

5-4-2017

## **Bullying Participant Role Behavior and Social and Emotional Outcomes**

Bethany S. Beggs

Follow this and additional works at: <https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/studentengagement-honorscapstones>

---

### **Recommended Citation**

Beggs, Bethany S., "Bullying Participant Role Behavior and Social and Emotional Outcomes" (2017).  
*Honors Capstones*. 250.  
<https://huskiecommons.lib.niu.edu/studentengagement-honorscapstones/250>

This Dissertation/Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Undergraduate Research & Artistry at Huskie Commons. It has been accepted for inclusion in Honors Capstones by an authorized administrator of Huskie Commons. For more information, please contact [jschumacher@niu.edu](mailto:jschumacher@niu.edu).

Bullying Participant Role Behavior and Social and Emotional Outcomes

Bethany S. Beggs and Michelle K. Demaray

Northern Illinois University

### Abstract

The current study was designed to investigate bullying participant role behavior and their associated social and emotional outcomes. Bullying is an important and prevalent problem in schools today, with participation in bullying indicating negative outcomes later in life. Data were collected from 303 students attending a middle school in the rural Midwestern United States. Participants were asked for demographic information and were given two measures: the Bullying Participant Behaviors Questionnaire (BPBQ) and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ). The bullying role behaviors from the BPBQ were used as independent variables: bully, victim, assistant, defender, and outsider. Four of the five scales of the SDQ were used as dependent variables: emotional problems, conduct problems, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behavior. The main research questions were: how do the various bullying roles relate to emotional problems, conduct problems, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behavior? And does gender matter? It was found that participation in any of the bullying participant roles was associated with social and emotional outcomes. The results found in the current study can help the public to realize some of the potential outcomes of being involved in bullying depending on the participant role. The results can also help school psychologists when creating new bullying interventions.

Bullying is a significant problem in schools today. It is a highly prevalent problem, almost so much that roughly one third of children have been involved in a bullying situation in some aspect (Nansel et al., 2001). Bullying has been shown to be related to various negative outcomes, such as increased levels of anxiety and depression, making it an extremely important area of study (Salmon, James, & Smith, 1998). Not only is it important to better the quality of life in schools for as many children as possible, it is also critical to help children before they reach the “real world” and have a chance to use that aggressive behavior in a harmful way. Ultimately, more research is needed to investigate the various roles in bullying situations and how each of those roles are related to certain outcomes, both social and emotional.

There are numerous varying definitions of bullying in the literature, but the CDC penned a uniform definition in 2013 that has been widely accepted in the field of school psychology: bullying is any unwanted aggressive behavior by another youth or group of youths, involving an observed or perceived power imbalance, and is repeated multiple times or is highly likely to be repeated. It is important to make a distinction that this behavior does not count as bullying if it is coming from siblings or current dating partners. Bullying may inflict harm or distress on the victim, and that harm or distress can be physical, psychological, social, or educational (Gladden, Vivolo-Kantor, Hamburger, & Lumpkin, 2013).

There is a variation in bullying research as to how bullying situations are made up and what kind of roles there are for the involved individuals to take. While some researchers will focus entirely on the perpetrators of bullying and their victims, others use a larger group-based system to analyze and study bullying. Salmivalli is one researcher in particular that places a lot of importance on not only the roles of bully and victim, but on the roles of the onlooking students as well. Salmivalli (1999) describes what kinds of behaviors encompass all of these

various roles. The role of “bully” is typically held by a child that is active and will take the initiative to begin the bullying interaction. The role of “victim” is held by a child that is “repeatedly and systematically harassed” (Salmivalli, 1999). The role of “assistant” or “assistant to the bully” is held by a child that does not begin the bullying interaction themselves, but are willing and keen to join in when another child has already begun bullying. The role of “reinforcer” is held by the child that does not actively bully the victim alongside the bully and the assistant(s), but will give positive feedback to the bully and the assistant(s), such as through laughing, effectively reinforcing this behavior. The role of “outsider” is held by the child who is in the classroom or standing by the interaction but will try to stay away and not take a side. Though these children are not actively participating in this negative interaction, they are still reinforcing the behavior of the bully and the assistant(s) by allowing it to go on. Finally, the role of “defender” is held by the child that is actively promoting anti-bullying behavior, by comforting the victim, taking their side, and trying to get others to stop bullying (Salmivalli, 1999). Though these descriptions speak to the behavior of only one child in each role, it is important to remember that there can be, and commonly is, more than one child in any of these roles during any given bullying interaction.

