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Bullying is a significant issue among school-aged youth, and it is important to examine the underlying mechanisms of these behaviors. Studies have shown that one characteristic found among some children who bully is a lack of empathy. Previous literature examining empathy and bullying has typically relied on the use of self-report data. Few studies have included other ways of evaluating empathy. Self-report data can be limiting, particularly for individuals who possess strengths other than verbal/linguistic. Drawings have been found to reveal insight into children’s emotions and may be more suited to assessing empathy. Studying children’s drawings of bullying, and their self-reported empathy may help extend research related to empathy and bullying. Using a mixed-methods research design, this study examined the relationship among bully/victim status, empathy, multiple intelligences through the evaluation of children’s drawings of bullying, in conjunction with their self-reported empathy. Quantitative results found that there were significant differences in empathy scores between participants identifying as “bullies” and “bully-victims” on Personal Distress. Additionally, there were significant differences in empathy scores found between female and male participants on Perspective Taking. All other quantitative results did not provide evidence of differences in empathy across bully/victim status, gender, nor age. Qualitative results did not provide evidence of
differences in participants’ ability to draw indicators of empathy based on bully/victim status, gender, age, or multiple intelligence types (suggesting that all participants were equally capable of drawing indicators of empathy). Mixed methods results found convergent, complementary, and divergent findings when participants’ quantitative and qualitative responses were combined. Specifically, consistent themes across participants’ quantitative and qualitative responses were found. Furthermore, it was found that participants who had lower empathy scores on the quantitative measure drew markers of empathy in their pictures. These participants endorsed dominance in intelligence types that were non-verbal (i.e., bodily/kinesthetic, visual/spatial). Results support the integration of quantitative and qualitative measures to assess and expand on research relating to the relationship and nuances among bullying, empathy, and multiple intelligences. These results may serve to inform bullying research, clinical utility, and intervention efforts seeking to ameliorate bullying problems among school-aged youth.
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CHAPTER 1:
INTRODUCTION

Humans have a basic need for love, connection, and belongingness with others (Maslow, 1943). Specifically, people tend to want to form caring and supportive relationships with family and friends. Individuals possess many traits and skills that allow them to form these connections with others. Among these relationship skills is empathy, which is a powerful ability that allows a person to become more connected to others through the processes of relating to their experiences and understanding their feelings or perspectives (Krznaric, 2012). When the power of empathy is applied in a school setting, it can help build greater connection among students and has the potential to foster a prosocial, safe school climate (Orpinas & Horne, 2006). This is the type of school environment that has the capacity to create the ideal conditions necessary (e.g., kindness, compassion) to help reduce and prevent bullying behaviors.

However, bullying continues to be a major issue among school-aged youth; nearly three out of four students experience bullying during their school years (Graham, 2011). Bullying is considered a specific type of peer aggression that is defined by three features: (1) bullying is intentional, (2) bullying is either repeated over time or has the potential to be repeated over time, and (3) bullying creates an imbalance of power between the perpetrator and victim (Andreou & Bonoti, 2010; Olweus, 1993; Rigby & Smith, 2011). Bullying behaviors can take on many forms, including physical bullying (e.g., hitting, destruction of property), verbal bullying (e.g., teasing, name-calling), social/relational bullying (e.g., exclusion, spreading rumors), and cyberbullying (e.g., posting hurtful
messages on social media). These forms of bullying typically co-occur, which means that victims often experience more than one form (Swearer, Espelage, & Napolitano, 2009).

Victims and perpetrators of bullying are not the only types of involvement for students; bullying is considered a group phenomenon, and the individuals involved can take on multiple roles or move across roles along the bully/victim continuum. These roles include the perpetrator, victim, bystander, and bully-victim. The perpetrator engages in bullying others, the victim is targeted by bullying perpetrators, the bystander witnesses bullying, the bully-victim engages in bullying others is also victimized by others.

Students may also be completely uninvolved in bullying situations, which is also considered a fifth role along the bully/victim continuum. While research has shown that most students experience bullying at some point during their schooling, the exact prevalence rates for each role across the bully/victim continuum are difficult to extract because of the differing methodologies and definitions of bullying used across studies. Studies have found that 8.3% to 18% of students are perpetrators of bullying (Swearer, Collins, Fluke, & Strawhun, 2012). Approximately 10% to 20.7% of students are victimized by their peers (Swearer et al., 2012). Wang, Iannotti, and Nansel (2009) assessed bullying occurring at least once in the past two months; they found that 53.6% of students were victimized by verbal bullying according to this definition.

While the literature contains varying prevalence rates of bullying, researchers have consistently found that there are serious consequences affiliated with involvement in bullying. Bullying significantly impacts the mental health of the students involved. Students who are involved in bullying situations as the bully, victim, bully-victim, or bystander, have an increased risk of experiencing significant mental health problems.
Involved students may experience depression and anxiety; however, the four levels of involvement can differentially impact students’ mental health.

