THE UNIVERSITY OF CALGARY

Bullying

Among Children and Adolescents

by

Takeshi Matsuda

A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES

IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE

DEGREE OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

CALGARY, ALBERTA

FEBRUARY, 2000

Canada

Abstract

A total of 656 students (98 grade six and 558 grade eight students) took a survey about bullying in school. About 67% of the students reported that they had bullied others, and 77% of the students reported their experiences of being bullied. The most frequent reasons for bullying others were physical appearance, personality, and uncleanness, and for being bullied the most frequent reasons were physical appearance, not following what everybody else decided, and personality. These students' answers concerning reasons for bullying appear to be the vulnerabilities of the victims, which happened to have become triggers of bullying incidents. The present study revealed that social exclusion, deliberately doing something which the victim doesn't like, and consistently gossiping about the person were the most frequently reported bullying. Some violent types of bullying were found among grade six students more than among grade eight students. At the most recent bullying, 17% of grade six students compared to 9% of grade eight students were victims. In this same context, about 19% of grade eight students and 13% of grade six students reported that they were bullies. Overall, bullies tended to reject authority more than others. In addition, bullies as compared to others reported fewer close friends. The incidence of being bullied was greater among grade six than grade eight students. However, the frequency of bullying was greater for individual victims among grade eight than among grade six victims. These findings suggest that some long – term bullying could exist, especially among grade eight students. Finally, some limitations of the study and implications for future research were discussed.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One: Introduction

The problem of bullying has been concern of researchers in Europe, Japan, and Australia since at least the 1980's. Even though bullying has not been as great a concern for Canadian researchers until recently, the problem seems to be prevalent in Canada. For instance, Charach, Pepler, and Ziegler (1995) obtained answers to the English version of Olweus' (1983) self – report questionnaire from 211 Toronto students, aged 4 to 14. About 20% of the students reported that they were bullied more than once or twice during the term. In addition, 15% of the students answered that they bully others more than once or twice during the term. Since it appears to be a problem in Canada, bullying requires further investigation.

The present study explored bullying problems among Canadian students by using an adapted version of Morita et al.'s (1985) self – report questionnaire. Morita and his colleagues (1985) emphasized the importance of treating bullying problems in a group context. Their notion concerning the group dynamics of bullying was directly applied to the present study. Thus, it was hypothesized that if a class has a bullying problem, each student in a classroom will take one of the following roles: bully, victim, bully/victim, bystander, defender, or audience. The present study investigated the relationships among students' age, gender, students' bullying involvement, and the following variables: a student's academic achievement, the numbers of friends participants have and their attitudes toward authority, group tasks, rules, group conformity, deviant students, and bullying. These particular variables were chosen because Morita et al. and other researchers found significant correlations between these variables and students' involvement in bullying situations.

Based on a review of the relevant literature, especially Morita et al. (1985), the following research questions were posed:

1. Are victims more submissive to authority than others?
2. Do bullies reject authority more than others?
3. Do defenders show more devotion to group tasks than others?

4. Do bullies dislike creating rules more than others do? Or, do they think that it is more acceptable to break rules as compared to others?

5. Are victims more aware of the pressure to conform to a group than others are?

6. Do victims tend to get lower grades in school and expect a lower level of education?

7. Are the numbers of friends who are reported by victims lower than those of people in other roles?

8. Are victims less tolerant of deviant students than others?

9. Do more boys than girls bully others?

10. Do girls bully more indirectly than boys?

11. Is the incidence of being bullied greater among grade six than grade eight students?

12. Is the frequency of bullying greater for individual victims among grade eight than among grade six victims?

13. Do bullies justify bullying more than other students?

Chapter two reviews relevant literature by focusing on theories of aggression and bullying, environmental factors related to bullying, definition of bullying and types of bullying. Chapter two also describes the prevalence of bullying in Europe, Japan, and Canada, and the group dynamics of bullying. Hypotheses for this research and their rationale are also explained in the chapter. Chapter three reports methodology including descriptions of participants, questionnaires, and procedures of the present study. Chapter four focuses on the results. Chapter five includes a detailed discussion of the results in the context of the various aspects raised in Chapter two. This last chapter concludes with a description of the limitations of the study and implications for future research.

Chapter Two: Literature Review

Theories of Aggression and Bullying

Aggressive behaviour arises in people for a variety of reasons, often from circumstance, frustration, or through injuries. This section will explore the frustration-aggression hypothesis, social learning theory, and the moral development model approach to explaining aggression and relate them to child bullying behaviour. In many cases, descriptions of bullying often mirror theories of human aggression; however, it is important to note that not all aggressive children are bullies.

Bullies are aggressive. But aggressive children are not always bullies. Although bullies choose a victim who has little influence within the bully's peer structure, but chronically-aggressive children who are not bullies behave aggressively toward anybody including peers who have high status in a peer group (Hazler, 1996; Ross, 1996). Thus, bullies usually enjoy an average popularity level while chronically-aggressive children have a low status among peers (Ross, 1996; Olweus, 1991; Foster, DeLawyer & Buevremont, 1986).

Frustration-Aggression Hypothesis

Early in the last century, aggressive people were thought to have internal innate drives different from those who were non-aggressive. Psychoanalytic theory, for example, suggested that every human inherently seeks pleasure and avoids pain and that this very basic concept of human nature is at the core of human mentality (Freud, 1933). This viewpoint implied that, if the ability to seek pleasure and avoid pain was blocked, then a person becomes aggressive.

Influenced by this psychoanalytic view, researchers at Yale University, Dollard, Doob, Miller, Mowrer and Sears, published the book titled "Frustration and Aggression" in 1939 claiming that every human has inherent biological tendencies to become aggressive when frustrated. Frustration, therefore, is an antecedent of aggression. But this belief has been questioned by other researchers who state frustration results in a variety of behavioral consequences, not only aggression. In addition, aggression, they say, can be elicited by a

variety of factors, not only via the feeling of frustration. For instance, Simpson and Yinger (1985) described some conditions that frustration does not result in aggression. According to them, members of a minority group can avoid, reform, and accept frustrating racial discrimination rather than responding aggressively. People who avoid contacting their minority group or who avoid contacting the dominant group are unlikely to respond aggressively to frustrating racial discrimination. People in a minority group might accept painful racial discrimination against them. In addition, they might protest non-violently or use legal approaches in order to improve the situation rather than attacking the dominant group violently.

Japanese researchers commonly view student frustration as one of the major causes of bullying in the school system (Fukaya, 1996; Morita, 1996, Takano, 1995; Taki, 1996). The Japanese point-of-view is that pressure on students to maintain high grades, severe teacher discipline and/or domestic abuse evoke frustration. Whatever pressure these students may be under, Japanese researchers agree that Japanese students portray signs of 'stressed out' behaviour. In 1996 Taki reported that a bully's aggressive personality can cause rather violent type of bullying, though he did not find a relationship between one's personality and other types of bullying. Taki's empirical research indicated that these bullies felt frustrated by outside factors. In contrast to the Japanese view on aggression, researchers from other parts of the world tend to focus on personal characteristics and experiences formed during child rearing years as causes of bullying (Ross, 1996).

Social Learning Theory

Some reinforcement theorists, such as Miller and Dollard (1941), admitted that if imitative behavior is reinforced, people can learn by observing others. However, unlike reinforcement theorists, Bandura (1965) explained that, without any direct reinforcement, people can learn by observing others or by vicarious experiences. For instance, he explored how children imitate the model's aggressive behaviour after children's observation of their models. Children in five treatment groups participated in the experiment. One group of nursery-school children was exposed to an aggressive adult model who behaved unusually

aggressive toward a bobo doll. Another group of children was exposed to a similar aggressive adult model, but in a film. Children in group three observed an aggressive cartoon character who behaved similarly aggressive toward a bobo doll. Children in the control group did not have any of these experiences. Children in the last group observed a non-aggressive adult model. According to Bandura, children who observed an aggressive human, filmed, or cartoon model behaved aggressively after the observation compared to the children in the control group and non-aggressive model group. Furthermore, he found that children who observed a non-aggressive model responded less aggressively than the children in the control group did. The results from this experiment clearly indicated that people can learn by observing others without any direct reinforcement or punishment.

Power-assertive parenting also evokes aggressive behaviour in children. Parents who use power assertive parenting try to control their children by using physical punishment, threats, or outbursts of their negative emotion. Parents are role models; if a parent displays aggressive behaviour in front of a child, a child in turn will learn this type of behaviour (Olweus, 1978; Bandura & Walters, 1959). One's peers can also become role models. One of the reasons why observers of bullying start harassing a victim is modelling (Olweus, 1978). This type of modelling occurs when the observer is frustrated and/or when the observer views the model's aggressive behaviour as appropriate (Bandura, 1973; Berkowitz, 1965). If the observer perceives that the bully/bullies feel good through acting out aggressive behaviour, the observer will therefore predict a positive outcome as a result of bullying (vicarious learning). According to Olweus, a child who does not hold a high status but who wants to gain acceptance will be more likely to imitate bullying behaviour.

Eron, Walder and Lefkowitz (1971) reported that children's tendencies toward aggressive behaviour were produced through parenting techniques. The same researchers also found instances where children became more aggressive after receiving punishment as a result of their aggressive behaviour because they held perceptions of their behaviour that were more powerful than any negative consequence that could be experienced. Children who viewed the punishment as fair were more likely to curtail their behaviour than children

who viewed the consequential punishment as unfair. Those who saw the punishment as unfair modelled the punishment as an effective way to solve interpersonal conflicts. These results indicate that how people perceive events is also an important factor.

Researchers explained that one's perception of an event and its environment is crucial in determining one's response (Bandura, 1986; Dodge & Coie, 1987; Perry, Perry & Rasmussen, 1986). For example, based on information processing theories, Huesmann (1977) introduced the concepts of scripts: the stored guidelines in memory concerning how to behave through his or her environment and how to solve social problems. These scripts are learned throughout one's life through observations, reinforcement, and one's other experiences. Usually these scripts are evaluated before they are used (Huesmann, 1988). Under this model, if a person behaves aggressively, it is because he/she learned aggressive scripts and if a person does not possess internal 'norms' prohibiting aggressive behavior, he/she is more likely to respond aggressively. Olweus (1978) reported that children can change their perception of a situation and eventually become aggressive. For example, if a child continuously witnesses a peer being bullied, the child may eventually begin to see the victim as deserving of the attacks.

Moral Reasoning

In many social occasions one makes a judgement about the appropriate action before he/she responds to a situation. Before one can make a judgement on appropriate actions, the concept of morality, convention, personal domain, and prudence must exist for an individual (Nucci, 1981; Smetana, 1982; Turiel, 1983). The concept of morality is related to whether an action is "right" or "wrong." Convention is related to the issues surrounding agreed upon societal norms, rules or roles. Personal domain concerns the issues surrounding individual's preference, perspective, and/or privacy. Prudence is related to the situation where a response could be potentially harmful to the self. When a personal judgement is made, more than one of the foregoing concepts is activated, depending on the circumstance and case.

Focusing on one's moral reasoning, a person under this model makes judgements based on underlying conceptions of justice in order to assess moral behaviours. Kohlberg (1969, 1976) wrote that a child's development in moral judgement consists of three levels: the pre-conventional, conventional and post-conventional.

At the pre-conventional level a person makes a moral judgement in terms of external consequences, such as punishment or reward. He or she will use the societal rules governing right and wrong by means of the punishment for negative behaviour. At the conventional level a person favours maintaining the status quo and internalizes right and wrong according to accepted societal regulations. A person operating at the conventional level is able to predict what effect his or her behaviour will have on others. Finally, at the post-conventional level a person makes judgments in terms of universal moral principles, believing in the validity of these principles regardless of the society in which he or she lives. Because each level has two sub-stages, this model has six moral judgement stages in total.

Kohlberg explained that these six developmental stages are universal, integrated and invariant. At which stage an individual processes information depends on his/her justice structures, cultural influences and past role models. People of all cultures can belong to any of the six developmental stages. In addition, individual's moral judgement stages in various aspects of his/her life tend to group together at a similar level. Thus, it is unlikely that a person would use stage 1 moral reasoning at one time, and stage 6 at another. Furthermore, each person moves through the six stages in the presented order; no one, for example, reaches the post-conventional stage without graduating from the pre-conventional and conventional stages.

Under this model researchers argued that antisocial aggressive behavior and one's stage of moral judgement are related (Blasi, 1980; Kohlberg, 1958). For instance, Kohlberg (1958) reported that delinquent boys tend to use lower levels of moral reasoning than do non-delinquent boys. Non-delinquent boys have the ability to consider the effect their actions will have on others, while delinquent boys are more self-centred in their

considerations. However, these research results are not consistent and the relationship between aggressive behaviour and moral judgment is still ambiguous (Guerra, Nucci, & Huesmann, 1994).

Many bullies do not consider their bullying behaviour as wrong (Olweus, 1978; Morita et al., 1985; Taki, 1996). Olweus (1978) found that a child with weak inhibitions of aggressive behavior was more likely to become a bully him/herself. Morita et al. (1985) wrote that students who bully do not think that they are morally-wrong for doing so. Morita et al. also found that 66 % of bullies justified their behaviour by claiming the victim acted wrongly and 'deserved' to be bullied. Taki (1996) found that bullies viewed commonly-unacceptable behaviour as wrong (such as stealing candy from a store), but fun. Under this same belief system, he also found that bullies did not see behaviors related to bullying, such as teasing, as wrong, but still claimed it was fun.

Because these researchers did not measure which mental process that bullies experienced while determining right and wrong behaviour patterns, it is difficult to determine how these moral reasoning theories can be applied to bullying. At the same time, it is clear that there is a relationship between a bully's moral reasoning and his or her behaviour.

Environmental Factors and Bullying

Environmental factors may also contribute, either directly or indirectly, to a child's aggressiveness. A child who lives in a stressful home and/or school environment may have a higher likelihood of becoming aggressive than a child who grows up amongst stability. Violent television programs and other environmental factors may also play a role.