Part of what makes bullying a vast problem is the prevalence. A study done in the United States with a nationally representative sample showed that roughly 30% of children are involved in bullying as a process, either as a victim, a bully, or a bully/victim (Nansel et al., 2001). In this study, 13% of students reported being bullies, 10.6% reported being victims of bullying, and 6.3% reported being bullied as well as bullying. In this study, roughly eleven percent of the children reported bullying “sometimes” (considered moderate) while 8.8% reported bullying once a week or more (considered frequently). Nansel and colleagues also found gender and age

differences in prevalence rates. Males reported being bullied and bullying more than females did, while it was found that bullying behavior was more common among grades six through eight, and less common in grades nine and ten.

Gender differences in bullying behaviors are complex. When it comes to bullying role behaviors, as reported by their peers, more girls fell into the categories of defender and outsider, where more boys fell into the reinforcing role and the assistant role (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). Another study has found that girls show more empathy and self-control than boys. This same study found a positive relation between empathy and defending, and a negative relation between self-control and bullying (Jenkins, Demaray, Fredrick, & Summers, 2014). Because girls show more empathy and self-control, and empathy is linked to defending while self-control is negatively related to bullying, these differences in personality traits could explain the gender differences in who is more likely to be a defender. Girls may also be more likely to be defenders because society expects girls to show personality traits that are typically considered more feminine: being caring and having prosocial tendencies. Girl's relationship strengths typically include empathy (Underwood & Rosen, 2011), likely making it easier for them to intervene and defend.

Bullying situations are made up of multiple parties, all of whom contribute to the situation in some way. Each bullying situation is slightly different. Some situations will just consist of a perpetrator of bullying and a victim. Ultimately, bullying is a group level phenomenon (Jenkins et al., 2014; Salmivalli et al., 1996; Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011). Bullying research cannot just focus on youth who bully and their victims, as there are many other roles to consider.

Research has focused on different bully role behaviors in the literature. Some research focuses almost entirely on the perpetrator and the victim of bullying. These studies are common because of the behaviors exhibited by youth who bully as well the outcomes of being victimized. Some studies also include the role of “bully/victim,” or a child that reports being bullied as well as bullying others (Nansel et al., 2001; Rodriguez, Gregus, Craig, Pastrana, & Cavell, 2014). In the current study we focus on several possible bullying behavior roles. Salmivalli et al. (1996) described six possible roles that includes the roles of bully, victim, reinforcer of the bully, assistant to the bully, defender of the victim, and outsider. In the current study, the following roles were included: bully, assistant to the bully, victim, defender of the victim, and outsider. Because bullying is a group process, it is important to consider all of the relevant roles and not just the roles found at the forefront of the interaction.

Much of the research is focused on identifying characteristics or outcomes associated with various bully role behaviors. For example, Jenkins et al. (2014) investigated the associations between bullying roles and various social skills such as cooperation, assertion, empathy, and self-control. Both bullying behavior and being victimized was negatively associated with cooperation (i.e. conduct problems). Empathy was found to be positively related to defending (i.e. prosocial behavior), and self-control was negatively related to both bullying and being victimized, while it was positively related to defending (i.e. emotional and conduct problems). It was also found that assertion was positively related to bullying, which could lend a hand to conduct problems. In regard to victimization, Rodriguez et al. (2014) found that youth that had been victimized had a higher probability of having a psychiatric disorder and were at increased risk of persistent suicidal tendencies, especially among girls. Nansel et al. (2001) also found that

being victimized was related to poorer relations with classmates, as well as increased loneliness and decreased ability to make friends.

### **Current Study**

It is well known that victimization may have a lasting negative effect on children. It can even predict anti-social behavior later in life (Olweus, 2011). This is why further research is needed to investigate more specific outcomes in regard to the different bullying behavior roles. The current study focused on conduct problems, emotional problems, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behavior. The main research questions were: how do the various bullying roles relate to emotional problems, conduct problems, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behavior? And does gender matter?