The research findings related to mental health concerns experienced by bully perpetrators are mixed. Studies have found that bully perpetrators were more likely to be depressed than victims and uninvolved students and also experienced more symptoms of anxiety (Nansel et al., 2001; Swearer, Song, Cary, Eagle, & Mickleson, 2001). It has also been found that repeated aggression towards peers is linked to long-term mental health impairments, specifically inattention and depression (Campbell, Spieker, Burchinal, & Poe, 2006). Klomek, Marrocco, Kleinman, Schonfeld, and Gould (2007) found that students involved in bullying situations in and out of school, as either a victim or a bully, were at higher risk for depression, suicidal ideation, and suicide attempts as compared to students who were uninvolved in bullying situations. Victims of bullying are more likely to experience anxiety (Swearer et al., 2001), compared to students who bully or students who are uninvolved. Research has shown that bully-victims are at higher risk for depression and other psychosomatic symptoms (e.g., anxiety, sleeping problems), as compared to those not involved in bullying behaviors. Fekkes and colleagues (2004) found that bully-victims experienced very similar symptoms compared to students who were exclusively victimized. Bully-victims were more than twice as likely to experience anxiety and were more than three times as likely to experience feeling unhappy and depressed. Klomek et al. (2007) found that girls who were frequently bully-victims were 32 times more likely to be depressed, and 10 to 12 times more likely to experience suicidal ideation or attempt suicide than girls who were uninvolved in bullying situations. Swearer and colleagues (2001) found that bully-victims also experience depressive
symptoms, as well as anxious symptoms and this type of involvement is likely to be the most impaired type related to bullying.

While research has predominately focused on the mental health problems of children who are bullies, victims, or bully-victims, there is an emerging body of research that suggests that bystanders also experience aversive mental health issues. One study found that when students observe their peers being victimized, this observation could increase bystanders’ feelings of vulnerability (Glover, Gough, Johnson, & Cartwright, 2000). In another study by Rivers, Poteat, Noret, and Ashurst (2009), a majority of students who participated in the study reported witnessing their peers being bullied. It was found that of these students who witnessed bullying, many had experienced significant levels of depression, anxiety, and substance use among several other mental health concerns.

It is evident that all students who are involved in bullying, either as bullies, victims, bully-victims, or bystanders, experience mental health repercussions that are directly related to their involvement. In addition to mental health consequences associated with involvement in bullying, there are consequences related to students’ perceived sense of school safety. Studies have found that students who bully (Bradshaw, O’Brennan, & Sawyer, 2008; Stockdale, Hangaduambo, Duys, Larson, & Sarvela, 2002), are bullied (Boulton et al., 2009; Stockdale et al., 2002; Varjas, Henrich, & Meyers, 2009), and who are dually involved as bullies and victims (i.e., bully-victims; Bradshaw et al., 2008) endorse lower perceptions of school safety than those not involved or less frequently involved in bullying. Adolescents who are directly involved in bullying as bullies, victims, or bully-victims were found to feel less safe at school than bystanders
(Glew, Fan, Katon, & Rivara, 2008). Of all those involved in bullying, bully-victims appear to feel the least safe at school and are most likely to miss school as a result of feeling afraid or unsafe (Berkowitz & Benbenishty, 2012; Bradshaw et al., 2008). Thus, there appears to be a clear relationship between bullying and school safety in that involvement in bullying is associated with negative perceptions of school safety. Due to the prevalence of bullying and its associated consequences, such as mental health problems and reduced perception of school safety, it is important to examine the underlying contributing factors that influence bullying behaviors, so that bullying behaviors can be addressed more effectively in schools.

Studies have found that one characteristic that is found among children who bully is a lack of empathy (Bullock, 2002; Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007). Empathy is an emotional response that corresponds to the recognition of the current feelings of another person (Kalisch, 1973), and is considered a basic component of emotional intelligence (Elliott, Watson, Goldman, & Greenberg, 2010; Goleman, 1996). Empathy has also been defined as the ability to share and understand another person’s emotional state (Caravita, Di Blasio, & Salmivalli, 2008; Cohen & Strayer, 1996; Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987). This is often confused with other emotional expressions, such as compassion and sympathy, which are actually responses to having an empathic connection to another person (Singer & Klimecki, 2014). Compassion and sympathy are believed to mean having feelings of concern for another person, which is then accompanied by the motivation to help that person (Miller & Eisenberg, 1988; Singer & Klimecki, 2014).
Empathy is a complex phenomenon that requires individuals to use their emotional and their cognitive systems in order to understand someone else, by taking their perspective (Bohart & Greenberg, 1997; Miller & Eisenberg, 1988). Using both affective and cognitive processes is what allows individuals to “step into” the experience of others, thereby allowing for greater connection to others (Fingerhut, 2011). According to Eisenberg and Strayer (1987), empathy is an affective reaction that occurs in response to overt cues (e.g., facial expressions) or indirect cues (e.g., the nature of another person’s situation). Individuals lacking empathy typically have difficulty interpreting visual cues regarding others’ emotions, and also express difficulty relating to others and understanding how others might feel (Bossenmeyer, 2010). Studies have found that children who bully show little empathy (Bullock, 2002; Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007). One study has demonstrated that low levels of empathy have been related to more frequent involvement in bullying (Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007). Furthermore, it has been shown that students who bully tend to display less empathic awareness than their peers who do not engage in bullying behaviors (Warden & Mackinnon, 2003).