According to Ross (1966), some parents accept bullying as 'natural' and at school, bullying is often ignored. Because of poor supervision at school, perhaps due to large classes and crowded conditions, it is easy to bully and be bullied without being noticed by a person of authority. In addition, according to Olweus (1980), child rearing years are extremely critical in determining one's later tendencies toward or away from aggression. Olweus claimed that a child who attains little warmth and tenderness from his/her parents

(especially from the mother) or who grows up with too much freedom and without set limits is more likely to become aggressive. As described before, power- assertive parenting can also cause children's aggression because children can observe and learn their parent's aggressive behaviour as a model (Olweus, 1978; Bandura and Walters, 1959).

Watching violent television programs seems to be related to children's aggressive behaviours (Friedrich-Cofer, Huston-Stein, Kipnis, Susman, and Clevitt, 1979). For instance, Liebert and Baron (1972) conducted an experiment concerning influences of violent television programs among five or six year-old and among eight or nine year-old children. Children in the aggressive program group watched a brief three-and-a-half minute excerpt from an actual violent television program. The segment included a chase, two fist fights, two shootings, and knifing. On the other hand, children in the nonaggressive program group were exposed to exciting three-and-a-half minute track race directly taken from a television sports program. In the segment, children observed athletes running around a track and jumping over hurdles. The segment for the aggressive group was as exciting as the one from nonaggressive group. After children observed either of the segments, they were taken to another room, and seated in front of "hurt" and "help" buttons. They were told that a child in the next room would try to play a game and win a prize. They were also told that the child would get hot and possibly get hurt or burned each time somebody pushed the "hurt" button. As a result of this experiment, Liebert and Baron (1972) reported that children who observed the aggressive television program pressed the "hurt" button more than the children who observed the nonaggressive television program. The results were the same for boys as well as girls and for both age groups.

However, some researchers criticized this experiment. According to Baron and Richardson (1994), pushing buttons to hurt somebody is not what people do when they become aggressive. Thus, pushing buttons is unrealistic for children to express their aggression. Furthermore, if the experimenters show the children an aggressive television program, the children might think that the experimenter approves of aggressive behaviours in such violent television programs. In addition, the three-and-a-half minute segment is too

short to represent the influence of violent television programs which children watch throughout their childhood.

In order to overcome these problems, researchers measured the effects of children's long time exposure -raging from several days to several decades- to violent television programs on their aggressive behaviours (Camino, Parke, & Berkowitz, 1975; Freshbach & Singer, 1971; Huesmann, Eron, Lefkowitz, & Walder, 1984; Milgram & Shotland, 1973;). Moreover, they observed children's actual aggressive behaviours in naturalistic settings. The results from these longitudinal studies were controversial. Some results partially support the effects of violent television programs on children's aggressive behaviours (Camino, Parke, & Berkowitz, 1975), but others did not (Feshbach & Singer,1971; Milgram & Shotland, 1973). Even though results were not consistent, children who watch violent television programs tended to behave more aggressively than other children who do not watch or seldom watch violent television programs (Freedman, 1984).

There are many possible environmental factors. Among those factors, parents' ignorance in viewing their children's bullying experiences as natural, poor supervision at school, poor child-parent relationship, and violent television programs are considered to be especially important.

Definition of Bullying

It is not easy to find a widely accepted, clear definition of bullying as it is an action that can take on different forms in various settings, including between people with distinctly different relationships. However, six common features of bullying, according to Farrington (1993), are:

> a physical, verbal or psychological attack or intimidation; an intention to cause fear, distress or harm to the victim; an imbalance of power, with the more powerful child oppressing the less powerful one, and repeated and unprovoked negative actions against the same child over a long period of time (p.21).

Although these features cover most actions that might be considered bullying, they do not mean that every act of bullying must include all six criteria. For instance, Morita et al.

(1985) described bullying as:

> Bullying occurs when one or more student(s) who is (are) superior in the interpersonal
> relationships of the group intend(s) to mentally or physically hurt somebody else in
> the same group. Furthermore, it is also bullying if one or more student(s) in the same
> group unintentionally participate in such actions, which result in mentally or
> physically hurting somebody else in the same group (p.4).

According to them the expression of 'in the same group' excludes an action such as
violence against a stranger on the street. The word 'group' includes both informal and
formal groups. 'Superior' may indicate social superiority, physical superiority and/or
superiority in the number of people involved on the bully's side. Finally, in this definition,
the expression 'intent to hurt' may mean different things to each participant in a situation.
For instance, one day a student intentionally hurts another student as the result of a teasing.
The student who inflicted the pain may not consider his or her actions to be bullying, but
according to Morita et al. it is considered bullying if the victim perceives it as such. The
action of bullying includes either a case whereby someone intentionally hurts someone
and/or the case whereby a victim simply feels that he or she is being hurt.

Olweus (1994), who is probably the most cited researcher in this area, considers
bullying as:

> A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and
> over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students. It is a
> negative action when someone intentionally inflicts or attempts to inflict injury or
> discomfort upon another - basically what is implied in the definition of aggressive
> behaviour... In order to use the term bullying, there should also be an imbalance in
> strength (an asymmetric power relationship): the student who is exposed to the
> negative actions has difficulty in defending him/herself and is somewhat helpless
> against the student or students who harass" (p. 1173).

The major difference between Morita et al and Olweus' definitions is their perception of the
length of time the activity covers. Morita et al. consider bullying a negative action which

may occur only once as long as the victim considers his or her experience as that of being bullied whereas according to Olweus, bullying is 'repeated negative actions', excluding actions that occur only once. It is import to recognize these differences when comparing research. The present research uses Morita's et al. definition.

Types of Bullying

Several types of bullying exist and Tuttum and Herbert (1993) identified five specific types: physical, verbal, gesture, extortion and exclusion. Physical bullying includes hitting, kicking and more violent attacks, sometimes utilizing a weapon. Verbal bullying can be teasing, insulting, and so on. If a bully threatens physical harm to a victim, it is Gesture bullying. Extortion bullying involves taking valuables, such as money, from a victim, while exclusion bullying involves ignoring a victim, leaving a victim out of an activity, and so on.

Different types of bullying have prevalence in different countries. Hoover, Oliver and Thomson (1993) noted that verbal bullying is most prevalent in the United States. Girls, also, mostly engaged in verbal or exclusion bullying while a high percentage of boys participated in physical bullying. In addition, Olweus (1991) from Norway mentioned that there are two kinds of bullying: direct and indirect bullying. he defined direct bullying as "relatively open attacks on the victim; indirect bullying is "bullying in the form of social isolation and exclusion from a group" (p.413). Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz and Kaukiainen (1992) from Finland explained that direct physical aggression, such as hitting, pushing, and kicking, direct verbal aggression, such as name-calling and threatening, and indirect aggression, which includes telling tales, spreading rumours, and persuading others not to play with someone, are different kinds of aggressive behaviors. Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, and Peltonen (1988) mentioned that this distinction could be applied to bullying because bullying is one kind of aggressive behaviour that is found in children. Finally, in Italy, children frequently call each other names, while physical forms of bullying and extortion also occurred (Genta, Menesini, Fonzi, Costabile and Smith, 1996).

In Canada, according to Bentley (1994), calling nasty names was the most frequently reported bullying. Students in her study also frequently reported bullying in the forms of physically hurting, rumour spreading, threatening, social exclusion, calling names about colour or race, taking one's belongings, in this order.

Many countries have similar patterns of bullying and researchers have found similarities between incidences of bullying in Europe and North America including Canada, and even, in some cases, Japan (Hoover, Oliver, & Thomson, 1993). The difference between countries seems to be quantitative rather than qualitative (Hoover, Oliver, & Hazler, 1992). However, many Japanese researchers believe that bullying in Japan is unique.

Students' Experiences of Bullying

Researchers from different countries have reported different rates of bully-victim problems. For example, in 1983, Olweus' anonymous self-report questionnaire was used in order to study bully-victim problems among 130,000 students, aged 7 to16 in the Norwegian comprehensive schools. Olweus (1991) reported that 15% of the students in the comprehensive schools in Norway are somehow involved in bully-victim problems either as bullies or victims.

Using a modified version of the Olweus questionnaire, Whitney and Smith (1993) studied bully-victim problems among 7,000 students, aged 8 to 16 in England. According to these researchers, 27% of the students in junior middle schools state that they have been bullied sometime in a term, and 10% of the students admit that bullying occurs at least once a week. Both Olweus and Whitney and Smith found that the frequency of being bullied decreases with age, but the frequency of bullying others does not. Also, they both reported that the incidence of bullying does not correlate with the class or school size.

Although they were not as large-scale as the two research projects described above, other research has been conducted in Europe, North America, Australia, and Japan. For instance, according to O'Moore and Hillery (1989), 8% of the students, aged 7 to13 in Ireland were bullied frequently, and 2.5% of them frequently bully others. In Japan, Hirano

(1991) used a Japanese version of Olweus' questionnaire to study bully-victim problems among 716 students aged 10 to15. According to her, about 15% of elementary school students and 10% of junior high school students said that they were sometimes bullied during the semester. Furthermore, 21% of grade 5 students were sometimes bullied, which is higher than the percentage found in other grades. On the other hand, the percentage of students who were bullied at least once a week is basically uniform throughout the grades -- about 4% of the total number of students in each grade. Although 15.8% of junior high school boys agreed that they were bullied, only about 4% of the girls in junior high schools reported similar acts. When compared to the percentages of other grades, the highest percentage of bullying others was found among grade 7 students. In addition, she found that more students bully others in junior high school (grades 7 to 9) than in elementary school (grades 5 and 6). As compared to 5.3% of junior high school students, only 0.3% of elementary school students bully others at least once a week. From these results, she suggested that several students tend to repeatedly bully the same junior high school students.

In Canada, Charach, Pepler, and Ziegler (1995) obtained answers from the English version of Olweus' self-report questionnaires from 211 Toronto students, aged 4 to 14. According to the researchers, 20% of the students said that they were bullied more than once or twice during the term. In addition, 8% of the students were bullied regularly -- once a week or more often. This figure is about twice as high as those incidents reported by the students in Olweus' and Hirano's research. With regard to students' experiences of bullying others, 15% of the students answered that they bully others more than once or twice during the term. Moreover, only 2% of the students reported that they engaged in bullying once a week or more often.

Because Morita et al. (1985) did not use Olweus' self-report questionnaire, the data from his research is not directly comparable to the above-mentioned research. Morita et al. reported that about 69% of the students have either bullied others or have been bullied. In his research, 48% of the students reported that they have bullied others (or have bullied

others and have been bullied), and 53% of the students answered that they had been bullied (or had bullied others and had been bullied). Moreover, according to Morita et al., bullying existed in every one of 44 classes. In 6 of the classes, all of the students reported that they had bullied in their homeroom classes; 95 to 100% of 17 of the classes answered that they had received bullying in their homeroom classes.

Bullying in A Group Structure

Even though many researchers focus on bully-victim relationships, there is very little empirical research that treats bullying in a group context. However, bullying among school children is collective in its nature and is based on the social relationships within the group (Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Berts, and King, 1982; Craig and Pepler, 1995; Salmivalli et al., 1996).

For example, Morita emphasized the importance of the other students in the group who surround the bully/victim relationship. He referred to the students who surround the bully and the victim as audiences, bystanders and defenders. Audiences include those students who watch and enjoy bullying. Although audiences do not actively participate in bullying, they directly encourage the bullies by making fun of their victims. On the other hand, bystanders also watch the bullying, but they pretend to not be doing so. Unlike audiences, bystanders do not directly encourage bullies. Nonetheless, the latter may perceive the former as supportive because they do not say anything to the contrary. Defenders are those who try to stop the bullying by doing something, such as reporting it to their teachers or telling the bullies to stop their negative behavior.

According to Morita et al., bullying roles may change with the situation. Today's bullies can become tomorrow's victims. There are many cases whereby a person who is a member of the audience becomes a bully or a victim. Morita et al. explained that it is difficult to see bullying from outside the group because audiences and bystanders function as a barrier. It is not easy for audiences and bystanders to become defenders or to tell their teachers and parents about bullying because they are afraid of becoming victims themselves. Thus, they either support the bullying or pretend that they have not seen it.

Morita further says that the barrier complicates the problem of bullying. Because of the barrier to communication and the fact that students issue few signals, teachers barely even notice that the bullying occurred in their own classrooms.

If one is to gain a better understanding of the concept of bullying, it is important to not only know about bullies and their victims, but to also be aware of the other students who surround them – namely, the audiences, the bystanders, and the defenders. Morita et al. explained that that would be the first step in solving the complicated problem of bullying. Appropriate intervention requires an understanding of the social psychological variables that support bullying.

Like Morita, other researchers have viewed bullying as a group process (Bjorkqvist et al., 1982 Craig & Pepler, 1995; Fukaya, 1996; Pikas, 1975; Lagerspetz et al., 1982; Salmivalli et al., 1996; Yamazaki, 1985). For instance, Salmivalli et al. (1996) explained that students take one of six participant roles when bullying occurs: victim, bully, reinforcer of the bully, assistant to the bully, defender of the victim, or the outsider. Craig and Pepler (1995) identified seven different roles of students in a bullying situation: bully, victim, bully-victim, active peer, peer onlooker, peer in joint, and peer intervener.

Even though the number of roles and the words used for these roles may vary from researcher to researcher, researchers seem to share very similar classifications of the roles of students in situations where bullying occurs. For example, the audience described by Morita et al. (1985), the reinforcer of bullying depicted by Salmivalli et al. (1996), and the peer onlooker set forth by Craig and Pepler (1995) are all very similar concepts. If students come around to see the bullying situation or if they are actively involved in observing the bullying, even if they themselves do not directly participate in the bullying activity, they are nonetheless referred to as the audience, the reinforcers, or the peer onlookers.

Next, there are those who remain outside the bullying situation or who pretend not to notice the bullying. In Morita's et al. research, they were defined as bystanders; in Salmivalli's et al. research, they were seen as outsiders, and in Craig and Pepler's research, they were "peers in joint." All three researchers used the word "bully" to refer to those who

mistreat somebody else and the word "victim" for those who are bullied by somebody. Terms such as peer interveners and defenders are used for those who actually try to stop the bullying.