First, it was hypothesized that both bully and the assistant role behaviors would be positively related to emotional problems, conduct problems, and negatively related to prosocial behavior. It was predicted that being victimized would be related to greater emotional problems as well as higher reports of peer relationship problems. It was hypothesized that defending behaviors would have a negative relation to peer relationship problems and a positive relation to prosocial behavior. As for the outsider group, due to limited research on this group we do not have specific predictions. Some outsiders may be pro-bully while others may be pro-victim. Finally, although there are no proposed hypotheses, the current study is also interested in if there are any gender differences in the relations between bullying role behaviors and social emotional outcomes.

## Method

### Participants

The data used in this research were collected from a rural middle school in the Midwestern United States. There were 303 middle school students surveyed, with the majority being female ( $n = 155$ ). At the time of collection, the participants were in 6<sup>th</sup> grade ( $n = 92$ ), 7<sup>th</sup> grade ( $n = 104$ ), or 8<sup>th</sup> grade ( $n = 107$ ). The sample consisted mostly of White individuals (88.1%), as well as African American (0.7%), Hispanic American (1.3%), Asian American (1.3%), American Indian (0.7%), and 7.9% identified with two or more races.

### Measures

The participants were asked to answer various self-report questionnaires: demographic information, the Bullying Participant Behaviors Questionnaire (Demaray, Summers, Jenkins, & Becker, 2014), and the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 1997).

**Demographic information.** Students were asked for their gender (coded 0 = *male* and 1 = *female*), grade level, and race.

**Bullying Participant Behavior Questionnaire.** The Bullying Participant Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ) is a measure created to investigate students' perception of bullying in schools and to assess various behaviors associated with each of the different roles. The students were provided with a definition of bullying. Then, over 50 items, participants were asked to rate the frequency with which they had either participated in or experienced the given behavior in the last 30 days. The questions used a 5-point scale ranging from 0 to 4 (0 = *never*, 1 = *1-2 times*, 2 = *3-4 times*, 3 = *5-6 times*, and 4 = *7+ times*). The items presented to the participants fell into five different groups: bully, assistant, victim, defender, and outsider. The bully items looked into the frequency of participating in bullying behaviors, and the assistant items looked into the

frequency of supporting a bully in their behavior, joining in, or helping with the bullying. The victim items examined the frequency of experiencing bullying behaviors, the defender items examined the frequency of engaging in defending the victim from bullying behaviors, and the outsider items examined the frequency of recognizing and acknowledging bullying behaviors but doing nothing about those behaviors. The referenced study from Demaray et al. (2014) was one of the first to examine the BPBQ and attempt to find validity and reliability. The BPBQ showed good internal consistency, with alpha coefficients ranging from  $\alpha = .88$  to  $\alpha = .94$  for the five subscales. Demaray et al. (2014) also found some evidence of concordant, convergent, and divergent validity.

**Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire.** The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) is a measure used to investigate five different constructs: four different problems that some children experience (specifically emotional problems, conduct problems, hyperactivity/inattention, and peer relationship problems), as well as one non-problematic construct of prosocial behavior. Despite collecting data regarding hyperactivity/inattention problems, those data were excluded from the final analyses and results due to a lack of relevance. This version of the SDQ consisted of 25 items, five for each construct. Each item was scored on a 3-point scale, ranging from 0 to 2 (0 = *not true*, 1 = *somewhat true*, 3 = *certainly true*). A pilot study done by Goodman, Meltzer, & Bailey (1998) found that the SDQ showed acceptable levels of inter-rater reliability. This pilot study also showed good internal reliability, where Cronbach's alpha ranged between  $\alpha = .61$  and  $\alpha = .82$  for the five different subscales of the SDQ.

### **Procedures**

The data were collected by the school, online in the school computer labs during class time. All responses were anonymous. Passive parental consent was obtained by sending a note

home to parents, giving them the option to opt their children out of participating in the survey. IRB approval has since been received to use the data for an extant dataset.

### **Research Questions**

The main research questions were: how do the various bullying roles relate to emotional problems, conduct problems, peer relationship problems, and prosocial behavior? And does gender matter?

### **Results**

First, preliminary analyses were conducted including running descriptive data and intercorrelations among the variables by the total sample and by gender. Means and standard deviations of all variables can be found in Table 1 and intercorrelations among the variables are presented in Table 2. For the main analyses, four regressions were conducted with the BPBQ scores (Bully, Assistant, Victim, Defender, Outsider) and gender as the independent variables in Step 1. In Step 2, gender interactions were included. In each regression, a different SDQ score served as the dependent variable in each of the four regressions, including Emotional Problems, Conduct Problems, Peer Relationship Problems, and Prosocial Behavior. These regression results can be found in Table 3.