Generally, studies examining bully/victim problems, as well as studies examining empathy rely on self-report data. It could be the case that children who bully may under-report their involvement (De Castro, Veerman, Koops, Bosch, & Monshouwer, 2002). Victims may also inaccurately report being bullied. It could also be the case that children are unable to accurately express their empathy using self-report surveys. Self-report data mainly allow children to think about bullying and empathy in a quantitative way. In contrast, utilizing alternative methods of assessing bullying may allow children to qualitatively consider their roles in bullying (Andreou & Bonoti, 2010). Likewise, using a
qualitative approach to assess empathy may help reveal how children feel about other participants involved in bullying (e.g., children may demonstrate an empathetic understanding of how a victim feels in a bullying situation) in ways that cannot be captured from quantitative approaches alone.

**Multiple Intelligences Approach to Assessment**

According to Gardner (1983), all human beings possess seven intelligences in varying amounts. These intelligences can work independently or together, and can showcase students’ strengths when applied to their preferred learning styles. Gardner (1983) defined these seven intelligences as logical/mathematical, visual/spatial, bodily/kinesthetic, musical, linguistic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal.

Logical/mathematical intelligence involves excelling in skills used in problem-solving and scientific thinking. Visual/spatial intelligence involves being adept in artistic or spatially perceptive skills. Bodily/kinesthetic intelligence involves excelling in skills used in physical movement. Musical intelligence involves having exceptional skills used in perceiving or expressing musical patterns. Linguistic intelligence involves utilizing words effectively. Interpersonal intelligence involves being adept in responding to and interacting with others, as well as being sensitive to others’ moods, intentions, and motivations. Lastly, intrapersonal intelligence involves excelling in skills related to accessing one’s own feelings and emotions (Feldman, 2003; Gardner, 1983).

While students possess all seven intelligence types, the varying degree to which they possess each intelligence type causes students to think, learn, and express themselves differently. According to the theory of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1983) students’ intelligences can be viewed in isolation. Students who are more linguistic are
more likely to perform well on tasks that require writing; however, their linguistic intelligence fails to transfer to other areas, such as mathematics. In this case, linguistic intelligence does not transfer to logical/mathematical intelligence (Armstrong, 2009). Similarly, students who are more visual/spatial may be less likely to perform as well on linguistic tasks given that their strengths are best evidenced in an artistic domain. When they are asked to complete tasks outside of the scope of their intelligence type, they may not have the opportunity to apply their strengths to that task (Armstrong, 2009). It is possible that by only using a quantitative, verbal approach to assess bullying and/or empathy in research studies, only a limited number of students will endorse bullying or empathy because they are responding favorably, according to their (verbal) strengths, to the type of assessment. Students who may possess visual/spatial or interpersonal intelligence may not have the opportunity to demonstrate their involvement in bullying nor their empathy of others on a predominantly verbal assessment. Conversely, they may be more likely to demonstrate a more accurate understanding of bullying and empathy if they are presented with an alternative, non-verbal assessment that is more suited to non-verbal intelligence types.

The Current Study

Studies have shown that one of characteristic that is found among children who bully is a lack of empathy for victims. Specifically, researchers have found that perpetrators of bullying fail to express empathy (i.e., the ability to understand another person’s emotional state; Caravita, Di Blasio, & Salmivalli, 2008) following the engagement of harmful behaviors towards victims (Bullock, 2002; Menesini et al., 2003; Warden & Mackinnon, 2003). Researchers have also found that low levels of empathy
may relate to more frequent involvement in bullying (Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007). Previous literature that has looked at empathy and bullying has typically relied on the use of self-report data; few studies have involved other ways of evaluating bullying and empathy. While utilizing self-report data are reliable, they are limiting in that self-report questions prompt individuals to think about bullying in a quantitative way. Furthermore, this verbal method of evaluating bullying and empathy may only be best suited for individuals who possess verbal/linguistic intelligence (Armstrong, 2009). Utilizing a non-verbal, qualitative methods to evaluate bullying, such as projective drawings, may provide individuals with alternative intelligences (i.e., visual/spatial) a way of demonstrating their perceptions of bullying and empathy not necessarily captured by quantitative, self-report methodology.