The only difference in the classification of the students' roles is the inclusion of assistant roles in the bullying situation. Salmivalli et al. and Craig and Pepler distinguished students who assist bullies, but do not partake as leaders. These students, called assistant to the bully or active peer, assisted by joining in the bullying, catching the victim, and/or holding the victim, and they were referred to as assistants or active peers of the bully. According to them, they are different from the students who reinforce bullying by laughing or making fun of the victim, but do not join in the bullying. On the other hand, Morita et al. viewed these students as bullies.

A Brief Description of Morita's Research

Because the present research used an adapted version of the questionnaire developed by Morita et al. (1985), it is important to describe their research, the survey of which took place from September 25 to October 20, 1984. They explained that, prior to this, most of the research in this field focused only on bully/victim relationships. Morita et al. emphasized the importance of focusing on the other children who surround the bully and his/her victims. Therefore, the purpose of his research was to explore the problem of bullying in the group dynamics of a class which included teachers, bullies, victims, and other students in the class.

In their study, they described the following characteristics as independent variables: the school, the sex, the family, the socioeconomic status, the experience of changing schools, the grade, the attendance at school, and student willingness for further education. They established the following bullying behaviors as dependent variables: bullying experiences, types of bullying, the number of students who were involved in bullying, the duration of bullying, the involvement in bullying, and the attitudes toward bullying. In addition, some other variables, such as the value systems, the rules and group norms, the perceptions of

interpersonal relationships with classmates and teachers, the class interpersonal structure (i.e., actual interpersonal relationships with teachers and friends), were included as independent or dependent variables in the analyses.

Morita et al. hypothesized that students' value systems in their classrooms mainly consist of their attitudes toward rules and regulations, group tasks, authorities, and group conformity. Based on this hypothetical model, they analyzed the data to discover the relationships between these attitudes and students' involvement in bullying situations.

Morita et al. also explored the relationship between students' attitudes toward formal rules and informal group norms and their involvement in bullying situations. They found some relationships between these variables.

Morita et al. conducted a two-step procedure. First, they used random sampling to choose 11 grade six classes in elementary schools from each area, Tokyo and Osaka. Second, they chose 22 junior high schools, which are located in the same school district as the 22 elementary schools mentioned above. They selected 22 classes from various junior high schools.

After intensive analysis of the data, they reported some important results. For instance, they found that students' attitude toward bullying was correlated with their involvement in bullying. That is to say, students who have positive attitude toward bullying were more likely to bully others. Victims tended to have negative attitude toward bullying. In addition, those who have positive attitude toward bullying tended to think that they do not have to follow school rules if they do not like them. On the other hand, those who have negative attitude toward bullying tended to obey school rules and their teachers no matter how they think about them.

Furthermore, according to these researchers, victims tended to possess rigid thinking against deviant behavior and deviant students. On the other hand, students who bully others tended to be flexible against such deviant behaviors and deviant students.

Morita et al. explained that students' academic achievement was also related to their involvement in bullying. They found that the students who received lower grades and/or

who expected a lower level of education had a higher possibility of becoming a victim as compared to others.

The number of friends seemed to be correlated with students' involvement in bullying. They reported that victims tend to have fewer friends compared to others. There were many victims, especially boys, who did not ask their friends for help. In addition, students who had many friends tended to have positive attitudes toward bullying.

Rationale for the Hypotheses

Attitudes toward Authority

Victims. Olweus (1994) described two types of victims: passive victims and provocative victims. According to him, provocative victims are somewhat anxious and aggressive. Ross (1996) explained that provocative victims are active, assertive and confident. Moreover, because they are usually hot-tempered, they often fight-back. In addition, their concentration is usually poor and they are difficult to manage. Their behaviour, such as teasing, makes their friends irritable. Thus, they are often the most unpopular among their peers (Olweus, 1978). Olweus (1994) explained that the number of provocative victims is relatively smaller than that of passive victims. That is, most victims are passive victims. He explained that passive victims have negative personality characteristics, submissive reaction to others, and/or are physically weak boys. These are important factors that encourage the development of bullying. However, empirical data does not support the premise that victimization is caused by victims' external deviations. Olweus argued that passive victims, as compared to other students, are generally anxious, insecure, cautious, sensitive, and quiet. Furthermore, they often have low self-esteem and feel stupid, ashamed, and unattractive. He also mentioned that being bullied might increase passive victims' anxieties, insecurities, and their negative evaluations of themselves.

Researchers have viewed the characteristics of passive victims in a similar way. Bjorkqvist (1982), a researcher in Finland, explained that victims feel inferior to others in many areas of life. According to him, victims score low in intelligence and dominance.

Although their scores in the ego picture on depression are very high, their scores on personal attractiveness are very low. According to Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Berts, and King (1982), victims are physically weaker than their peers. Furthermore, not only are they physically weaker, but they are often overweight or handicapped. In spite of the fact that Olweus reported that victimization is not usually caused by victims' external deviations, Lagerspetz et al. explained that physical weakness, being overweight and other handicaps can encourage victimization. Furthermore, they mentioned that victims have lower self-esteem, are more dependent, and hold a more positive attitude toward their teachers. Interestingly, their results, concerning the victims' higher dependence and positive attitude toward their teachers are very similar to those given by Morita's et al. (1985) with Japanese participants. In order to measure the students' attitudes toward authority, Morita et al. asked participants about obeying more capable others and obedience to teachers. He found that victims have a greater tendency to submit than do others.

Researchers, such as Bjorkqvist (1982), Olweus (1994), Lagerspetz et al. (1982), and Morita et al. (1985), seem to agree with the fact that passive victims are generally viewed as being inferior to others. In addition, they are often physically weaker than other students and may be deviant as a result of being overweight or other handicaps. As Lagerspetz explained, passive victims tend to have a higher dependence on others and possess a positive attitude toward their teachers. If they feel inferior to others, it is expected that this feeling of inferiority may cause them to submit to authority more than others do. Therefore, similar to the Japanese victims, it is expected that Canadian passive victims would answer that they tend to submit to authority.

However, these characteristics of passive victims are not necessarily viewed as causes of bullying. For instance, Lagerspetz et al. (1982) argued that these characteristics of victims could possibly be one of the causes and one of the consequences of bullying. Furthermore, Taki (1996), a Japanese researcher, did not view victims' characteristics as a major cause of bullying. This is because he did not find any significant relationship between victims' characteristics and any types of bullying in his research. According to

him, the characteristics of victims should not be treated as causes, but rather as their vulnerabilities. A vulnerability, such as physical weakness or lack of social skills, may make the child a target in an environment where bullying can easily occur, such as a stressful school situation. Thus, Taki suggested that major causes of bullying probably exists on the side of bullies in a certain environment which allows them to bully someone, but not on the side of victims who have certain characteristics.

Bullies. Researchers from different countries have described typical characteristics of bullies in a similar manner. Olweus (1994) reported that bullies are typically aggressive towards both their peers and adults. They often have a strong need to dominate others and do not really empathize with their victims. Among boys, bullies tend to be physically stronger than others, especially as compared to the victims. Contrary to the common view among psychologists, Olweus observed that the bullies in his research were more anxious and insecure. However, he reported that they do not have low self-esteem. Bjorkqvist et al. (1982) reported that bullies are usually physically stronger and feel themselves to be dominant over others. Moreover, they have a preference for dominating others, and think that the social norms require this type of behaviour. Since it is difficult for bullies to control their impulses and feelings, it is not surprising that their behaviour is very dominant when bullying others. Similarly, Stephenson and Smith (1988) from England reported that typical bullies are often aggressive, physically strong, active and assertive. In addition, Yamazaki (1985) from Japan explained that bullies usually have weak self-regulation against aggressive behaviour. Thus, they often respond to any kind of stimulus aggressively.

All of these researchers from different countries, not surprisingly, agree that typical bullies are aggressive. Morita et al. (1985) reported that bullies tend to reject authority more than others do. If bullies are aggressive, they may respond to school authorities aggressively. Therefore, it is expected that Canadian bullies would probably reject authorities as Japanese bullies do. One may assume that Canadian bullies would probably answer that they prefer student-oriented decision-making, and do not readily obey others,

such as those in positions of authority at school. Moreover, they would not easily submit to their friends.

Defenders and Devotion to Group Tasks

Just like bullies and victims, researchers from different countries have described similarities among defenders. According to Salmivalli et al. (1996), defenders of victims are the most popular among students. They explained that 30% of the girls take the role of defender because peers appreciate their behaviour. On the other hand, only 4.5% of the boys are defenders. Although, according to Salmivalli et al., defending victims goes against the norm of a boy's group, high status allows certain students to defend victims.

Similarly, in Morita's et al. (1985) research, defenders were very sociable and tended to have more friends than others. Coie, Dodge, and Kupersmidt (1990) found that high-status children tend to behave very sociably. Morita et al. explained that defenders showed devotion to group tasks more than others do. If Canadian defenders also had as high a status as the defenders in Salmivall's et al. study and Morita's research, they probably would behave more sociably, as Coie et al. explained. Thus, it is expected that Canadian defenders will also show more devotion to group tasks than other students, such as bullies.

Attitude toward Rules

It is assumed that bullies dislike creating rules more than others. More than this, as compared to others, they more strongly think that it is okay to break rules. Morita et al. (1985) explained that attitudes toward formal rules and informal group norms among students are related to the participant roles. They found that the students are divided into two distinct groups: pro-rule students and anti-rule students. Pro-rule students tend to obey rules. On the other hand, anti-rule students tend to think that it is acceptable to break rules; they dislike setting up rules, reject obeying any kind of authority, dislike the pressure to conform, and admit to acts of violence and bullying. Morita et al. mentioned that bullies and bullies/victims seem to be categorized as anti-rule students, but victims, bystanders,

and stoppers tend to be pro-rule students. Moreover, audiences appear to be a mixture of pro- and anti-rule students. According to Morita, these results suggest that attitudes toward formal rules and informal group norms seem to be important factors that divide students into those who bully others and those who do not.

In addition to Morita, many other researchers have found that bullies tend to reject rules (Bjorkqvist et al., 1982; Hoover and Hazler, 1991; Lagerspetz et al., 1982; Olweus, 1991). For instance, Olweus (1991) mentioned that a bully's behavior can be viewed as anti-social and rule-breaking. According to him, there is a greater possibility that this type of student will engage in criminal activity and/or alcohol abuse. He explained that about 60% of bullies were convicted at least once by 24 years of age. He further stated that only 10% of boys, who were neither bullies nor victims in grades 6 to 9, have three or more convictions by the age of 24. However, from 35-40% of the former bullies have three or more convictions at the same age. From this picture of typical bullies, it is predicted that Canadian bullies will dislike creating rules more than others do, and they are also more likely to break them.

Group Conformity

Morita et al. explained that the defenders in their research usually noticed others' strengths, were independent from the pressures of group conformity, and preferred to be disciplined by students themselves. According to his analysis, they were independent from the pressures of group conformity because they felt that they had the support of their classmates.

As mentioned earlier, researchers reported that defenders are usually popular among their peers and behave in socially acceptable ways (Morita et al., 1985; Salmivalli et al, 1996). If Canadian defenders are popular as well, it is expected that they would view their classmates as supportive of them. This would allow them to be independent from the pressures of group conformity, and follow what they believe is the right thing to do.

Academic Achievement

Victims seem to achieve lower grades than others. Morita et al. (1985) found that there was a strong relationship between being a victim and having low grades. Furthermore, Scandinavian researcher reported that victims often suffer from low self-esteem and poor academic performance at school (Olweus, 1978; Roland, 1980).

This can also be applied to Canadian victims. Hazler (1996) explained that a victim cannot concentrate on school work because too much time is spent on worrying about the relationship problems with peers. Thus, probably a Canadian victim is also afraid of possible attacks and cannot help thinking of protection. Under such circumstances, it is more likely that they are not able to concentrate on their schoolwork. Thus, it is expected that Canadian victims get lower grades in school and expect a lower level of education just as Japanese victims in Morita's et al. (1985) study did.

Friends

Some researchers reported that there is a correlation between friendship and the degree to which students get involved in bullying. For example, Morita et al. stated that victims tended to have fewer friends than others do. Furthermore, they found that there was a strong relationship between being a bystander and having no friends. In addition, Hirano (1991) reported that the more students are victimized, the fewer friends they have. She stated that victims appear to not enjoy breaks between classes and tended to spend the time alone. Furthermore, Ahmad and Smith (1990) found a correlation between the frequency of being bullied and the frequency of being alone during breaks between classes. On the other hand, these British researchers found no relationship between the frequency of being bullied and the number of friends and the frequency of being bullied and their feelings about breaks between classes. Finally, Olweus (1984) stated that passive victims are usually lonely and without friends. Therefore, Canadian victims are also expected to have fewer friends than others.

Tolerance

Researchers have reported that victims are usually less tolerant of deviant students than others. For instance, Morita et al. (1985) found that there was a relationship between the attitude of students toward deviant students, or so-called, "bad guys," and the possibility of being victimized. For example, bullies/victims and victims tend to avoid or never interact with bad guys, but bystanders tend to answer that it is all right to interact with them.

Furthermore, they reported that victims tended to reject deviant behaviors. Victims appeared to depend on the rules and norms created by others. In other words, victims seemed to think that they "have to obey any rules because they are rules"; thus, they are not flexible when it comes to considering other options. If victims express such attitudes toward their peers, it is highly possible for victims to get rejected by their peers. Morita et al. explained that victims' rigid thinking against deviant behaviors and deviant students might be related to causes of bullying.

According to Perry, Kusel, &Perry (1988), victims were often children who have been rejected by their peers. Shantz (1986) reported that not only an aggressive victim's behavior, but also a non-aggressive and rejected child's behavior may elicit attack. These children were sometimes stubborn and tried to influence others or refused to be influenced by others. In addition, according to Coie (1987), these children cannot ignore the aggressive attempts of their peers. Victims in Canada may also be rigid against deviant behavior. Therefore, victims are probably less tolerant of deviant students than are other students.

Gender

A great many researchers from different countries have reported that there is a strong relationship between students' gender and their experiences of bullying. Salmivalli et al. (1996) explained that a student's sex is one of the most significant factors in the distribution of participant roles. According to them, boys are more likely than girls to become bullies, reinforcers, and assistants. On the other hand, girls tend to take the roles of

defenders and bystanders. They mentioned that a boy's use of aggression to create social order and a girl's greater ability for empathy (Hoffman, 1977) may be responsible for the sex differences in bullying. Moreover, in Morita's et al.(1985) research, they found that 54% of boys and 43 % of girls answered that they have bullied somebody.

