects of the research through intervention or interaction with them; (2) identifiable private information about the subjects of the research; or (3) the informed consent of human subjects for the research.

Performance Site - a site whose staff, facilities or private records of individuals are engaged in the conduct of research; or a site that receives HHS funds. The performance site is the actual place where the research activity (e.g., site where staff are consenting subjects.

IRB of Record - The IRB responsible for review of research and for determining that the research meets the regulatory requirements for approval.

To complete this form: Single left-click to complete text fields. To check a box, double left-click on the box, then click “checked”. Click OK.

Section I - KSU Investigator Information

Last Name: Tobias First Name: Scott

Title of Study (should match Human Subjects Research Application)

Adolescent Bullying and Resilience Among Middle School Students
## Performance site #1

1. Name of Performance Site (e.g. Oriana House, Akron Children’s Hospital, Summa, School)
   - Jackson High School

2. Who is conducting research activities at this Performance Site?
   - KSU PI, CO-PI or key personnel
   - Collaborator → Local PI Name:

3. Performance Site contact name & phone number for IRB matters
   - Monica Myers, 330-837-3501

4. Who will be the IRB of Record for research conducted at this Performance Site?
   - KSU IRB → answer question #5
   - Performance Site’s IRB → provide FWA # and expiration
   - Other IRB → Name:

5. If KSU is the IRB of Record, what is the method of documenting the Performance site’s reliance on our IRB?
   - Master IRB Collaboration Agreement (currently only applicable for Summa)
   - Individual Investigator Agreement/Letter of Support (applicable for researchers at locations with no FWA)

6. If KSU is not the IRB of record, has the site’s local IRB granted approval?
   - No → Explain:
   - Yes → provide dates of site IRB Approval: ______ to: ______ → (attach copy of the Performance Site’s IRB Approval letter).
   - Performance Site’s IRB file number: _____

7. What are the study procedures that will take place at this Performance Site (e.g., conduct research interviews; obtain informed consent, accessing records).
   - Obtain parental informed consent, distribute surveys, and collect completed consent forms and completed surveys

## Performance site #2

8. Name of Performance Site (e.g. Oriana House, Akron Children’s Hospital, Summa, School)
   - Perry High School

9. Who is conducting research activities at this Performance Site?
**APPENDIX O – Multi-site Study**

**IRB LOG NUMBER ___________________________**

- KSU PI, CO-PI or key personnel
- Collaborator → Local PI Name:

10. **Performance Site contact name & phone number for IRB matters**
    
    Jason Conrad, 330-477-3486

11. **Who will be the IRB of Record for research conducted at this Performance Site?**
    
    - KSU IRB → answer question #5
    - Performance Site's IRB → provide FWA # and expiration
    - Other IRB → Name:

12. **If KSU is the IRB of Record, what is the method of documenting the Performance site’s reliance on our IRB?**
    
    - Master IRB Collaboration Agreement (currently only applicable for Summa)
    - Individual Investigator Agreement/Letter of Support (applicable for researchers at locations with no FWA)

13. **If KSU is not the IRB of record, has the site's local IRB granted approval?**
    
    - No → Explain:
    - Yes → provide dates of site IRB Approval: _____ to: _____ → (attach copy of the Performance Site’s IRB Approval letter). ☑
        Performance Site's IRB file number: ______

14. **What are the study procedures that will take place at this Performance Site (e.g., conduct research interviews, obtain informed consent, accessing records).**
    
    Obtain parental informed consent, distribute surveys, and collect completed consent forms and completed survey.

---

**Performance site #3**

15. **Name of Performance Site (e.g. Oriana House, Akron Children's Hospital, Summa, School)**
    
    GlenOak High School

16. **Who is conducting research activities at this Performance Site?**
    
    - KSU PI, CO-PI or key personnel
    - Collaborator → Local PI Name:

17. **Performance Site contact name & phone number for IRB matters**

---

Questions? Email: Researchcompliance@kent.edu
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28. Who will be the IRB of Record for research conducted at this Performance Site?
   √ KSU IRB  →  answer question #5
   □ Performance Site’s IRB  →  provide FWA # and expiration
   □ Other IRB  →  Name:

29. If KSU is the IRB of Record, what is the method of documenting the Performance site’s reliance on our IRB?
   □ Master IRB Collaboration Agreement (currently only applicable for Summa)
   □ IRB Authorization Agreement (applicable for a location with an FWA)
   √ Individual Investigator Agreement/Letter of Support (applicable for researchers at locations with no FWA)

30. If KSU is not the IRB of record, has the site’s local IRB granted approval?
   □ No → Explain:
   □ Yes → provide dates of site IRB Approval: ______ to: ______ (attach copy of the Performance Site’s IRB Approval letter).
     Performance Site’s IRB file number: ______

21. What are the study procedures that will take place at this Performance Site (e.g., conduct research interviews, obtain informed consent, accessing records).
   Obtain parental informed consent, distribute surveys, and collect completed consent forms and completed surveys.

**If additional Performance Site’s, copy/paste table below.**