Drawings have been found to provide insight into children’s emotions (Kosslyn, Heldmeyer, & Locklear, 1977; Malchiodi, 1998; Skybo, Ryan-Wenger, & Su, 2007). Additionally, drawings may be more accommodating for non-verbal intelligence types than verbal-based quantitative measures. Studying children’s drawings of bullying, in addition to their self-reported empathy may help extend the research related to empathy and bullying. The purpose of this dissertation study was to examine the relationship between bully/victim status and empathy through the evaluation of children’s drawings of a bullying situation, as well as their self-reported empathy. The research on bullying and empathy, which has suggested that children who bully have low empathy, has exclusively relied on quantitative and verbally-driven assessments (Caravita, Di Blasio, & Salmivalli, 2008; Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007). Therefore, this study aimed to explore whether or not children who bully may actually have more empathy than what is
currently understood in the literature, when they are given a non-verbal, visual/spatial assessment in conjunction with a verbal assessment, to demonstrate their empathy towards others involved in a bullying situation. The guiding research question was, “Do children reveal empathy in their drawings of bullying situations?” Specifically, this dissertation study examined the similarities and differences between students’ self-reported, quantitative data on bullying and empathy and their visual, qualitative data on bullying and empathy. Age and gender differences were also explored, given that developmental (Kohlberg, 1971) and gender differences (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Warden & Mackinnon, 2003; Pozzili & Gini, 2010) in empathy have been found in the literature.

The following chapter describes the extant literature on bullying and the theoretical models used to explain the etiology of bullying. Then, the literature on empathy and bullying is discussed, including age and gender differences. Next, the literature on multiple intelligences and its applicability in assessment is reviewed. Finally, specific research questions and hypotheses for the current study are presented. It is anticipated that the results of this study will add to the research on bullying and empathy, particularly as a unique qualitative methodology is being utilized to determine students’ empathy towards victims of bullying. Further, this study hopes to generate beneficial implications in support of the value and utilization of qualitative efforts to assess empathy (as well as other internal, trait-based factors) in the fields of psychology, education, and mixed methods.
CHAPTER 2:
LITERATURE REVIEW

Overview of Bullying

Human aggression is any behavior that is intended to cause immediate harm to another person who is motivated to avoid such treatment (Anderson & Bushman, 2002). Bullying is a type of aggressive behavior that consists of three critical components. First, bullying is intentional and negative; a student who bullies another student does so with the intent to harm (i.e., physically or emotionally) that person (Olweus, 1993). Second, bullying behaviors are repeated over time, as opposed to a single incident (Olweus, 1993). Third, there is usually a power imbalance between bullies and victims (Andreou & Bonoti, 2010; Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, 2016; Olweus, 1993; Rigby & Smith, 2011), meaning that students who are bullied generally have a difficult time defending themselves. This power imbalance is either perceived by the victim, or is an actual difference (e.g., physical, social) between the bully and victim (Scheithauer, Hayer, Petermann, & Jugert, 2006). Typically, the bully has some advantage or power over the student being victimized.

Bullying behaviors can occur in many forms such as physical, verbal, relational, and electronic. Physical bullying (e.g., hitting, punching, kicking) and verbal bullying (e.g., teasing, name calling) are considered to be direct forms of bullying (Schitehauer, Hayer, Petermann, & Jugert, 2006; Wang, Iannotti, & Nansel, 2009) because these forms of bullying directly involve the victim, whereas relational bullying (e.g., spreading rumors, gossiping, excluding) is considered to be an indirect form of bullying (Schitehauer, Hayer, Petermann, & Jugert, 2006; Wang, Iannotti, & Nansel, 2009) because the victim, while the target of bullying, is not directly involved. Cyberbullying
has emerged as a more recent form of relational bullying that involves the use of computers (e.g., Facebook messaging or instant messaging) or cell phones (i.e., text messaging; Wang, Iannotti, & Nansel, 2009). While relational aggression may be difficult to detect due to its covert nature, it is prevalent and can lead to detrimental consequences for victimized students (e.g., anxiety, depression).

**Participant Roles**

A common misconception is that bullying is a problem that occurs only between two individuals: the bully the victim. However, recent research suggests that bullying is a problem that impacts many other people (Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Menesini & Salmivalli, 2017; Swearer et al., 2010). Bullying is now known to be a much broader and more complex issue that frequently involves multiple people playing multiple roles (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). Therefore, bullying should be considered a group phenomenon as opposed to an isolated problem between the bully and victim. Thus it is important to understand how bullying impacts the people who are involved, either directly or indirectly. Students involved in bullying situations can be categorized along the bully/victim continuum as either bullies, victims, or bully-victims (Haynie et al., 2001). Bullies are those who perpetrate aggressive behaviors towards others, victims are those who are the targets of aggressive behaviors, and bully-victims are those who bully others and get bullied by others. Students can also be bystanders or uninvolved. Bystanders are individuals who witness bullying happen (Salmivalli, 2010), and comprise the most common role that students take on. Smith and Shu (2000) reported that nearly two out of three students will observe bullying occur during their lifetime. These bullying roles are not static (Ryoo, Wang, & Swearer, 2014).
and can change as a child encounters new environmental contexts (e.g., new peer groups, new school, new grade level). For instance, a student who perpetrates bullying in one setting (e.g., classroom) may choose to remain uninvolved in another setting (e.g., afterschool club), while a student who was victimized in elementary school may begin engaging in bullying as he or she enters middle or high school.