Along with Salmivalli and Morita, other researchers from different countries have also reported that more boys tend to bully others than girls. Olweus (1991) found that boys, particularly those in junior high school, tended to be more exposed to the problems of bullying than girls. According to him, more than 60% of the girls in grades 5 to 7 who were bullied reported that boys were the ones who bullied them. Furthermore, more than 80% of bullied boys also answered that boys, not girls, bullied them. According to Charach et al. (1995), 20% of boys and 21% of girls in a Toronto survey reported being victimised, but 23% of boys and only 8% of girls, the latter being almost one third of the former's figure, acknowledged bullying more than twice per term. Thus, among the Canadian students in the present research, more boys are expected to bully others than girls.

In addition, researchers have reported that boys tend to be involved in more violent forms of bullying than girls. According to Morita, 69% of junior high school boys answered that a classmate might pretend to horse around, but was actually bullying another student by means of hitting or kicking that person. 20% of junior high school boys say that a peer may bully someone by taking his clothing. These results suggest that a high percentage of junior high school boys actually witness very violent bullying that is more than likely done by their male, as opposed to their female, classmates. Moreover, Hirano (1991) reported that boys were often involved in violent bullying, but girls tended to be involved in more indirect forms of bullying, such as exclusion from a group. Similarly, Olweus (1991) mentioned that boys were more often victims and bullies of direct forms of bullying that were relatively violent; on the other hand, girls tended to be engaged in more indirect forms of bullying, such as social isolation from a group. Therefore, it is expected that Canadian boys will tend to be involved in more violent forms of bullying, while girls will tend to be engaged in more indirect forms of bullying, such as exclusion from a group.

Age

Researchers from different countries have explained that a student's age plays an important role in bullying. Using Olweus' questionnaire, researchers from Norway, England, and Italy, found a decrease in the experience of older students being bullied (Olweus, 1991; Whitney & Smith, 1993; Genta et al, 1996). However, they did not find a significant decrease in their experiences of bullying others. Moreover, in Canada, Charach et al. (1995) explained that the results concerning the relationship between a student's age and acts of bullying are similar to those in Norwegian and British surveys. According to them, younger students report more incidents of being bullied than older children.

In Japan, Hirano (1991) reported similar results in her research concerning the bullying experiences of students in grades 5 to 9. According to her, 21% of grade 5 students reported that they were bullied at least sometime during the term. That is, more grade 5 students reported being bullied by others than do the students of later grades. On the other hand, regarding a student's experience of bullying others, Hirano found slightly different results. She observed that almost 24% of grade 7 students reported bullying others. Because this tendency was not found in the Norwegian and British studies, she concluded that this might be unique to bullying in Japan.

Even though Morita et al. (1985) did not use Olweus's questionnaire, more grade 6 students reported that they are bullied than grade 8 students. According to Olweus, 62% of grade 5 students and 44% of grade 8 students answered that they were bullied by others, or that they bullied others and were also bullied. On the other hand, 53 % of grade 6 students and 44% of grade 8 students reported bullying others or bullying others and were also bullied. However, these results are not directly comparable to the results of the research described above, as Morita et al. did not use Olweus' questionnaire, and he restricted his research to only grade 6 and 8 students.

Overall, all the research from Norway, England, Italy, Canada, and Japan indicated that more elementary than junior high school students report being bullied. As a result,

there is a very strong possibility that more grade 6 than grade 8 students in the present study would also report their experiences of being bullied.

If a decrease in the number of the students who report being bullied are found, it is important to consider the significance of this decrease. Olweus (1991) mentioned that a considerable number of older students bully younger students. He interpreted the decrease as reasonable because older students have fewer possible bullies older than themselves.

On the other hand, according to Morita (1996), the decrease in the incidence of bullying with age does not mean that the incidence of bullying declines. He concluded that where junior high school is concerned, he found that the same child tended to be bullied over and over again. The average number of students who reported being bullied is 4.5 students per class in elementary school and 2.1 students per class in junior high school. In addition, the average number of students who were bullied and also bully others was 5.7 students per class in elementary school and 2.1 students per class in junior high school. The average number of students who report bullying others is 5.3 students per class in elementary school and 5.8 students per class in junior high school. He explained that bullies and victims in elementary school are probably not the same children all the time because the number of students who were bullied and who also bully others was relatively high when compared to the number of junior high school students. This means that the roles of elementary school children in bullying situations are not fixed. On the other hand, in junior high schools, the same children tended to always be victimized because the number of the students who were bullied and also bully others was relatively low when compared to the number of victims in elementary school. He mentioned that the bullying in junior high school was no higher than in elementary school because the average number of students who reported bullying others was almost identical to that of other elementary and junior high schools.

Furthermore, the data showed that bullying in junior high school occurred over longer periods of time than bullying in elementary school. He stated that 8.9% of elementary school students and 23 % of junior high schools students answered that the most

recent bullying had occurred over the previous 6 months. Therefore, according to him, the situation in junior high school could be worse because the same students tended to be bullied by others over and over again and for a longer time. Based on these results, the frequency of bullying will probably be greater among grade 8 than among grade6 individual victims.

Attitude toward Bullying

Researchers have reported that a student's perception of bullying is directly related to their involvement in it. For example, Morita reported that bullies, bullies/victims, and audiences tended to answer that bullying was not a serious problem. It should be noted that about 53% of the bullies stated that bullying was not wrong; on the other hand, only about 40% of victims thought that bullying was wrong, and 25% of victims chose "I don't know" as their response. According to Morita, close to 60% of bullies, bullies/victims, and audiences answered that they bullied somebody because they felt that the person was wrong or bad. In addition, Hirano (1991) reported that about 60% of Japanese students had a positive attitude against bullying answered that they would join in bullying somebody whom they do not like. Similarly, in Canada, Charach et al. (1995) stated that bullies were more likely to answer "did not feel much" when they were asked how they feel about watching bullying. Based on the results of this research, it is expected that students' perceptions of bullying will be related to their direct involvement in the problem. In particular, Canadian bullies probably justify the act of bullying more than other Canadian students.

Research Framework

As mentioned above, the present study builds on the results of Morita's et al. research. In their research, they emphasized the importance of treating bullying problems in a group context. Their notion regarding the group dynamics of bullying is directly applied to this research. Therefore, it is hypothesized that if a class has a bullying problem, each student in a Canadian classroom will take on one of the following roles: bully, victim,

bully/victim, bystander, defender, or audience.

Dependent variables for this research include the following factors: a student's academic achievement, the numbers of friends he has and their attitudes toward authority, group tasks, rules, group conformity, deviant students, and bullying. These particular variables were chosen because there is a significant correlation between these variables and a student's involvement in bullying situations, as found in Morita and others' research. Independent variables include a student's involvement in bullying and the gender and age of the student.

Hypotheses

Most of the hypotheses focus on the relationships between the independent variables, as outlined in the framework of the research section and students' involvement in bullying. These hypotheses include:

Attitudes toward authority

1. Victims are more submissive to authority than are others.

2. Bullies reject authority more than others.

Devotion to group tasks

3. Defenders show more devotion to group tasks than others.

Attitudes toward rules

4. Bullies dislike creating rules more than others do. Moreover, they think that it is more acceptable to break rules as compared to others.

Group conformity

5. Victims are more aware of the pressure to conform to a group than others are.

Academic achievement

6. Victims tend to get lower grades in school and expect a lower level of education.

Friends

7. The number of friends who are reported by victims are lower than those of people in other roles.

Tolerance

8. Victims are less tolerant of deviant students than others.

<u>Gender</u>

9. More boys than girls bully others.

10. Girls bully more indirectly than boys.

<u>Age</u>

11. The incidence of being bullied is greater among grade six than grade eight students.

12. The frequency of bullying will be greater for individual victims among grade eight than among grade six victims.

<u>Attitude towards bullying</u>

13. Bullies justify bullying more than other students.

Chapter Three: Methodology

Participants

Students under the Calgary Board of Education's supervision in 9 grade six classes and 27 grade eight classes participated in the survey - consisting of three elementary and six junior high schools located in middle socio-economic status areas of the city. The age of grade six students is 11 to12 years-old, and grade eight students are 13 to 14 years-old. The samples' schools were volunteered by their principals. About 56 % of elementary students and 71 % of junior high students agreed to answer the survey questions, with consent of their parents. A total of 656 students (98 grade six and 558 grade eight students) took the survey. Approximately half of the 656 students were male (329 students) and the rest of the students were female (327 students). In grade six, 45 students (46%) were male and 53 students (54%) were female. In grade 8, 284 students (51%) were male and 274 students (49%) were female. The percentage of the students who took the survey in a class ranged from 18% to 100%. The low percentages for some classes reflected that many students did not return the consent forms. Students were encouraged to contact their teacher if they had any questions.

Questionnaire

In order to understand the relationship among bullies, victims, audiences and defenders Morita et al.(1985) developed a self-report questionnaire, which can be divided into four categories: general information; value systems and perceptions of rules; friendships; and structures in a classroom. An adapted version of this questionnaire was used to evaluate bullying in Canada.

The category of general information consists of questions regarding school, gender, occupation of parents, economical status, experiences of changing schools, grades, attendance and future education expectations. Value systems and perceptions of rules include questions concerning attitudes toward rules and non-conformity. The friendship category contained questions about relationships between classmates. The structure category consists of questions concerning relationships between the class and teacher.

Morita et al. (1985) believed the above factors interact and change according to variables like the frequency and forms of bullying, and the number of bullies in a classroom and attitudes toward them. The questionnaire's reliability and validity was not mentioned in their report.

The questionnaire was modified to reflect language and cultural differences and to make it more user friendly. Some questions were deleted for the Canadian sample because they were deemed 'inappropriate.' Questions, such as "What is your father's job", "When you come back home from school, who is usually at home", or "How scary is your home room teacher to you?" were deleted. Furthermore, question eight of the original version of the questionnaire was "your classmates decided that they are going to do something after school, but you have to go to your 'juku' (a cram school) after school. What are you going to do?" However, schools like juku do not exist in Canada. Therefore, that part was changed to "the piano lesson". Although the content of the questions remained the same, the ways of answering some questions were modified for the students. For instance, a Likert scale is applied to seven questions because a Likert scale is viewed as easier for the students to answer. Some examples of the questions which Likert scales were applied are: "When you do a class class activity with your classmates, do you think that 'I do not want to do this, I am not interested?'", "When you are supposed to do a class activity with your classmates, do you somehow try to avoid doing the activity?", "Suppose that you wanted to improve the students' behaviour in your class, Would you create many rules for them to follow?", or "Are there any school rules which are not needed for you?". Alternatives ranged from strongly agree, through agree, don't know, and disagree to strongly agree.

Procedures

The survey was conducted between November and December, 1998. The author went to each school and explained the purpose and procedure of the survey, in detail, to the participating teachers and gave consent letters for the teachers, parents and students to sign that indicated possible risks and the right of withdrawal. Only students who completed the consent form were allowed to take the survey (see Appendix A). In addition, a cover letter

informing the participants of the purpose of the study, the time required to complete the questionnaire and details about the author were given out (see Appendix B).

The students' homeroom teachers administered the questionnaire. Teachers discussed the parameters of the survey with the students, highlighting the following points: the survey should be taken seriously; the purpose of the research; the survey would remain anonymous; teachers will not view the results of the survey; the completed questionnaires will be stored in a locked cabinet for two years and shredded afterwards.

During the data collection sessions, which lasted an hour, students were not allowed to leave the classroom or speak, except to ask the teacher a question. Elementary school teachers read out the questions to the class as it aided student comprehension. When the survey was completed, the forms were put directly into an envelope provided by the author, sealed, and these sealed envelopes were collected.

Chapter Four: Results

Previous Bullying Experiences

In the present study, 52% of grade six students and 70% of grade eight students reported their experiences of bullying others (Table 1). In addition, 85% of grade six students and 75% of grade eight students reported that they have been bullied. These results indicate that bullying problems are prevalent among the students.

Students' Experiences as Victims of Bullies

Students were asked to select possible reasons for why they had been targets of bullying. Physical appearance (40%), not following what everybody else decided (39%), and personality (36%) were the top three reasons students cited for having been bullied. Chi - square tests were calculated to determine grade and/or gender differences in the number of students bullied for each reason. For these and other tests of significance, the .05 alpha level has been selected.

Grade. The difference between grade six and grade eight girls on the variable indicating that a student had been bullied because of uncleanness was significant, χ^2 (1, N =327) = 15.11, p<.0001. Table 2 indicates that only 4% of grade eight female students had been bullied for uncleanness compared to about 18% of grade six female students. There was a significant difference among female students between grades six and eight on the alternative indicating that they have been bullied due to personality, χ^2 (1, N= 326) = 4.24, p<.04. Table 2 shows that 47% of grade six female students reported that they had been bullied because of their personalities compared to 32% of grade eight female students.

Gender. Gender differences were significant for the following variables among grade eight students: uncleanness, poor grades, and inability to perform to a certain standard in physical education class. Table 2 indicates that only 4% of grade eight female students reported that they had been bullied because they were not clean compared to 12% of grade eight male students, χ^2 (1, N= 556) = 15.00, p<.0001. In addition, a larger percentage of grade eight male students (35%) reported that they had been bullied for obtaining a poor

mark than grade eight female students (27%), χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 556) =3.88, p<.049. Similarly, more grade eight male students (30%) reported having been bullied because they could not do something in physical education class than grade eight female students (22%), χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 555) = 3.88, p<.049.

Table 1

Percentages of Students Who Have Bullying Experiences in the Past

	Students who have bullied others %	Students who have been bullied %
Grade 6 (n=98)	52**	85
Grade 8 (n=562)	70	75
$\underline{M}$* (n=660)	67	77

* the mean of Grades six and eight.

**Percentages do not sum to 100% because students could choose more than one category.

Table 2

Percentages of the Students Who Have Been Bullied for Certain Reasons

Grade 6	Personality	Not clean	Bad Mark	Physical Education
Male (n=53)*	34**	13	40	30
Female (n=45)*	47	18	34	33
Grade 8				
Male (n=273)*	30	12	35	30
Female (n=282)*	32	4	27	22

* The number may vary depending on the number of students for each item.