Regarding Emotional Problems, because the change in  $R^2$  for the second step was not significant, the second step of the regression did not account for a significant increase in variance. The first step of the regression was significant and accounted for 29.3% of the variance ( $R^2 = .293$ ,  $F(6, 292) = 20.173$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Gender (beta = .370,  $p < .001$ ), Bully (beta = .144,  $p = .049$ ), Victim (beta = .426,  $p < .001$ ), and Defender (beta = -.140,  $p = .016$ ) were unique significant predictors.

Regarding Conduct Problems, because the change in  $R^2$  for the second step was not significant, the second step of the regression did not account for a significant increase in variance. The first step of the regression was significant and accounted for 30.3% of the variance ( $R^2 = .303$ ,  $F(6, 292) = 21.182$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Bully (beta = .415,  $p < .001$ ), Victim (beta = .286,  $p > .001$ ), and Assistant (beta = -.143,  $p = .049$ ) were unique significant predictors.

Regarding Peer Relation Problems, because the change in  $R^2$  for the second step was not significant, the second step of the regression did not account for a significant increase in variance. The first step of the regression was significant and accounted for 23.2% of the variance ( $R^2 = .232$ ,  $F(6, 292) = 14.721$ ,  $p < .001$ ). Victim (beta = .569,  $p < .001$ ) and Defender (beta = -.135,  $p = .026$ ) were unique significant predictors.

Regarding Prosocial Behavior, because the change in  $R^2$  was significant, the second step of the regression did account for a significant increase in variance. The second step of the regression accounted for 26.1% of the variance ( $R^2 = .261$ ,  $F(5, 287) = 2.902$ ,  $p = .014$ ). Gender (beta = .179,  $p = .003$ ), Bully (beta = -.236,  $p = .012$ ), and Defender (beta = .386,  $p < .001$ ) were unique significant predictors. This was the only regression with a significant change in  $R^2$ , where Outsider by gender (beta = -.194,  $p = .006$ ) was a significant interaction. An interaction was present in that for girls, the higher the Outsider score, the lower the Prosocial Behavior score. See Figure 1 for a graph of the significant interaction.

### **Discussion**

Overall, it was found that participation in any of the bullying participant roles is associated with some social and emotional outcomes. All four social and emotional outcomes were significantly related to bullying role behaviors and resulted in at least two unique significant predictors.

### **Emotional Problems**

Emotional problems resulted in four different significant predictors. Gender was a predictor such that females were more likely to have emotional problems. This phenomenon is not surprising in the slightest, considering the emotional state of typical middle school girls. Though all individuals express emotions, there is a gender difference in how emotions are expressed. Girls are more likely to express internalizing emotions while boys are more likely to express externalizing emotions (Chaplin & Aldao, 2013). Internalizing emotion expression is typically what is thought of as emotional problems, whereas externalizing emotions, such as anger, are more likely to fall into the construct of conduct problems.

Bullying was also found to be positively associated with emotional problems, which follows what was hypothesized. This positive association was hypothesized because the child's emotional problems may be causing the bullying behavior. Perhaps the child is involved in a negative situation in another aspect of their life (i.e., an abusive home), and the resulting emotional problems are what lead them to bully others. Another possibility is that the bullying is the cause of the emotional problems. The bully may feel guilty about how they treat their fellow classmates, resulting in emotional problems.

As hypothesized, victimization was also positively associated with emotional problems. This is also not surprising, as a large amount of literature has shown that being bullied can lead to loneliness (Nansel et al., 2001), an increased probability of having a psychiatric disorder, and increased risk of suicidality (Rodriguez et al., 2014). These previously discovered outcomes are all similar to the emotional problem construct that the current study is investigating. Victims may be traumatized from being bullied, or at least upset about the negative situations they must deal with, which can result in emotional problems.

Two results were found that did not align with the given hypotheses. The first is that defending was found to be negatively associated with emotional problems. Though this finding was not originally hypothesized, it is not surprising. Children that defend their classmates from bullies may have a lot of confidence, or may be high in self-efficacy. On the other hand, actively defending a classmate from a bully may raise a child's confidence. Thus, though directional causation is unknown, defending behavior is associated with less emotional problems. Additionally, it was hypothesized that the assistant role would be positively associated with emotional problems. It was believed that the bully role would have similar outcomes to the assistant role. Ultimately, the association between assisting and emotional problems was not significant.