**Etiology of Bullying Behaviors**

**Family Factors.** Several family variables have been linked to the development of aggression and violence among children (Loeber & Hay, 1997). Specifically, mother-infant relationships characterized by an insecure attachment have been associated with aggressive outcomes in boys such as aggressive noncompliance (Loeber & Hay, 1997; Renken, Egeland, Marvinney, Mangelsdorf, & Sroufe, 1989). Other studies have found that parenting practices such as coercive interactions, punitive discipline, and physical abuse and neglect are associated with childhood aggression as well as aggression, bullying, and violence later in life (e.g., Herrenkohl & Russo, 2001; Patterson, DeBaryshe, & Ramsey, 1989). However, in these studies, there is a lack of clarity regarding whether the punitive disciplinary practices were used prior to the emergence of the child’s aggressive behaviors or if punitive disciplinary practices were used in reaction to the child’s aggressive behaviors (Loeber & Hay, 1997). Finally, researchers have found that family structure may influence childhood aggression (Loeber & Hay, 1997). For example, children who are raised in single parent homes have demonstrated greater aggressive behaviors than children raised with both parents (e.g., Kupersmidt, Griesler, DeRosier, Patterson, & Davis, 1995). However, some of the variance in childhood
aggression among single parents is due to the type of neighborhood the child resides in (Kupersmidt et al., 1995).

**Neighborhood Factors.** Research continues to emerge regarding the influence neighborhoods have on childhood aggression (e.g., Attar, Guerra, & Tolan, 1994; Kupersmidt et al., 1995; Swearer et al., 2006). For example, studies have found that elementary-age children who observe or experience violence in their neighborhoods behave more aggressively and have increased aggressive fantasies and social cognitions supporting aggression and bullying (Guerra, Huesmann, & Spindler, 2003; Guerra, Huesmann, Tolan, Van Acker, & Eron, 1995). Other studies have found that within disadvantaged neighborhoods children experience more stressful life events and these stressors are associated with heightened aggression (Attar et al., 1994; Guerra et al., 1995; Loeber & Hay, 1997). Finally, Loeber & Wikström (1993) found that neighborhoods influence the emergence of aggressive behaviors among boys. Specifically, the quality of a neighborhood influenced whether 10 to 12-year-old boys had progressed to physical fighting or violence with the most disadvantaged neighborhoods associated with more extreme forms of aggressive behaviors and bullying.

**Peer Influences.** One common theme in the literature is the influence peers have on the development and maintenance of bullying and aggressive behaviors (Faris & Ennett, 2012; Rodkin & Hodges, 2003; Werner & Crick, 2004). Researchers theorize that peer groups can teach children to behave aggressively by modeling these behaviors, reinforcing bullying behaviors when they are displayed by group members, or coercing group members to engage in other aggressive behaviors (Bandura, 1978; Werner & Crick, 2004). It has also been suggested that peer rejection influences the development of
aggressive behaviors (e.g., Loeber & Hay, 1997). Werner and Crick (2004) provide evidence for this in a year-long study conducted with 2nd through 4th graders that investigated the relationship between maladaptive peer relationships and the development of physical and relational aggression. The study found that peer rejection and association with aggressive peers predicted future physical and relational aggression among both genders.

**Gender and Developmental Differences**

While both males and females can engage in any form of bullying, males and female perpetrators tend to display different forms of aggression towards their victims. Males tend to display more physical bullying behaviors towards others, while females tend to display more covert, relational aggression (Wimmer, 2009). Research on aggression has found that similar gender differences exist, and in fact, begin to emerge as early as the preschool years, with girls exhibiting lower levels of physical aggression than boys (Loeber and Hay, 1997). Girls, however, display higher levels of verbal and indirect aggression compared to boys (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). As children age these gender differences in aggressive, bullying behaviors remain consistent (Anderson & Huesmann, 2007). Studies conducted with adolescents have found that boys tend to engage in more direct, physical and verbal forms of bullying than girls and that girls continue to employ more relational forms of bullying than boys (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). Overall, however, it has been found that boys are involved in bullying at greater rates than girls (Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, & Sadek, 2010). According to a study by Österman et al. (1998), these differences are evident
across cultural groups. In adulthood gender differences in aggression persist with males committing more violent crimes than females (Anderson & Huesmann, 2007).