**Percentages do not sum to 100% because students could choose more than one category.

Students' Experiences as Bullies

Students were asked whether they had ever bullied others, and if so, to give specific reasons for their actions. The three most frequently reported reasons for bullying others were: his/her physical appearance (34%); his/her personalities (32%); and cleanliness (23%). Chi-square tests were calculated to examine the difference between genders and between grades on each reason for bullying others.

Grade. A significant difference exists between grade six and grade eight students in bullying others for their uncleanness, boys χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 327) =7.64, $\underline{p}$<.0057 and girls χ^2 (2, $\underline{N}$= 329) = 11.41, $\underline{p}$<.0033, in this order. Table 3 shows that a larger percentage of grade eight students (34% of boys and 33% of girls) reported that they had bullied for this reason than grade six students (15% of boys and 9% of girls). Grade six and eight boys differed significantly on having bullied others because they didn't follow what everybody else had

decided, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 327) =5.91, $\underline{p}$<.015. Table 3 indicates that the percentage of grade boys who reported having bullied others for this reason is higher (27%) than grade six boys (11.3%). In addition, boys in grades six and eight differed significantly on having bullied others because they received a poor mark, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 327) =4.50, $\underline{p}$<.033. More grade eight boys (20%) reported that they had bullied others because of academic performance than grade six boys did (8%). Boys in grades six and eight differed on having bullied others because they could not do something in physical education class, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 327) =3.95, $\underline{p}$<.047. Table 3 shows that 26 % of grade eight boys reported that they had bullied others because of their lack of ability in physical education class; on the other hand, only 13% of grade six boys reported that they had bullied someone for the same reason.

Gender. The gender difference on the variable concerning bullying others due to their inability in physical education class was statistically significant in grades six and eight, χ_2(1, $\underline{N}$= 98) =6.40, $\underline{p}$<.011 and χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 557) = 27.08, $\underline{p}$<.000, respectively. Table 3 indicates that the percentage of grade eight boys (26% and 13% of grade six boys), who bullied others for their inability in physical education class, is higher than the girls in both grades (9% of grade eight girls and 0% of grade six girls). Among grade eight students, boys differed significantly from girls on bullying someone because they were slower than others, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 557) =10.44, $\underline{p}$<.001. Table 3 shows that a higher percentage of grade eight boys reported that they had bullied slower students (26%) than grade eight girls (15%).

Table 3

Percentages of the Students Who Have Bullied Someone for Certain Reasons

	Not clean	Not follow what everybody else decided	Bad Mark	Physical Education	Slower than others
Grade 6					
Male (n=53)*	15**	11	8	13	15
Female (n=45)*	9	13	2	0	18
Grade 8					
Male (n=273)*	34	27	20	26	26
Female (n=282)*	33	23	10	9	15

* The number may vary depending on the number of students for each item.

**Percentages do not sum to 100% because students could choose more than one category.

Current Bullying Experiences

Bullying in Homeroom Classes

Students were asked what kind of bullying occurred in their homeroom classes. They were also asked about the duration of the most recent bullying in their homeroom classes and what they did or what happened to them when it occurred. The three most commonly reported types of bullying in homeroom classes are: social exclusion (81%); deliberately doing something which the victim doesn't like (69%), and consistently gossiping about the person (63%). After chi-squares were calculated, some differences between grades were found.

Grades. Among male students, a significant relationship was found between grade and bullying in the form of taking money or other valuables from the victim and/or taking what they are wearing, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$=326) =10.33, p<.001 and χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 327) =7.98, p<.005, in this order. Table 4 indicates that the percentage of grade 6 male students who reported this type of bullying was higher (40%) than that of grade eight male students (19%). Similarly, 26% of grade six male students reported bullying by taking what the victim is wearing compared to only 12% of grade eight male students. Bullying by social exclusion and/or hitting, kicking, or pinching were also related to grade among male students, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 326) =6.20, p<.013 and χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 326) =5.99, p<.014, respectively. Table 4 shows that a greater percentage of grade six male students reported social exclusion bullying (89%) than grade eight male students (73%). In addition, violent bullying such as hitting, kicking, or pinching was reported by 72% of grade six male students compared to 54% of grade eight male students. Among female students, grade was significantly related to bullying by confiscating what the person is wearing, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 327) =15.07, p<.0001. Table 4 indicates that36% of grade six female students reported taking what the victim is wearing, but only 13% of grade eight female students reported this form of bullying in their homeroom classes.

Table 4

Bullying Type

	Social exclusion	Hitting, Kicking, punching	Taking what the person is wearing	Taking money or valuables	Constantly gossiping about the person	Frightening the person
Grade6						
Male (N=53)*	89**	72	26	40	60	53
Female (N=45)*	87	64	36	27	73	36
Grade8						
Male (N=273)*	73	54	12	19	51	45
Female (N=284)*	76	50	13	18	67	32
Male M*** (N=326)*	81	63	19	30	56	49
Female M**** (N=329)*	82	57	25	23	70	34

* The number may vary depending on the number of students who answered each item.

**Percentages do not sum to 100% because students could choose more than one category.

*** The mean of Grades six and eight male students.

**** The mean of Grades six and eight female students.

Students were asked about the duration of the most recent bullying in their homeroom classes. As shown in Table 5, about 23%(almost a month:12%, almost three month:9%, almost half a year:1%) of grade six students reported that bullying lasted almost a month or longer than a month. In addition, about 10% (almost a month: 4%, almost three month: 3%, almost half a year: 3%) of grade eight students reported that the bullying lasted almost a month or longer than a month. Only 2% of grade six students and 13% of grade eight students reported a complete absence of bullying in their classes. About 7% of grade six

students and 13% of grade eight students reported that the most recent bullying remained ongoing.

Table 5

Percentages of the Duration of The Most Recent Bullying

	Only once briefly	About a week	Almost half a month	Almost a month	Almost three month	Almost half a year	It has been continuing	No bullyin g
Grade6 (n=98)	36	23	9	12	9	1	7	2
Grade8 (n=548)	40	18	5	4	3	3	13	13

Students reported what they did or what happened to them when the most recent bullying in their homeroom class occurred. About 26% of grade six students and 20% of grade eight students reported that they were bullies. In addition, about 35% of grade six students and 17% of grade eight students alleged that they were victims. This difference in grade was statistically significant, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 572) =6.05, $p<.014$. Students who were bullied, but also bullied others were categorized as bully/victims. About 29% of grade six and 17% of grade eight students reported being bully/victims. Among female students, this grade difference was statistically significant, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 572) =6.14, $p<.014$. Table 6 indicates that 20% of grade six female students and about 8% of grade eight female students were bully/victims. Students who did not do anything or who did not know about the bullying were termed bystanders. The number of students who reported themselves as bystanders was the largest (about 40%) among six group statuses in bullying. Among female students, a significant relationship existed between grade and bystander status, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 276) =6.46, $p<.011$. About 41% of grade eight female students reported that they were bystanders as compared to only 20% of grade six female students.

Table 6

Percentage of Students' Bullying Involvement

	Victim	Bully/Victim	Bully	Audience	Defender	Bystander
Grade6						
Male (N=47)	17	9	13	17	6	38
Female (N=40)	18	20	13	20	10	20
Grade8						
Male (N=245)	10	9	12	18	10	40
Female (N=236)	7	8	8	25	11	41

Gender. Gender was also related to certain types of bullying. For instance, gender was significantly related to bullying by constantly gossiping about the victim among grade 8 students, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 557) =15.50, p<.000. Table 4 shows that the percentage of grade eight female students was higher (67%) than that of grade eight male students (51%). Furthermore, among grade eight students, gender also had a significant relationship with bullying by frightening the victim, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 557) =10.10, p<.001. This form of bullying was reported by 45% of grade eight male students, and 32% of grade eight female students.

Attitudes toward Authority

It was hypothesized that victims are more submissive to authority than are others. In the questionnaire, students were asked whether somebody who is capable should obey someone who is capable. About 23% of the victims compared to 27% of others answered that somebody who is incapable should obey someone who is capable. Thus, the data did not indicate that victims tend to be submissive to authority than are others. However, only 27% of the victims compared to 42% of others disagreed with the statement, that is, somebody who is incapable should obey someone who is capable. In addition, the percentage of the victims who chose "I don't know" was much higher (51%) than that of

others (31%). These victims' answers were statistically different from others, χ^2 (4, $\underline{N}$= 571) =11.96, $\underline{p}$< .02.

Moreover, whether bullies tend to reject authority more than others was examined. In the questionnaire, students were asked, if their opinions are different from homeroom teacher's opinion, what they would do. The bullies' answers to this question were significantly different from others, χ^2 (2, $\underline{N}$= 571) =9.99, $\underline{p}$< .006. Bullies tended to answer that they would insist the rightness of their opinions (48%) rather than following their teachers' opinion (45%). However, about 65% of others reported that they would follow their teachers' opinion rather than insisting on their opinions (32%).

Devotion to Group Tasks

The present study hypothesized that defenders would show more devotion to group tasks than others. Defenders' answers to a question, "When you do a class activity with your classmates, do you think that 'I do not want to do this. I am not interested?,'" were statistically different from others, χ^2 (5, $\underline{N}$= 572) =12.12, $\underline{p}$< .03. About 15% of defenders compared to 8% of others answered, "I always think this," or "I very often think this." In addition, about 75% of defenders compared to 82% of others chose, "I sometimes think this," or "I never think this." Therefore, contrary to the hypothesis, the data indicated that more defenders than others think, "I do not want to do this," or, "I am not interested," when they do a class activity with their classmates.

Attitudes toward Rules

It was hypothesized that bullies dislike creating rules more than others do. The data from the present study did not support this hypothesis. Students were asked if they would create many rules to follow when they wanted to improve the students' behaviour in their classes. As indicated in the Table 7, bullies' answers were not statistically different from others' answers.

In addition, it was also hypothesized that bullies think that it is more acceptable to break rules as compared to others. Nevertheless, such a tendency was not found in the present study. Table 8 indicates that bullies' answers were not statistically different.

Table 7

Percentages of Students' Attitudes toward Creating Rules

	I strongly agree	I agree	I don't know	I disagree	I strongly disagree
Audience (N=121)	3	34	32	25	6
Bully (N=58)	3	22	38	28	9
Bully/Victim (N=53)	2	21	38	32	8
Bystander (N=223)	2	22	40	29	7
Defender (N=60)	2	23	37	33	5
Victim (N=57)	4	19	37	32	9

Table 8

Percentages of the Students' Attitude toward Unnecessary Rules

	Obey school rules because all rules have to be obeyed	Some school rules are not needed, but obey the rules	Do not have to obey school rules because they are not needed	Not a big deal to break school rules
Audience (n=121)	21	76	3	0
Bully (n=58)	10	76	7	7
Bully/Victim (n=53)	25	70	6	0
Bystander (n=223)	22	66	7	4
Defender (n=60)	25	68	3	2
Victim (n=57)	25	70	2	4

Group Conformity

Even though it was hypothesized that victims are more aware of the pressure to conform to a group than others do, the present study did not find such a tendency. Students were asked a question, "Assume that you play the piano. One day, your classmates decide that they want you to do something after school, but you have a piano lesson after school. What would you rather do?" Victims' answers to the question were not statistically different from those of others (Table 9).

Table 9

Percentages of the Students Who Aware of the Pressure to Conform to a Group

	Stay at school and join classmates	Go to the piano teacher's house
Audience (n=121)	45	53
Bully (n=58)	59	41
Bully/Victim (n=53)	51	49
Bystander (n=223)	44	55
Defender (n=60)	52	45
Victim (n=57)	54	44

Academic Achievement

In the present study, victims reported that their grades were not particularly lower than those of others. As Table 10 indicates, about 65% of the victims answered that their grades were above the average or close to the top.

Although it was hypothesized that victims expect a lower level of education compared to others, the present study did not find such a tendency. Victims' answers about their expectations of further education were not statistically different from those of others (Table 11).

Table 10

Percentages of the Reported Grades

	Close to the top	Above the average	About the average	Below the average	Close to the bottom
Audience (n=121)	30	30	37	2	2
Bully (n=58)	19	33	43	3	2
Bully/Victim (n=53)	17	34	42	8	0
Bystander (n=223)	23	33	35	9	0
Defender (n=60)	25	33	35	5	2
Victim (n=57)	18	47	32	4	0

Table 11

Percentages of the students' Expectations of Further Education

	Junior high	Senior high	Technical school	College	University
Audience (n=119)	0	3	4	10	83
Bully (n=58)	0	3	7	12	78
Bully/Victim (n=52)	0	2	6	12	81
Bystander (n=221)	0	0	4	10	85
Defender (n=59)	2	2	3	10	83

Friends

It was hypothesized that the number of friends who are reported by victims are lower than those of people in other roles. Students were asked how many friends with whom they want to be close even after they graduate from their school. Students chose one number ranging from 1 to 10. In order to examine the relationships between the numbers of the friends and bullying involvement, t - tests were conducted. Although it was hypothesized that the number of friends who are reported by victims would be lower than those of students in other roles, the data did not support the hypothesis. However, it was found that bullies, instead of victims, tend to report lower number of friends, t (73, $N=569$) = -3.08, p< .003. About 43% of bullies compared to 34% of victims chose one number from 0 to 3 (Table 12). Furthermore, about 19% of bullies compared to 34% of victims answered one number from 7 to 10.

Table 12

Percentages of the Numbers of Friends

| | Numbers of friends | | | | | | | | | | |
	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10 or more
Victim (N=57)	0	7	9	18	7	18	9	7	2	2	23
Defender (N=59)	0	3	8	7	17	10	8	8	3	3	31
Bystander (N=221)	0	7	11	9	14	14	5	9	6	2	23
Bully/Victim (N=53)	2	6	6	13	13	17	2	4	6	6	26
Bully (N=58)	0	10	17	16	14	14	10	2	3	0	14
Audience (N=121)	0	5	17	7	10	15	7	10	2	1	26

Tolerance

It was hypothesized that victims are less tolerant of deviant students than others. However, in the present study, victims' answers to the question, "If there are some of your classmates who are called 'bad guys', how would you interact with them", were not statistically different from those of others, χ^2 (3, $\underline{N}$= 57) =4.05, p< .26. (Table 13).