### **Conduct Problems**

Conduct problems resulted in three different significant predictors. Bullying was found to be positively related to conduct problems, as was hypothesized. It is important to note that the diagnostic criteria for conduct disorder from the DSM-IV-TR specifically included bullying as one of the criterion related to aggression (4th ed., text rev.; *DSM-IV-TR*; American Psychiatric Association, 2000). Though the DSM-IV diagnostic criteria are now considered obsolete, it is critical to understand that the psychological community used to specifically view bullying as a possible predictor of conduct disorder. This follows what one might expect in a typical classroom. Bullying behavior is generally not found to be desirable to the instructor, as it can be distracting and harmful. Because of this, the teacher and other students may be trying to stop the bully from exhibiting such behaviors, but the bully continues. Perhaps there is another cause behind the bullying behavior that is also causing the conduct problems, such as an undiagnosed learning disability or unrest at home (i.e., divorce, a parent was laid off, etc.). Life issues that the

child may carry with them can manifest as externalizing behaviors, potentially leading to bullying or other conduct problems.

The following findings for conduct problems were a surprise to the researchers. Victimization was found to be positively related to conduct problems, which was not included in the proposed hypotheses. Though this result is not what was expected, it is logical. Students that exhibit conduct problems may be targets for the bullies in the class, leading to their victimization. Another possibility is that being victimized might create anger or frustration in the child, which may then present itself in the classroom as conduct problems.

The other unexpected finding is that assisting was found to be significantly negatively associated with conduct problems. There are a couple of different possible explanations for this. One possibility is that assisting the bully may be a more subtle line of action than the act of bullying, and thus does not make peers think of them when being asked questions about conduct problems. Another possibility is that these assistants may be socially savvy children, and they understand how to get on the bully's side (i.e., get in on the powerful side of the situation) without actively bullying alongside the central bully or bullies. This would lead their peers not to rate them highly in the conduct problem construct but to still rate them as assistants.

### **Peer Relationship Problems**

Peer relationship problems resulted in two different significant predictors. Unsurprisingly, victimization was found to be positively related to peer relationship problems. This finding can be explained in a couple of different ways. Perhaps there are children that are less capable of handling social situations, which results in problems creating and maintaining relationships with their peers. Then, because of their lack of a social system at school, the bullies turn to them as easy targets. Another possibility is that these children are bullied from the start,

and the persistent negativity and harm causes them to become withdrawn. Being victimized may also lead these victimized children to lose trust in the few friends they may have, resulting in the indicated peer relationship problems.

Additionally, it was found that defending was negatively related to peer relationship problems, as was hypothesized. It is logical to us that children that feel comfortable defending their classmates from bullies would not have problems creating and maintaining relationships with their peers. A study from Poyhonen, Juvonen, and Salmivalli (2010) showed that being perceived as a defender was associated with greater social status. This suggests that being perceived as a defender can increase a child's social status, which would likely carry better peer relationships with it.

### **Prosocial Behavior**

Prosocial behavior resulted in three different significant predictors, as well as a significance interaction. Gender was found to be significantly related to prosocial behavior, such that females are more likely to exhibit prosocial behavior than males are. This finding coincides with societal expectations of females and their behavior. Women are expected to be empathic, caring, and helpful. These traits are what make up the theoretical basis of prosocial behavior.

Additionally, it was found that bullying was negatively related to prosocial behavior. This finding was expected because bullying behavior is essentially the opposite of prosocial behavior on a basic, conceptual level. Children that bully typically are not prosocial, and thus are not likely to exhibit both the potentially harmful bullying behaviors and prosocial behaviors.

The proposed hypothesis was further supported when it was found that defending was positively related to prosocial behavior. This finding was expected because defending other classmates from a bully essentially is prosocial behavior in and of itself. If a child is willing to

take it upon themselves to defend their classmates from a bully, it is likely that this child finds value in helping others or simply in being kind. It is these positive, helping behaviors that ultimately make up the construct of prosocial behavior.