**Consequences of Bullying**

**Mental Health.** Bullying has many consequences for all who are involved, some longer lasting than others. The research findings related to mental health concerns experienced by bully perpetrators are mixed. Some findings indicate that there is no relationship between students who bully others and depression (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005), while other studies have found that both bullies and victims report higher levels of depression than students uninvolved in bullying (Roland, 2002). Other studies have found that bully perpetrators were more likely to be depressed than victims and uninvolved students and also experienced more symptoms of anxiety (Nansel et al., 2001; Swearer, Song, Cary, Eagle, & Mickleson, 2001). It has also been found that repeated aggression towards peers is linked to long-term mental health impairments, specifically inattention and depression (Campbell, Spieker, Burchinal, & Poe, 2006). Klomek, Marrocco, Kleinman, Schonfeld, and Gould (2007) found that students involved in bullying situations in and out of school, as either a victim or a bully, were at higher risk for depression, suicidal ideation, and suicide attempts as compared to students who were uninvolved in bullying situations. These researchers also found that students who reported frequently bullying others in or out of school were three times more likely to be depressed than students who were uninvolved, and students who reported infrequently bullying others were two times more likely to be depressed (Klomek et al., 2007). It was also found that girls who bullied others were at a significantly higher risk of experiencing depression and suicide attempts than boys who bullied others (Klomek et al., 2007).
Victims of bullying are more likely to experience anxiety (Swearer et al., 2001), compared to students who bully or students who are uninvolved. Additionally, research has shown that victims experience high levels of depressive symptoms, including suicidal behaviors and suicidal ideation. One study by Cleary (2000) examined the relationship between victimization and both suicidal and violent behaviors in high school students found that these behaviors were more prevalent for victimized students than non-victimized students. The study also found differences between male and female victims. Males tended to report more victimization than females and males reported more violent behavior than suicidal behavior, compared to females (Cleary, 2000). Klomek and colleagues (2007) found that victimized boys were more likely to be depressed, experience suicidal ideation, and attempt suicide more than boys who were not victimized. In another study by Fekkes, Pijpers, and Verloove-Vanhorick (2004) it was found that students in elementary school who were victimized were more than two times as likely to report feeling tense and anxious, and were more than three times as likely to report feeling unhappy and depressed than students who were not involved in bullying. Klomek et al. (2007) found that frequency of victimization related to students reporting being depressed. Specifically, students who were frequently victimized were seven times more likely to be depressed as compared to students who were uninvolved, whereas students who were infrequently victimized were two to three times more likely to be depressed.

Research has shown that bully-victims are at higher risk for depression and other psychosomatic symptoms (e.g., anxiety, sleeping problems), as compared to those not involved in bullying behaviors. Fekkes and colleagues (2004) found that bully-victims
experienced very similar symptoms compared to students who were exclusively victimized. Bully-victims were more than twice as likely to experience anxiety and were more than three times as likely to experience feeling unhappy and depressed. Klomek et al. (2007) found that girls who were frequently bully-victims were 32 times more likely to be depressed, and 10 to 12 times more likely to experience suicidal ideation or attempt suicide than girls who were uninvolved in bullying situations. Swearer and colleagues (2001) found that bully-victims also experience depressive symptoms, as well as anxious symptoms and this type of involvement is likely to be the most impaired type related to bullying. Holt and Espelage (2007) looked at perceived social support, from both peers and family, and how that related to reported levels of anxiety and depression along the bullying continuum. They found that bully-victims reported significantly less perceived peer support as compared to peers who were uninvolved in bullying behaviors and that bully-victims reported more anxiety and depressive symptoms than students who were uninvolved or were bullies (Holt & Espelage, 2007).

While research has predominately focused on the mental health problems of children who are bullies, victims, or bully-victims, there is an emerging body of research that suggests that bystanders also experience aversive mental health issues. One study found that when students observe their peers being victimized, this observation could increase bystanders’ feelings of vulnerability (Glover, Gough, Johnson, & Cartwright, 2000). In another study by Rivers, Poteat, Noret, and Ashurst (2009), a majority of students who participated in the study reported witnessing their peers being bullied. It was found that of these students who witnessed bullying, many had experienced
significant levels of depression, anxiety, and substance use among several other mental health concerns.

These mental health concerns can result when children are involved in bullying situations directly, but also can result through bullying situations that occur online. Cyberbullying is an emerging form of bullying that can have very serious mental health consequences (e.g., anxiety and emotional distress) similar to mental health consequences linked to traditional bullying (Schneider, O’Donnell, Stueve, & Coulter, 2012). Some research suggests that victims of cyberbullying may experience even more serious mental distress, including depression (Mitchell, Ybarra, & Finkelhor, 2007; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004), self-harm, and suicide (Hay & Meldrum, 2010; Hinduja & Patchin, 2010; Klomek et al., 2007). Schneider and colleagues (2012) found that the students who reported being victims of both cyberbullying and traditional bullying within school experienced the highest levels of depressive symptoms as well as suicide attempts, and students who reported being victims of either cyberbullying or traditional bullying also reported experiencing high levels of psychological distress.