Table 13

Percentages of Students' Attitudes toward Deviant Students

	Do not mind interacting with them	Might interact with them	Avoid them as much as possible	Never interact with them
Audience (n=121)	19	45	30	7
Bully (n=58)	28	36	28	9
Bully/Victim (n=53)	28	38	30	4
Bystander (n=223)	29	35	29	8
Defender (n=60)	30	42	23	5
Victim (n=57)	32	28	28	12

Gender

It was hypothesized that more boys than girls bully others. The present study found mixed results. For instance, more boys (72%) than girls (62%) reported their experiences of bullying others. This difference was statistically significant, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 656) =8.62, p< .003. However, almost the same percentage of the boys (12%) and girls (10%) reported their experiences of bullying others at the most recent bullying in their homeroom classes. This gender difference was not statistically significant.

Even though it was hypothesized that girls bully more indirectly than boys, the data in the present study did not consistently support the hypothesis. About 70% of the girls compared to 56% of the boys answered that they had experienced bullying in the form of

constantly gossiping about the person in their homeroom classes. This gender difference was statistically significant, χ^2 (1, $\underline{N}$= 655) =16.83, $\underline{p}$< .000. However, about the same percentage of the boys (81%) and girls (82%) answered that they had bullying in the form of social exclusion in their homeroom classes. In addition, girls seem to engage in direct or physical bullying as much as boys do. In the present study, about the same percentages of the boys (63%) and girls (57%) reported bullying by hitting, kicking, and punching in their homeroom classes.

Age

It was hypothesized that the incidence of being bullied was greater among grade six than grade eight students. About 85% of grade six compared to 75% of grade eight students reported their experiences of being bullied. This difference was statistically significant, χ^2(1, $\underline{N}$= 660) =4.01, $\underline{p}$< .045. In addition, about 17% of grade six students compared to 9% of grade eight students were victims at the most recent bullying. This difference was also statistically significant, χ^2(1, $\underline{N}$= 572) =6.05, $\underline{p}$< .014.

Furthermore, it was also hypothesized that the frequency of bullying is greater for individual victims among grade eight than among grade six victims. As explained above, the incidence of being bullied was greater among grade six than grade eight students. However, more grade eight students (70%) than grade six students (52%) reported their experiences of bullying others. This grade difference was statistically significant, χ^2(1, $\underline{N}$=660) = 11.86, $\underline{p}$<.000. From these results, more grade eight victims than grade six victims are repeatedly bullied by others. In other words, the frequency of bullying is probably greater for individual victims among grade eight than among grade six victims.

Attitude towards Bullying

Finally, the hypothesis that bullies justify bullying more than other students was not supported in the present study. Students were asked what they think about bullying somebody else. Bullies' answers to this question were not statistically different from those of others (Table 14).

Table 14

Percentages of the Reported Attitudes toward Bullying

	Bullying can help us to become stronger	Bullying is not a big deal	Whether bullying is wrong depends on the reason	Bullying must not be allowed	Don't know
Audience (n=121)	0	2	24	61	12
Bully (n=58)	5	3	29	47	14
Bully/Victim (n=53)	0	8	26	51	13
Bystander (n=223)	3	6	20	52	17
Defender (n=60)	3	2	27	62	7
Victim (n=57)	4	7	30	44	16

Chapter Five: Discussion

Results confirm that bullying is a problem for the children of this study, and that certain kinds of bullying occur relatively more frequently. In order to grasp an overall picture of bullying problems, the first section explains the demographic features of bullying, including children's reasons for bullying, types of bullying, duration of bullying, and bullying involvement. The subsequent section examines the effects of specific variables on bullying.

The Surveyed Students' Bullying Experiences

Prevalence of Bullying Problems

The results from the present study indicate that bullying problems are prevalent among the students of this study. Students were asked if they have ever bullied somebody and/or have been bullied. Approximately, 67% of the students reported that they had bullied others, and 77% of the students reported that they were victims of bullying. Overall, these percentages are higher than those of the Japanese students in the study conducted by Morita et al. (1985), who found that 69% of participants reported their bullying experiences. They also concluded that about 49% of the students reported their experiences of bullying others, and 53% of the students reported their experiences as victims. Among the students of the present study, bullying was a problem.

Although bullying has been viewed as a serious problem among children since the early 80's in Europe and Japan, bullying problems have not been a concern until recently in Canada. However, the results in this present study suggest that bullying problems could be prevalent and serious among Canadian students. It is noteworthy that about seven or eight out of ten surveyed students reported that they have either bullied others or have been bullied. Bullying may not be restricted to a particular group of students, rather it is possible that bullying is a concern for the majority of students.

Gender. Although previous studies reported that more boys than girls bully others (Morita et al., 1985; Olweus, 1995; Salmivalli et al., 1996), Bentley (1994) argued that

students' answers in a questionnaire might not reflect their actual behaviors. According to her, more boys than girls seem to identify themselves as bullies because bullying behavior could be viewed as more consistent with male values and roles in the society. In other words, engaging in bullying behavior might be viewed as more acceptable among boys than among girls. Thus, in a questionnaire, many girls might not want to identify themselves as bullies. Nevertheless, Craig and Pepler's (1995) observational study, which did not use a self-report questionnaire, found that male students were more likely actively involved in bullying.

In the present study, a higher percentage of boys (72%) than the girls (62%) reported their experiences of bullying others in the past. This result is consistent with the results from previous literature (Morita et al., 1985; Olweus, 1995; Salmivalli et al., 1996). As Salmivalli et al. (1996) explained, boy's use of aggression, including bullying, could be viewed as a useful way for boys to create a social order or status in a peer group.

However, regarding the students' most recent bullying experiences, about the same percentages of boys (12%) and girls (10%) reported that they bullied others. The reason why more boys than girls did not report that they bullied others at the most recent bullying remains unclear. In order to determine whether this gender difference actually exists, further research must be employed.

Grade. A higher percentage of grade six students (85%) reported their experiences of being bullied than the grade eight students (75%). This result is consistent with the results from previous literature (Charach et al., 1995; Genta et al., 1996; Morita et al., 1985; Olweus, 1991; Whitney & Smith, 1993). However, in the present study, a higher percentage of the grade eight students (70%) than grade six students (52%) reported bullying others. This result is contrary to the results of the Japanese study done by Morita et al. (1985), who found that the percentage of the Japanese grade eight students who reported bullying others (44%) was lower than that of the Japanese grade six students (53%). The findings of the present study indicate that the incidence of being bullied is greater among grade six than grade eight students, but because a student may be victimized more than once the frequency

of bullying could be greater for individual victims among grade eight than among grade six victims.

<u>Reasons for Bullying</u>

Iwashita (1985) explained that the more adolescents feel the sense of belongingness to their peer group, the more they feel pressure to conform. Adolescents pay great amount of attention to keep their status as a member of their peer group. For instance, Harvey and Rutherfold (1960) found that such a pressure to conform influences even their tastes for pictures. Thus, when a student is perceived as not conforming well to his/her peer group, the student might have a high possibility of being rejected and bullied.

According to Morita (1994), children's reasons for bullying are often a part of the justification of their bullying behavior. Students bully victims when the victims who do not conform to their peer group are perceived as wrong or bad. Researchers describe passive victims in a similar way, with inferiority being one of the main characteristics. For example, they are often physically weaker than other students, tend to depend others, and have lower self-esteem (Bforkqvist, 1982; Lagerspetz et al., 1982; Morita et al. 1985; Olweus, 1994). Nevertheless, these characteristics of passive victims are not necessarily causes of bullying. These characteristics could be one of the causes of bullying or one of the consequences of bullying (Lagerspetz et al., 1982). Furthermore, Taki (1996) emphasized that these characteristics should be treated as the victims' vulnerabilities rather than the causes of bullying. However, these differences are sometimes viewed as their inferiorities, which become triggers of bullying under certain conditions.

The present study found that the most frequent reasons for bullying are physical appearance, personality, and personal cleanliness. In addition, physical appearance, not following what everybody else decided, and personality are the three most frequently answered reasons for being bullied. However, this does not mean that these characteristics of victims are causes of bullying. Rather, these characteristics should be viewed as the victims' vulnerabilities, which can easily turn into triggers of bullying.

<u>Grade.</u> As Iwashita (1985) explained, conformity to their peer group is one of

adolescents' social priorities. Results from grade differences support this common observation. More grade six girls than grade eight girls report that they are bullied due to lack of cleanliness. Furthermore, students' lack of cleanliness is a frequently reported reason for bullying others. The data showed that more grade eight students than grade six students bullied others because he/she was not clean. Both grade eight boys and girls report that they have bullied somebody because he/she was not clean more than grade six boys and girls did. In addition, more grade eight boys than grade six boys say that they bully others because they do not follow what everybody else decided. More grade six girls are bullied because of their personality.

Furthermore, students' academic performance and their ability in physical education class are the reasons for bullying others. More grade eight boys answered that they bully someone because of his/her academic performance than the grade six boys. Similarly, more grade eight boys report that they bully somebody because he/she could not do something in physical education class.

Gender. Gender is also related to students' reasons for bullying others or being bullied. More grade eight boys than grade eight girls report that they have been bullied because they are not clean. In addition, more grade eight boys than grade eight girls report that they have been bullied because they got a really bad mark. Similarly, the data show that more grade eight boys than grade eight girls are bullied because they could not do something in physical education class.

Gender relates to the reasons for bullying others. For instance, more grade eight and six boys than the girls in both grades report that they have bullied somebody because he/she could not do something in physical education class. Furthermore, more grade eight boys than grade eight girls report that they have bullied someone because he/she was slower than others.

These grade and gender differences may reflect value differences among the students. For instance, ability in physical education class may be more valued among boys more than among girls. If this is true, more boys than girls probably bully others or may be bullied due

to poor physical education skills.

Types of Bullying

Previous studies found that indirect bullying, such as verbal bullying or social exclusion, was more frequent than direct physical bullying, such as hitting or kicking (Bentley, 1994; Hoover, Oliver and Thomson, 1993; Morita et al., 1985; Olweus, 1993; Perry, Kuel, and Perry, 1988). For example, Morita et al. (1985) reported that social exclusion was the most frequent bullying. According to Hoover, Oliver and Thomson (1993), verbal bullying was the most prevalent. Results from the present study are consistent with previous studies. Students were asked about the kind of bullying that occurred in their homeroom classes since they became grade six or eight students. They identify social exclusion, deliberately doing something which the victim doesn't like, or consistently gossiping about the person as the most frequently occurring types of bullying. Some grade differences were found.

Grade. More grade six boys report social exclusion bullying (89%) than grade eight boys (73%). In addition, more grade six boys (26%) than grade eight boys (12%) report bullying, such as taking what the victim is wearing. Not only boys, but also more grade six (36%) than grade eight girls (13%) report bullying by taking what the victim is wearing. More grade six (40%) than grade eight boys (19%) report that they had bullying in the form of taking money or other valuables from the victims in their homeroom classes. In addition, more grade six boys (72%) than grade eight boys (54%) report that they had bullying by hitting, kicking, or pinching in their homeroom classes.

Compared to the study done by Morita et al. (1985), violent bullying among grade six students of the present study appears to be prominent. Especially, it is noteworthy that 40% of grade six students report that they had bullying in the form of taking money or other valuables from the victims in their homeroom classes. According to Morita et al., about 12% of grade six and 15 % of grade eight students report this type of bullying. The difference may reflect a very low crime rate of the Japanese society, or lack of random sampling of the present study. However, given the serious nature of violent bullying,

immediate interventions such as Bully - Proofing Program (Garrity, Jens, Porter, Sager and Short – Camilli, 1994) are recommended.

<u>Duration of Bullying</u>

Students were asked about the duration of the most recent bullying in their homeroom classes. Considering that only 2% of grade six students and 13% of grade eight students report a complete absence of bullying in their homeroom classes, bullying problems are prevalent among the students. In the Toronto survey done by Charach et al. (1995), about 16% of 211 students from grade four to eight reported there were no children who had bullied in their homeroom classes during the term. Because participants' age, total number, and the questionnaire used were different, this result from the Toronto survey is not directly comparable to the results of the present research. However, it is noteworthy that only 2% of grade six students in the present study report a complete absence of bullying in their classes. In the present study, more grade six students (21%) than grade eight students (7%) report that the most recent bullying lasted from one month to three months. However, more grade eight students (3%) than grade six students (1%) report that the bullying lasted almost half a year. In addition, more grade eight students (13%) than grade six students (7%) report that bullying has been continuing.

Some long-term (longer than three months) bullying cases exist, especially among grade eight students. Thus, especially in long-term bullying, the frequency of bullying is probably greater for individual victims among grade eight victims than among grade six victims. Because these long-term bullying could be severe and serious, immediate direct interventions are necessary.

<u>Bullying Involvement</u>

Students were asked about the nature of their most recent bullying experiences in their homeroom classes. About 19% of grade eight students and 13% of grade six students report that they were bullies. More grade six students (17%) than grade eight students (9%) admit that they were victims. In addition, about 14% of grade six and 9% of grade eight students were bully/victims. These results suggest that, especially among grade eight students, fewer

individual victims tend to be repeatedly bullied.

Although most of the previous literature reported that more boys bully others than girls (Charach et al., 1995; Morita et al., 1985; Olweus, 1991; Salmivalli et al., 1996), this tendency was found only among grade eight students, but not among grade six students. The data from the present research indicate that more grade eight boys (12%) than grade eight girls (8%) report that they bullied at the most recent instance in their homeroom classes. However, the same percentage of grade six boys and girls (13%) report that they were bullies. Results show that only 6% of grade six boys were defenders at the most recent bullying incident in their homeroom classes. As explained before, results show violent bullying is prevalent among grade six students in the present study. In addition, only 2% of grade six students reported complete absence of bullying in their classes. Because these results from the present research indicate that bullying among grade six students could be serious, it is understandable that fewer grade six students than grade eight students intervene when they observe bullying in their homeroom classes. Students, nevertheless, should be shown how to obtain help.