Also, it was found that there was a significant interaction between the outsider role and gender. For girls, as outsider behavior increases, prosocial behavior decreases. This is not surprising, as an individual that falls into the outsider role is less likely to engage with peers at all, let alone in a positive manner such as prosocial behavior. For boys however, the level of prosocial behavior stays relatively static regardless of low or high levels of outsider behavior. This means that outsider behavior does not predict whether or not a boy engages in prosocial behavior.

Finally, another result was hypothesized that was not confirmed by these findings. It was predicted that assisting would be negatively related to prosocial behavior, but the relation between the two variables was ultimately found to be insignificant. This association was predicted because it was believed that the bullying role outcomes would be similar to the outcomes from the assisting role, as previously stated. One can argue that this general assumption was wrong from the beginning, after analyzing the results and finding that both bullying and assisting were not significant predictors in the same direction for any of the four outcomes.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

This study has several limitations. Although the sample was relatively large, it was not representative of the general population. With 88.1% of the participants identifying as White, the sample was not diverse enough to be considered appropriately representative. Similarly, life in a rural school likely differs from life in a suburban or an urban school. A larger sample size would

also make the results more statistically significant. Secondly, self-report measures can result in rater bias. Participants may shift their responses in order to appear more socially acceptable, or participants may have inaccurate perceptions of themselves and the situations they are involved in. This inaccurate reporting may lead to inaccurate results. Additionally, the data were only collected once. Though the BPBQ refers to frequency of participation or experience over the last 30 days, only having one data point for each participant means that no causation or directionality can be found. There is a possibility that participating in bullying roles leads to the negative outcomes discussed, or there is a possibility that children have already experienced the negative outcomes presented here and those experiences lead them to participate in bullying situations.

Future research should focus on these limitations. Further studies should attempt to recruit a large sample that is representative of the general population. Future research should also include multiple measures that employ different methods of collecting data (i.e., self-report, others-reported, behavioral measures, etc.). Additionally, future research would ideally collect data at multiple points over the child's development. This could provide insight on many more aspects of bullying, rather than just the relation between bullying participant roles and associated social and emotional outcomes. Finally, future research should focus primarily on the outsider role. The only significant result found in relation to the outsider role was the interaction between outsider and gender for prosocial behavior. Future studies that focus specifically on that role may provide ample new knowledge about the virtually unknown bullying participant role of the outsider, and about why there is that gender difference in prosocial behavior as an outsider.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, it should be clear that being involved in bullying, regardless of the role, can impact a child's life. That impact varies based on which role the child participates in. The

knowledge gained from this study can go on to provide researchers with a basis of new research, and can help guide psychologists to new or revamped methods of bullying intervention.

Educating the public on these outcomes of bullying can open eyes to how much of a problem bullying really is, and can encourage parents to teach their children the importance of prosocial behavior or taking care of their peers. Though the psychology community may never be able to rid schools of bullying, research such as the current study may be able to reach the public and inform them of the problem that bullying entails for their children.

## References

- American Psychiatric Association. (2000). *Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders* (4th ed., text rev.). Washington, DC: Author.
- Chaplin, T. M., & Aldao, A. (2013). Gender differences in emotion expression in children: a meta-analytic review. *Psychological Bulletin, 139*(4), 735.
- Demaray, M. K., Summers, K. H., Jenkins, L. N., & Becker, L. D. (2014). Bullying Participant Behaviors Questionnaire (BPBQ): Establishing a reliable and valid measure. *Journal of School Violence, 1-31*.
- Espelage, D. L., Rose, C. A., & Polanin, J. R. (2015). Social-emotional learning program to reduce bullying, fighting, and victimization among middle school students with disabilities. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Remedial and special education*, (299–311). New York: Routledge <http://doi.org/10.1177/0741932514564564>
- Gladden RM, Vivolo-Kantor AM, Hamburger ME, Lumpkin CD. *Bullying Surveillance Among Youths: Uniform Definitions for Public Health and Recommended Data Elements, Version 1.0*. Atlanta, GA; National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and U.S. Department of Education; 2013. Available from <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/pdf/bullying-definitions-final-a.pdf>.
- Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: a research note. *Journal of child psychology and psychiatry, 38*(5), 581-586.
- Goodman, R., Meltzer, H., & Bailey, V. (1998). The strengths and difficulties questionnaire: A pilot study on the validity of the self-report version. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 7*(3), 125–130. <http://doi.org/10.1007/s007870050057>