**School Safety and Academic Achievement.** Studies have found that students who bully (Bradshaw, O’Brennan, & Sawyer, 2008; Stockdale, Hangaduambo, Duys, Larson, & Sarvela, 2002), are bullied (Boulton et al., 2009; Stockdale et al., 2002; Varjas, Henrich, & Meyers, 2009), and who are involved as bully-victims (i.e., bully-victims; Bradshaw et al., 2008) endorse lower perceptions of school safety than those uninvolved in bullying. Adolescents who are directly involved in bullying as bullies, victims, or bully-victims were found to feel less safe at school than bystanders (Glew, Fan, Katon, & Rivara, 2008). Of all those involved in bullying, bully-victims appear to feel the least safe
at school and are most likely to miss school as a result of feeling afraid or unsafe (Berkowitz & Benbenishty, 2012; Bradshaw et al., 2008). Thus, there appears to be a clear relationship between bullying and school safety in that involvement in bullying is associated with negative perceptions of school safety.

Studies have found that bullying appears to be associated with decreased academic achievement for students in elementary (Woods & Wolke, 2004), middle (Beran, Hughes, & Lupart, 2008; Juvonen, Wang, & Espinoza, 2011; Rothon, Head, Klineberg, & Stansfeld, 2010), and high school (Bauman, 2008; Konishi, Hymel, Zumbo, & Li, 2010). Specifically, bullying and victimization have been found to be negatively associated with various indicators of academic achievement including impaired math and reading achievement (Konishi et al., 2010), overall GPA (Juvonen et al., 2011), students’ self-reported grades (Bauman, 2008), educational benchmarks (Rothon et al., 2010), and lower teacher ratings of achievement (Beran et al., 2008; Juvonen et al., 2011).

**Theoretical Models of Bullying Behavior**

**Bandura’s Social Learning Theory.** Bandura’s (1977) Social Learning Theory posits that people learn from observing the behaviors of others as well as the outcomes of those behaviors. According to this theory, children can acquire aggressive behaviors by observing models (e.g., parents, peers) who engage in similar aggressive acts and are reinforced for this behavior. Bandura, Ross, and Ross (1961) provided initial support for this assumption by demonstrating that children learn and imitate aggressive behaviors they have observed in adult models. Some of the children in the study watched a male or female adult behaving aggressively toward a toy called a Bobo doll. Later on, when these children were allowed to play in a room with a Bobo doll, they began to imitate the
aggressive behaviors they had previously observed from the adult model. In general, children who observed the aggressive models engaged in significantly more aggressive behaviors than children who were exposed to a non-aggressive model or no model.

Bandura (1977) asserts that in order for observational learning to be successful four conditions – attention, retention, motor reproduction, and motivation – must be present. First, the observer must pay attention to the model and be able to remember the behavior that was observed. Second, the observer has to be able to replicate the behavior that the model has demonstrated. Lastly, the observer must be motivated to imitate the behavior that has been modeled. Thus, the likelihood that children will imitate bullying behaviors they observe depends on whether they attend to the person’s behaviors, remember the behaviors that are observed, are physically capable of replicating the bullying behaviors, and are motivated to engage in the bullying behaviors.

Reinforcement, punishment, and self-efficacy play an important role in motivation (Bandura, 1978; Okey, 1992). For example, children are more likely to engage in aggressive behaviors (i.e., bullying) if they result in positive outcomes and/or if they have high self-efficacy for aggressive behaviors and low self-efficacy for alternative coping strategies (Bandura, 1978; Okey, 1992).

**Bronfenbrenner’s Social-Ecological Theory.** Due to its social nature, bullying can be conceptualized within the framework of Bronfenbrenner’s (1979) social-ecological theory (Orpinas & Horne, 2006; Swearer & Doll, 2001; Swearer, Espelage, Koenig, Berry, Collins, & Lembeck, 2012). Bronfenbrenner (1979) suggested that behaviors cannot be fully explained by examining internal factors in isolation. Instead, in order to obtain a full understanding of any behavior, a careful examination and
understanding of the environment must be achieved (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Specifically, to understand bullying, one must understand the environmental factors that allow bullying to occur and not exclusively assess the internalizing factors contributing to an individual’s bullying behaviors.

Bronfenbrenner’s social-ecological theory (1979) stated that children exist within an environment that contains complex interactions of systems. There are five systems: the individual, the microsystem, the mesosystem, the exosystem, and the macrosystem. Bronfenbrenner (1979) suggested that a change in any given system could cause changes to the other systems, ultimately affecting the individual. Understanding how each system operates is as important as understanding the complexities of the interactions across systems.

The first level is an individual’s internal factors and traits (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), and is important in considering an individual’s behaviors. The second level is the microsystem. The microsystem includes any system in which the child is interacting with other systems (Bronfenbrenner, 1979), including family, school, religious institutions, peers, and neighborhoods. Children encounter multiple microsystems every day, specifically among home, school, and their community. It is important to consider the impact that exposure to multiple microsystems can have on an individual.