Variables That may Influence Bullying

Attitude toward Authority

The data in the present study do not support the hypothesis that victims are more submissive to authority than others. Almost the same percentage of victims (23%) as others (27%) answer that somebody who is incapable should obey someone who is capable. However, it is possible that victims in the present study could be more submissive than others for the following two reasons. First, the students' answers might not actually reflect their attitudes toward authority. This is because the question asks what they think about the viewpoint, which is not equal to their actual attitude toward authority. In other words, victims might behave submissively to authority, but it does not mean that victims actually think that they should be submissive to authority. It is possible that victims are not willing to be submissive to authority, but they are forced to. Second, victims, who disagree with the viewpoint that the less competent should obey the more competent, may avoid

"directly" disagreeing with this viewpoint. The percentage of the victims who disagreed with the viewpoint (27%) was lower than that of others (42%). Instead, the percentage of the victims who chose "I don't know" was higher (51%) than that of others (31%). This finding suggests that victims are afraid of asserting themselves. Through an intervention program, such as Bully Proofing Program (Garrity et al., 1994), it is important to help victims to effectively assert themselves especially when they start being bullied.

Devotion to Group Tasks

Contrary to the hypothesis, defenders in the present study show no more devotion to group tasks than others. More defenders (15%) than others (8%) answer that they always or very often think that they do not want to do or are not interested in a class activity with their classmates. Furthermore, lower percentage of defenders (75%) than that of others (82%) answer that they sometimes or never think like that. These results indicate that defenders are more autonomous than those who do not defend others. Their teachers might enlist defenders as leaders during small group work to raise the level of support that is available to individual students in classrooms. Acting as leaders may help defenders overcome their reluctance to commit to activities with their classmates.

Cultural differences might be related to this unexpected result. Other researchers reported that defenders of victims are sociable and very popular among peers (Coie, Dodge, and kupersmidt, 1990; Morita et al., 1985; Salmivalli et al, 1996). Salmivalli et al. (1996) explained that defenders need their high status among peers in order to defend victims because defending victims goes against the norm of their peer groups. If this explanation by Salmivalli et al. is true, defenders in the present research are probably popular among their peers. However, defenders do not necessarily need to commit to group tasks in their class in order to keep their popularity among peers. In Japanese homeroom classes, devotion to group tasks is usually highly valued. Thus, devotion to group tasks is probably an important factor to become popular among peers in a homeroom class. The hypothesis that defenders show more devotion to group tasks than others was built based on the result from the Japanese study done by Morita et al. (1985). They reported that defenders showed

more devotion to group tasks than others. However, in Canadian homeroom classes in the present study, devotion to group tasks is probably not valued as much as it is in homeroom classes in Japanese schools. Yet, as mentioned previously, the independence of defenders may be helpful if it is guided toward positive leadership behavior.

Attitudes toward Rules

Students were asked if they would create many rules in order to improve the students' behavior in their classes and what they would do if there were some school rules which are not needed for them. The present study did not find any relationships between their attitudes toward rules and their bullying involvement.

The hypotheses that bullies dislike creating rules more than others do and that bullies think that it is more acceptable to break rules as compared to others were built based on the results of the Japanese study done by Morita et al. (1985). Japanese schools are famous for *kanri kyoiku*, or "controlled education". Students, particularly those in junior high school, are generally stressed because so many school rules and regulations exist to restrict their behavior. Thus, it is understandable that the Japanese bullies showed negative attitudes toward school rules. However, Canadian schools do not have such school rules and as many regulations as Japanese schools. Thus, the students in the present study do not necessarily show negative attitudes toward school rules.

Group Conformity

Although it was hypothesized that victims are more aware of the pressure to conform to a group than others are, the data did not support this hypothesis, which was built based on the results of the Japanese study done by Morita et al. (1985). This result might reflect cultural differences between Japan and Canada. In Japanese schools, group conformity is highly valued. Nevertheless, in Canadian schools, group conformity is not valued as much as in Japanese schools. In addition, in Canadian schools, autonomy is probably valued more than in Japanese schools. Therefore, victims in the present study are probably not as aware of the pressure to conform to a group.

Academic Achievement

It was hypothesized that victims tend to get lower grades in school and expect a lower level of education. However, the present study did not find any relationships between the students' academic achievement and their bullying involvement. Again, this result also might reflect cultural differences between Japan and Canada.

The majority of Japanese students are pressured to be successful at school. This phenomenon is called *juken jigoku* or "examination hell", because they need to get high marks in order to pass the examinations to enter the best senior high schools and universities. For many Japanese students, this kind of competition starts when they are in elementary school or even pre-school. Graduates from the so-called prestigious universities enjoy many privileges in society; therefore, parents are eager to gain entrance for their children into the best schools possible. In the Japanese study done by Morita et al. (1985), victims tended to get lower grades. However, Canadian victims in the present study do not show such a tendency. This is probably because academic achievement is considered to be more important in the Japanese society than in the Canadian society.

Friends

The self-identified bullies of this study have fewer friends and are less respected than other groups of students in their classrooms. More bullies (43%) than others (27%) report from 0 to 3 friends. In addition, about 19% of bullies compared to 40% of others report from 7 to 10 friends. Thus, bullies, compared to others, tend not to have many close friends who they really like. Moreover, the higher percentage of bullies (41%) than that of others (29%) report that their classmates sometimes or never recognize their ability. These results indicate that many bullies probably do not like and/or do not trust their classmates as much as others, and their classmates lack respect for them.

These results are contrary to previous studies. Even though chronically aggressive boys tend to be less popular (Foster, Delqwyer, and Guevremont, 1986), bullies are not different from others in popularity (Olweus, 1991). Although regular aggressive boys indiscriminately aggress toward other children, bullies tend to pick their targets more

selectively (Hoover and Hazler, 1991; Ross, 1996). Therefore, it is possible that bullies in the present study are unpopular among their peers because they are unselectively aggressive toward any other children. Within the context of a supportive teacher-pupil relationship, a teacher might provide feedback to a bully about their impact on others. Realizing how his/her behavior affects others might lead the bully to modify the aggressive behavior; greater acceptance for the individual may result.

Tolerance

Students were asked if there are some of their classmates who are called "bad guys", how they would interact with them. In the Japanese study done by Morita et al. (1985), the attitude of students toward deviant students, or so-called, "*huryo*", was related to the possibility of being victimized. Although it was hypothesized that victims are less tolerant of such deviant students than others, this hypothesis was not supported in the present study. This is probably because the image attained from the word "bad guys" was not as strong as that of the Japanese word "*huryo*", or bad guys.

Gender

It was hypothesized that more boys than girls bully others. The results regarding this hypothesis in the present study are mixed. For instance, more boys (72%) than girls (62%) report their past experiences of bullying others. Nevertheless, at the most recent bullying in their homeroom classes, almost the same percentage of the boys (12%) and girls (10%) say that they bullied others. The first of these findings is supported by other studies (e.g., Ahmad and Smith,1994; Olweus, 1985; Roland, 1980).

Boys and girls tend to bully differently. Researchers reported that boys tend to engage in physical and violent type of bullying and that girls tend to be involved in indirect forms of bullying (Bjorkqvist et al., 1992; Hirano, 1991; Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, & Peltonen, 1998; Olweus, 1991; Whitney & Smith, 1993). In the present study, these tendencies were not clearly found. This is probably because the question "since you became a grade six (or grade eight) student, has any bullying like the following occurred in your homeroom class?" could not discriminate boys' bullying and girls' bullying. For instance, a girl would report that some boys in her homeroom class are physically bullying a victim. Or, a boy could

report that some girls in his homeroom class are indirectly bullying a victim. Thus, students' answers for the question did not perfectly represent boys or girls' bullying tendencies.

However, it is interesting to focus on the fact that the higher percentage of girls (68%) than that of boys (52%) reported that they bully by constantly gossiping about the person in their homeroom classes. If this difference reflects the gender difference in types of bullying, this result is consistent with the results from previous studies (Hirano, 1991; Morita et al., 1985; Olweus, 1991). Even though it was expected that more girls than boys would report bullying by social exclusion, this is not the case among the students of the present study. About the same percentages of the girls (78%) and boys (76%) report that they had bullying in the form of social exclusion in their homeroom classes. Although this result was contrary to the results from many other previous studies (Hirano, 1991; Morita et al., 1985; Olweus, 1991; Rigby& Slee, 1991; Whitney & Smith, 1993), it was consistent with the results from Bentley's (1994) Canadian study. According to Bentley, roughly the same percentage of boys and girls ranged from grade four to six report bullying in the form of social exclusion. Moreover, more grade eight boys (45%) than grade eight girls (32%) report that they had bullying in the form of frightening the victim in their homeroom classes. In addition, in the present study, it was found that girls seem to engage in physical bullying as much as boys do. About the same percentages of the boys (63%) and girls (57%) reported direct bullying by hitting, kicking, and punching in their homeroom classes. Therefore, the data in the present study does not support the hypothesis that girls bully more indirectly than boys. Other researchers have commented on the increase in physical violence among girls (e.g., Tieger, 1980; Bentley, 1994), and these results seem to support this observation.

Age

It was hypothesized that the incidence of being bullied is greater among grade six than grade eight students. Results support this hypothesis. The higher percentage of grade six students (85%) than that of grade eight students (75%) report their experiences of being bullied. At the most recent bullying, about 17% of grade six students compared to 9% of

grade eight students were victims. These results were consistent with the results from previous research, which found a decrease in the experience of older students being bullied (Charach et al., 1995; Genta et al, 1996; Hirano, 1991; Morita, 1985; Olweus, 1991; Whitney & Smith, 1993).

In addition, it was found that the frequency of bullying was probably greater for individual victims among grade eight than among grade six victims. Among grade six students, 85% of the students reported their experiences of being bullied compared to 52% of the students who reported bullying others. On the other hand, compared to those of grade six students, the lower percentage of the grade eight students (75%) reported their experiences of being bullied, and the higher percentage of the grade eight students (70%) reported their experiences of bullying others. Therefore, it is more possible among grade eight students than among grade six students that the same victims are repeatedly bullied by others.

Attitudes toward Bullying

In the present study, it was hypothesized that bullies justify bullying more than other students. However, no relationships between the students' attitudes toward bullying and their bullying involvement are found. These results are contrary to the previous studies (Bentley, 1994; Ross, 1996). It is noteworthy that about 47% of bullies report that bullying must not be allowed. If they truly think that bullying must not be allowed, then why is it that they bully others? Further research in this area is needed.

Summary

Bullying problems are prevalent among the grade six and eight students of this study. About 67% of the surveyed students report that they bully others, and 77% of the students say that bullies have victimized them. These percentages were much higher than those of the Japanese study done by Morita et al. (1985).

The three most frequent reasons for bullying others are physical appearance, personality, and uncleanness, and for being bullied the most frequent reasons are physical appearance,

not following what everybody else decided, and personality. Although some gender and grade differences in the reasons for bullying exist, these differences seem not to reflect the differences in the nature of the bullying among boys and girls in both grades. Instead, the gender and grade differences probably come from the differences in their interests or values. The students' answers regarding reasons for bullying appear to be the vulnerabilities of the victims, which happened to have become triggers of bullying incidents. Thus, their answers concerning the reasons for bullying should not be treated as the causes of bullying, but as the victims' vulnerabilities. The existence of aggressive bullies and group norms which allow bullying somebody are more likely to become the causes of bullying.

Students were asked what kind of bullying occurred in the students' homeroom classes. Social exclusion, deliberately doing something which the victim doesn't like, and consistently gossiping about the person are the most frequently reported reasons. Some violent types of bullying manifest themselves among grade six students more than among grade eight students. For instance, about 40% of the grade six boys compared to 19% of the grade eight boys report that they experience bullying in the form of taking money or other valuables from the victims in their homeroom classes. Moreover, about 72% of grade six boys compared to 54% of grade eight boys report that they experienced physical bullying such as hitting, kicking, or pinching in their homeroom classes. A higher percentage of the grade six girls (36%) than grade eight girls (13%) report bullying by taking what the victim is wearing. Immediate intervention programs should be conducted especially among grade six students.

Students were asked how long the most recent bullying in their homeroom classes lasted. Only 2% of the grade six students and 13% of grade eight students report a complete absence of bullying in their homeroom classes. About 21% of grade six students as compared to 7% of grade eight students answer that the bullying lasted from about one month to three months. In addition, 3% of grade eight students and 1% of grade six students answered that the bullying lasted almost half a year. Even though the percentages of the students who reported long - term bullying in their homeroom classes appear to be

low, the long – term bullying should be treated carefully and as soon as possible because long – term bullying is a serious problem.

Student participation in bullying varies. About 17% of grade six students compared to 9% of grade eight students are victims. About 19% of grade eight students and 13% of grade six students report that they were bullies. These results probably reflect that the frequency of bullying is greater for individual victims among grade eight students than among grade six students. In addition, only 8% of grade six students and 11% of grade eight students are defenders of the victims. In other words, only one out of ten students actually try to intervene the bullying. Training in empathy (Boulton and Underwood, 1992; Pepler, Craig, Ziegler, and Charach, 1993) and training in intervention in abusive situations (Baron and Byrne, 1997) would be helpful because students could learn about why bullying is wrong, what their personal responsibilities are, and what actions might be most effective in stopping the bullying.

The data did not support the hypothesis that victims are more submissive to authority than others. However, when victims were asked if somebody who is incapable should obey someone who is capable, victims tend not to disagree with the opinion. In addition, the percentage of the victims who chose "I don't know" was much higher (51%) than that of others (31%). Because the question only asked how they think about the view point, the students' answers to the question might not reflect their actual attitudes toward authority.

In the present study, bullies tend to reject authority more than others. The students were asked that if their opinions are different from homeroom teacher's opinion, what would they do. About 48% of the bullies as compared to 32% of others answer that they would insist that they were right.

Even though it was hypothesized that defenders show more devotion to group tasks than others, the defenders' answers are contrary to this hypothesis. The higher percentage of defenders (15%) than that of others (8%) answer that they always or very often think that they do not want to do or are not interested in a class activity with their classmates. The hypothesis was built based on the results from the study done by Morita et al. (1985).