Jenkins, L. N., Demaray, M. K., Fredrick, S. S., & Summers, K. H. (2014). Associations among middle school students' bullying roles and social skills. *Journal of School Violence*, 1-20. <http://doi.org/10.1080/15388220.2014.986675>

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R.S., Ruan, W., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among us youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *JAMA*, 285(16), 2094–2100. <http://doi.org/10.1001/jama.285.16.2094>

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression* (pp. 411–448). Hillsdale, NJ, England: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Olweus, D. (2011). Bullying at school and later criminality: Findings from three Swedish community samples of males. *Criminal Behaviour & Mental Health*, 21(2), 151–156. <http://doi.org/10.1002/cbm.806>

Olweus, D. (2013). School bullying: Development and some important challenges. *Annual Review of Clinical Psychology*, 9(1), 751–780. <http://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-clinpsy-050212-185516>

Pöyhönen, V., Juvonen, J., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). What does it take to stand up for the victim of bullying?: The interplay between personal and social factors. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 56(2), 143-163.

Rodriguez, J. H., Gregus, S. J., Craig, J. T., Pastrana, F. A., & Cavell, T. A. (2014). Bullied children. In *Comprehensive evidence based interventions for children and adolescents* (pp. 301–316). Wiley.

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Bjorkqvist, K., Osterman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group.

- Aggressive Behavior*, 22, 1–15.
- Salmivalli, C. (1999). Participant role approach to school bullying: Implications for interventions. *Journal of adolescence*, 22(4), 453-459.
- Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 40(5), 668–676.  
<http://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2011.597090>
- Salmon, G., James, A., & Smith, D. M. (1998). Bullying in schools: self-reported anxiety, depression, and self-esteem in secondary school children. *BMJ*, 317(7163), 924-925.
- Solberg, M. E., Olweus, D., & Endresen, I. M. (2007). Bullies and victims at school: Are they the same pupils? *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(2), 441–464.  
<http://doi.org/10.13481000709906X105689>
- Underwood, M. K., & Rosen, L. H. (2011). Gender and bullying: Moving beyond mean differences to consider conceptions of bullying, processes by which bullying unfolds, and cyberbullying. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Sweater (Eds.), *Bullying in North American schools* (2nd ed., pp. 13–22). New York: Routledge.

**Table 1***Means and Standard Deviations of Bullying Participant Roles and Social/Emotional Outcomes*

Variables	M	SD
<b>Total Sample</b>		
Bully	14.71	5.111
Victim	19.38	9.379
Assistant	12.08	3.275
Defender	19.56	9.182
Outsider	14.62	6.117
Emotional Problems	3.65	2.727
Conduct Problems	2.80	1.503
Peer Relation Problems	2.42	1.892
Prosocial Behavior	7.29	2.079
<b>Boys</b>		
Bully	15.48	6.565
Victim	19.67	10.075
Assistant	13.34	5.791
Defender	18.85	8.790
Outsider	15.55	7.842
Emotional Problems	2.99	2.479
Conduct Problems	2.95	1.776
Peer Relation Problems	2.63	1.945
Prosocial Behavior	6.57	2.305
<b>Girls</b>		
Bully	14.44	5.530
Victim	19.39	9.221
Assistant	11.41	3.111
Defender	19.87	9.586
Outsider	13.75	5.397
Emotional Problems	5.00	2.606
Conduct Problems	2.81	1.485
Peer Relation Problems	2.82	1.928
Prosocial Behavior	7.81	1.927

*Note: N = 299-303. M = means, SD = standard deviations*

**Table 2***Correlations between Bullying Participant Roles and Social/Emotional Outcomes for the Total Sample*

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1. Gender	1.000									
2. Bully	-.250**	1.000								
3. Victim	-.077	.428**	1.000							
4. Assistant	-.367**	.684**	.211**	1.000						
5. Defender	.016	.207**	.523**	.075	1.000					
6. Outsider	-.165**	.311**	.146*	.396**	.002	1.000				
7. Emotional Problems	.329**	.161**	.371**	-.032	.109	.051	1.000			
8. Conduct Problems	-.120*	.476**	.432**	.255**	.183**	.222**	.383**	1.000		
9. Peer Relation Problems	-.034	.089	.442**	.030	.125*	.117*	.422**	.238**	1.000	
10. Prosocial Behavior	.276**	-.250**	-.003	-.294**	.257**	-.234**	.110	-.080	-.063	1.000

Note:  $N = 299-303$ . \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ .

**Table 3***Associations among Bullying Participant Roles and Social/Emotional Outcomes*

SDQ Outcome	Dependent Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$
Emotional Problems Model 1 $R^2 = .293^{***}$ $\Delta R^2 = .293$	Gender***	2.015	.288	.370
	Bully*	.078	.039	.144
	Victim***	.124	.018	.426
	Assistant	-.086	.063	-.100
	Defender*	-.042	.017	-.140
	Outsider	.021	.024	.048
Emotional Problems Model 2 $R^2 = .310^{***}$ $\Delta R^2 = .017$	Gender***	2.113	.317	.388
	Bully	.014	.049	.026
	Victim***	.109	.026	.375
	Assistant	-.055	.071	-.064
	Defender	-.025	.028	-.084
	Outsider	.038	.032	.050
	Bully X Gender	.163	.085	.169
	Victim X Gender	.012	.038	.027
	Assistant X Gender	-.003	.182	-.001
	Defender X Gender	-.016	.036	-.038
Conduct Problems Model 1 $R^2 = .303^{***}$ $\Delta R^2 = .303$	Gender	-.096	.158	-.032
	Bully***	.123	.021	.415
	Victim***	.046	.010	.286
	Assistant*	-.068	.034	-.143
	Defender	-.007	.009	-.042
	Outsider	.025	.013	.102
Conduct Problems Model 2 $R^2 = .315^{***}$ $\Delta R^2 = .012$	Gender	-.139	.174	-.046
	Bully***	.107	.027	.360
	Victim***	.060	.014	.375
	Assistant	-.062	.039	-.130
	Defender	-.012	.016	-.076
	Outsider*	.038	.017	.153
	Bully X Gender	.060	.046	.112
	Victim X Gender	-.031	.021	-.133
	Assistant X Gender	-.074	.100	-.058
	Defender X Gender	.009	.020	.039
Outsider X Gender	-.031	.027	-.077	

**Table 3** continued

SDQ Outcome	Dependent Variable	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	$\beta$
Peer Relation Problems Model 1 $R^2 = .232^{***}$ $\Delta R^2 = .232$	Gender	-.078	.209	-.021
	Bully	-.052	.028	-.138
	Victim***	.115	.013	.569
	Assistant	-.027	.045	-.045
	Defender*	-.028	.012	-.135
	Outsider	.029	.018	.095
Peer Relation Problems Model 2 $R^2 = .242^{***}$ $\Delta R^2 = .010$	Gender	.037	.231	.010
	Bully	-.057	.036	-.153
	Victim***	.126	.019	.624
	Assistant	-.038	.051	-.063
	Defender*	-.050	.021	-.240
	Outsider	.033	.023	.106
	Bully X Gender	.022	.061	.033
	Victim X Gender	-.022	.027	-.072
	Assistant X Gender	.106	.132	.066
	Defender X Gender	.037	.026	.132
Prosocial Behavior Model 1 $R^2 = .224^{***}$ $\Delta R^2 = .224$	Outsider X Gender	-.009	.036	-.017
	Gender**	.729	.230	.176
	Bully*	-.064	.031	-.155
	Victim	-.011	.015	-.050
	Assistant	-.065	.050	-.099
	Defender***	.073	.014	.323
Prosocial Behavior Model 2 $R^2 = .261^{***}$ $\Delta R^2 = .037^*$	Outsider	-.036	.019	-.106
	Gender**	.742	.250	.179
	Bully*	-.097	.039	-.236
	Victim	.007	.021	.034
	Assistant	-.081	.056	-.124
	Defender***	.087	.022	.386
	Outsider	.009	.025	.025
	Bully X Gender	.092	.067	.125
	Victim X Gender	-.049	.030	-.150
	Assistant X Gender	.029	.144	.016
Defender X Gender	-.025	.028	-.080	
Outsider X Gender**	-.108	.039	-.194	

Note: \*  $p < .05$ , \*\*  $p < .01$ , \*\*\*  $p < .001$ . Unstandardized coefficients: *B* = beta, *SE B* = standard error.

**Figure 1**

*Graph of interaction between Gender and Outsider Behavior in terms of Prosocial Behavior*