Devotion to group tasks is an important factor for defenders being popular in Japanese homeroom classes. However, Canadian defenders who live in a society which stresses individuality probably do not necessarily need to show devotion to group tasks as much as Japanese defenders do in order to keep their popularity.

Even though it was hypothesized that victims have fewer friends than those of people in other roles, this hypothesis is not supported in the present study. However, bullies as compared to others report that they have fewer close friends. Moreover, bullies are more likely to answer that their classmates do not recognize their ability.

Some mixed results concerning gender differences in bullying involvement exist. Regarding past bullying experiences, more boys (72%) than girls (62%) report their experiences of bullying others. However, regarding their most recent bullying experiences, almost the same percentage of the boys (12%) and girls (10%) report their experiences of bullying others. In addition, in the present study, results do not support the hypothesis that girls tend to bully more indirectly than boys, or that boys tend to bully more directly than girls.

Finally, the incidence of being bullied is greater among grade six than grade eight students. Furthermore, the frequency of bullying was greater for individual victims among grade eight than among grade six victims. These findings indicate that some long – term bullying exist especially among grade eight students. Because long – term bullying could be serious and severe, immediate interventions are necessary.

Limitations of The Study and Implications for Future Research

Lack of random sampling restricts the generalizability of the findings. First, participant's schools were volunteered by their principals. Bullying problems in other schools could be slightly different from those of the participants' schools. Second, the percentage of the students who took the survey in a class ranged from 18% to 100%. This is because many students did not return the parents' consent forms which were required to take the survey. It is possible that the parents who knew their children are involved in

bullying problems did not want to give them permission to participate in the survey.

In addition, the questionnaire could have been more specific, especially in determining gender differences. The question "since you became a grade six (or grade eight) student, has any bullying like the following occurred in your homeroom class?" could not discriminate boys' from girls' bullying. Furthermore, if the questions concerning students' attitudes toward deviant students and students' attitudes toward bullying were more specific, the results regarding these variables might have been different.

The present study was originally designed to explore the differences and similarities of bullying in Japan and Canada. However, due to lack of the actual Japanese data, the present study just focused on the analysis of the Canadian data. Future research comparing bullying in Canada and other countries would be helpful to determine what aspects of bullying are culturally specific or universal. Such information will be useful when intervention programs are exchanged internationally.

References

Ahmad, Y., & Smith, P. K. (1990). Bullying in schools and the issues of sex differences. In J. Archer (Ed.), Male Violence . London: Routlege.

Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of a model's reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 11(589-595).

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

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

Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1959). Adolescent aggression. New York: Ronald.

Baron, R. A., & Byrne, D. (1997). Social Psychology. (18 ed.). Toronto: Allyn and Bacon.

Baron, R. A., & Richardson, D. R. (1994). Human Aggression. New York and London: Plenum Press.

Bentley, K. M. (1994). Bully/Victim problems in elementary schools and students' beliefs about aggression. , Unpublished master's thesis, University of Calgary, Calgary, Alberta, Canada.

Berkowitz, L. (1965). The concept of aggressive drive: Some additional considerations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental psychology (Vol. 2, pp. 301-329). New York: Atherton Press.

Berkowitz, L. (1988). Frustrations, appraisals, and aversively stimulated aggression. Aggressive Behavior, 14, 3-11.

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

Bjorkqvist, K. L., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. Aggressive Behavior, 18, 117-127.

Blasi, A. (1980). Bridging moral cognition and moral action: A critical review of the literature. Psychological Bulletin, 88, 1-45.

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

Charach, A., Pepler, D., & Ziegler, S. (1995). Bullying at school: A Canadian perspective. Education Canada(Spring), 12 - 18.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Kupersmidt, J. (1990). Peer group behavior and social status. In S. R. Asher & J. D. Coie (Eds.), Peer rejection in childhood . New York: Cambridge University Press.

Craig, w. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1995). Peer processes in bullying and victimization: An observational study. Exceptionality Education Canada, 5(3), 81 - 95.

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

Dollard, J., Doob, L., Miller, N. E., Mowrer, O. H., & Sears, R. R. (1939). Frustration and aggression. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Eron, L. D., Walder, L. O., & Lefkowitz, M. M. (1971). Learning of aggression in children. Boston:: Little Brown.

Farrington, D. P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. In M. Tonry & N. Morris (Eds.), Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research . Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Foster, S. L., DeLawyer, D. D., & Guevremont, D. C. (1986). A critical incident analysis of liked and disliked peer behaviors and their situation parameters in childhood and adolescence. Behavioral Assessment, 8, 115-133.

Freedman, J. L. (1984). Effect of television violence on aggressiveness. Psychological Bulletin, 96,227-246.

Freud, S. (1940). Jenseits der Lustprinzips. Das Ich und das Es; Das okonomishe Problem des Masochismus; Der untergang des Odipuskomplexes. London: Imago Publishing.

Fukaya, K. (1996). Ijimesekaino kodomotachi [Children in the world of bullying]. Tokyo: Kaneko shobo.

Garrity, C., Jens, K., Porter, W., Sager, N., & Short - Camilli, C. (1994). Bully proofing your school: A comprehensive approach for elementary schools. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.

Genta, M. L., Fonzi, A., Costabile, A., & Smith, P. K. (1996). Bullies and victims in schools in central and southern Italy. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 11(1), 97-110.

Guerra, N. G., Nucci, L., & Huesmann, L. R. (1994). Moral cognition and childhood aggression. In L. R. Huesmann (Ed.), Aggressive behavior: Current perspectives (Vol. xix, pp. 13 - 33). New York: Plenum Press.

Gustafson, R. (1986). Human physical aggression as a function of frustration: Role of aggressive cues. Psychological Reports, 59, 103-110.

Harris, M. B. (1974). Instigators and inhibitors of aggression in a field experiment: University of New Mexico.

Harvey, J. H., & Rutherfold, J. M. (1960). Status in the informal group: Influence and influencibility at different age levels. Child Development, 31, 377 - 385.

Hazler, R. J. (1996). Breaking the cycle of violence. Washington,DC: Accelerated Development.

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

Hirano, K. (1991). Towards Reducing Bullying in Schools. Bunkyou University, Faculty of Education, Annual Report, 25, 77 - 96.

Hoffman, M. L. (1977). Empathy, its development and prosocial implications. Nebraska Symposium on Motivation, 25, 169 - 217.

Hoover, J., & Hazler, R. J. (1991). Bullies and victims. Elementary School Guidance & Counseling, 25, 212 - 219.

Hoover, J. H., Oliver, R., & Hazler, R. J. (1992). Bullying: Perceptions of adolescent victims in the midwestern USA. School Psychology International, 13, 5 - 16.

Hoover, J. H., Oliver, R. L., & Thomson, K. A. (1993). Perceived Victimization by School Bullies: New Research and Future Direction. Journal of Humanistic Education and Development, 32, 76 -84.

Huesmann, L. R. (1977). Formal models of social behavior. Paper presented at the Paper presented at the meeting of the Society for Experimental social Psychology, Austin, Texas.

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

Iwashita, T. (1995). Shakai shinrigaku [Social Psychology]. Tokyo: Kawashima shoten.

Kohlberg, L. (1976). Moral stages and moralization. In Lickona (Ed.), Moral development and behavior (pp. 31-53). New York: Holt,Rinehart, & Winston.

Kohlberg, L. (1958). The development of modes of moral thinking and choice in the years ten to sixteen. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Chicago, Chicago.

Kohlberg, L. (1969). Stage and sequence: The cognitive-developmental approach to socialization. In D. A. Goslin (Ed.), Handbook of socialization theory and research (pp. 347-480). Chicago: Rand McNally.

Lagerspetz, K. M., Bjorkqvist, K., Berts, m., & King, E. (1982). Group aggression among school children in three schools. Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 23, 45 - 52.

Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Bjorkqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression typical of females? Gender differences in aggressiveness in 11 - to 12 year old children. Aggressive Behavior, 14, 403-414.

Levens, J. P., Camino, L., Parke, R. D., & Berkowitz, L. (1975). Effects of movie violence on aggression in a field setting as a function of group dominance and cohesion. Journal of Personality & Social Psychology, 32(2), 346 - 360.

Liebert, R. M., & Baron, R. A. (1972). Some immediate effects of televised violence on childrens' behavior. Developmental Psychology, 6, 469-475.

Milgram, S., & Shotland, R. L. (1973). Television and antisocial behavior: Field experiments. New York: Academic Press.

Miller, N., & Dollard, J. C. (1941). Social learning and imitation. New Haven,CT: University Press.

Morita, Y., & Kiyonaga, K. (1996). Ijime [Bullying]. Tokyo: Kaneko shobo.

Morita, Y., Kiyonaga, K., Matsuura, Y., Arakawa, S., Tamura, M., Hara, K., Takekawa, I., Motobe, R., & Takemura, K. (1985). Ijime shuudann no kouzou ni kansuru shakaigakuteki kenkyuu [The sociological study of the dynamics of bullying] : Osaka itiritu University.

Nucci, L. (1981). Conceptions of personal issues: A domain distinct from moral or societal concepts. Child Development, 52, 114-121.

Olweus, D. (1978). Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere Publishing Corporaton.

Olweus, D. (1980). Familial and temperamental determinants of aggressive behavior in adolescent boys: A causal analysis. Developmental Psychology, 16, 644-660.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among school children: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In D. Pepler & K. Rubin (Eds.), The development and treatment of childhood aggression . Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1994). Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do. Oxford, England: Blackwell.

O'Moore, A. M., & Hillery, B. (1989). Bullying in Dublin schools. Irish Journal of Psychology, 10, 426 - 441.

Parker, D. R., & Rogers, R. W. (1981). Observation and performance of aggression: Effects of multiple models and frustration. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 7, 302-308.

Pepler, D., Craig, W., Zeigler, S., & Charach, A. (1993). A school - based anti - bullying - intervention: Preliminary evaluation. In D. Tuttum (Ed.), Understanding and managing bullying (pp. 76 - 91). Oxford: Heinemann Educational.

Perry, D. G., Kusel, S. J., & Perry, L. C. (1989). Victims of peer aggression. Developmental Psychology, 24, 807 - 814.

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

Pikas, A. (1975). The way to stop Bullying. Stockholm: Prisma.

Rieger, T. (1980). On the biological basis of sex differences in aggression. Child Development, 51, 943 - 963.

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

Roland, E. (1980). Terror in school. Rogalandeforskning: Stavanger.

Ross, D. M. (1996). Childhood bullying and teasing: What school personnel, other professionals, and parents can do. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

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.

Shantz, D. W. (1986). Conflict, aggression, and peer status: An observational study. Child Development, 57(6), 1322 - 1332.

Smetana, J. (1982). Concepts of self and morality: Women's reasoning about abortion. New York: Praeger.

Stephenson, P., & Smith, D. (1988). Bullying in the junior school. In D. Tattum & D. Lane (Eds.), Bullying in schools : Trentham Books.

Takano, S. (1995). Ijimenomekanizumu [The mechanism of bullying]. Tokyo: Kyouiku shuppan.

Taki, M. (1996). Ijime wo sodateru gakkyuutokusei [The characteristics of classes with bullying problems]. Tokyo: Meiji tosho.

Turiel, E. (1983). The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tutum, D. P., & Herbert, G. (1993). Countering Bullying: Initiatives in Schools and Local Authorities: Trentham Books.

Whitney, I., & Smith, P. K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. Educational Research, 35(1), 3 - 25.

Worchel, S. (1974). The effect of three types of arbitrary thwarting on the instigation to aggression. Journal of Personality, 42, 300-318.

Yamazaki, M. (1985). Ijimeno kouzu [The structure of bullying]. Tokyo: Gyousei.

Appendix A

Dear Students:

My name is Takeshi Matsuda. I am a Japanese student at the University of Calgary. I am studying educational psychology, especially about bullying.

In Japan, bullying is one of the more serious problems at schools. In order to understand the differences between bullying in Japan and Canada, it is very important for me to know about bullying in Canada.

The survey will take about one hour to complete. Because you do not write your name on the questionnaire, nobody will know your answers.

If you are all right with completing the questionnaire, please sign in the blank below. If you have any questions, please ask me. Even if you put your signature in the blank below, you are free to refuse or withdraw at any time for any reason and without penalty or explanation.

Thank you very much for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Takeshi Matsuda

Consent for Research Participation

I understand that the questionnaire is for the study about bullying, and it takes about one hour to complete.

Since I will not write my name on the questionnaire, I understand that nobody will know how I answered the questionnaires.

I understand that, even if I put my signature in the blank below, I am free to refuse or withdraw at any time for any reason and without penalty or explanation.

(If you accept these statements above and you are all right with completing the questionnaire, please put your signature and the date below.)

_____   _____
Signature   Date

Appendix B

Dear Parent/Guardian:

My name is Takeshi Matsuda. I am a graduate student in the Department of Educational Psychology at the University of Calgary, conducting a research project under the supervision of Dr. D. McDougall, as part of the requirements towards a M.Sc. degree. I am writing to provide information regarding my research project, which is a comparison of bullying in Canada and Japan, so that you can make an informed decision regarding your child's participation.

The purpose of the study is to explore the differences between bullying in Japan and Canada. As part of the study your child will be asked to complete a questionnaire regarding his/her school experiences related to bullying. This questionnaire will take approximately one hour to complete. You should be aware that even if you give your permission, your child is free to withdraw at any time for any reason and without penalty.

Participation in this study will involve no greater risks than those ordinarily experienced in daily life. The questionnaire will take approximately one hour of class time to complete.

Data will be gathered in such a way as to ensure anonymity because your child will not be asked to write his/her name on the questionnaire. Once collected, responses will be kept in strictest confidence. Only group results will be reported in any published studies. The raw data will be kept in a locked filing cabinet at the University only accessible to the researcher and his supervisor. All files will be destroyed two years after completion of the study.

If you have any concerns, please feel free to contact Linda Brost, Specialist, Accountability Services, Calgary Board of Education: Telephone, 294-8447; Fax, 294-8434; e-mail, lgbrost@cbe.ab.ca.

Two copies of the consent form are provided. Please return one signed copy to your child's school by _____(date) and retain the other copy for your records.

Thank you for your cooperation.

Sincerely,

Takeshi Matsuda