Mesosystems are the next level and include relationships between microsystems. For example, the connection between a student and his or her parents (a microsystem) and the relationship between a student and his or her neighborhood (another microsystem) may be influenced by the relationship between the student’s parents and the neighborhood (a mesosystem). According to Bronfenbrenner (1979) large-scale cultural
contexts, such norms, beliefs, or traditions, are referred to as the macrosystem. A macrosystem will change over time because generations will adopt new norms, which will inform the cultural context of a new macrosystem. All five levels in Bronfenbrenner’s social-ecological model are interactive, and influence and are influenced by each other. Bronfenbrenner’s work encourages researchers to consider interactions across all of these levels when examining the complexities of human development and behavior (Bronfenbrenner, 1979). Researchers specifically examining school bullying have taken this framework and have applied it to develop the social-ecological model of bullying (Swearer & Doll, 2001).

**The social-ecological model of bullying.** Given the complexity of bullying, researchers have determined that bullying behaviors cannot be attributed to a single cause (Swearer & Espelage, 2011). Instead, bullying behavior follows the principle of equifinality, which suggests that there are many different factors that can all impact an individual’s involvement within the bullying continuum (Espelage & Swearer, 2010). Therefore, researchers must consider the impacts of these different factors in order to gain a full understanding of bullying. The social-ecological model of bullying was developed in alignment with Bronfenbrenner’s model, to help explain how all of these varied factors can impact or exacerbate individuals’ involvement in bullying (Swearer & Espelage, 2004). Specifically, the social-ecological model was developed so that researchers could understand how all of the varied factors, across different levels within Bronfenbrenner’s model, dictate a student’s involvement in bullying (Swearer & Espelage, 2004; Swearer & Espelage, 2011).
**Individual influences.** Factors within individuals can determine their engagement in bullying (Swearer & Espelage, 2004). These factors can include personal characteristics, biological factors, behavior, and personal experience. Other factors can include education level, employment status, violent history, and personal beliefs (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). Some of these factors may be able to be changed with intervention, such as mental health, empathy, and attitudes towards bullying and aggression (Lee, 2011). However, other factors tend to potentially increase the risk of engagement in bullying (e.g., lower levels of education, history of engaging in violence; Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). Other individual factors are less likely to be changed but still play a role in the bullying dynamic, such as age and gender.

**Family influences.** Given that children spend a substantial amount of time with their family, factors within the family system can influence children’s involvement in bullying. Research has found that several familial characteristics have impacted bullying perpetration, including family members’ involvement in gangs, poor parental supervision, parental attitudes towards bullying, low parental communication, an authoritarian parenting style, an inappropriate discipline (Swearer & Hymel, 2015). Additionally, the presence of domestic abuse and maladaptive sibling relationships have been identified as potential predictors of bullying involvement (Lee, 2011; Swearer et al., 2012). Poor communication among family members and a lack of emotional support within the family have been considered to be factors that could exacerbate bullying behaviors (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002).

**Peer influences.** Children spend a majority of their day interacting with peers across a variety of contexts (e.g., schools, social media), and bullying is considered a
social relationship problem (Pepler, Craig, & O’Connell, 2011). Therefore, peer influences have a significant impact on an individual’s involvement in bullying behaviors. There is a wide range of variables related to a child’s peer group that have been identified as affecting involvement in bullying. Classrooms that have significant negative peer interactions (Pepler et al., 2010) and classrooms characterized by peer norms that support engagement in bullying behaviors (Craig & Pepler, 1997; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004) have been shown to influence students’ involvement in bullying behaviors. Additionally, the use of bullying as a means of “climbing the social ladder” (Espelage, Holt, & Henkel, 2003) has been shown to dictate students’ engagement in bullying. Additionally, affiliation with aggressive peers has been shown to be associated with greater involvement in bullying perpetration (Espelage, Holt, & Henkel, 2003).

**School influences.** Children spend a majority of their day each week at school. Bullying behaviors have been extensively studied within the school context, as well as the impact of bullying on school climate (Richard, Schneider, & Mallet, 2011; Wang, Berry, & Swearer, 2013). Therefore, it has been shown that school factors can significantly influence bullying behaviors. Specifically, bullying behaviors have been shown to be related to inappropriate teacher responses (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006), negative relationships between teachers and students (Doll et al., 2004), lack of teacher support (Barboza et al., 2009), as well as teacher attitudes towards bullying, their reactions towards bullying, and their overall classroom management styles (Lee, 2011). Similarly, larger issues such as school-wide behavior management systems, anti-bullying policies, and the overall school culture, impact the occurrence of bullying behaviors as well (Lee, 2011; Swearer & Espelage, 2011).
Community and cultural influences. While children are more directly connected to their family, peer, and school contexts, community and culture can also potentially influence children’s bullying behaviors. These factors can include unsafe neighborhoods (Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2000), poverty (Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O’Brien, 2009), and the absence of community resources, such as parks and playgrounds (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). Factors that have been shown to increase the risk of involvement in bullying behaviors are the level of residents’ social connectedness, lack of neighborhood organization, a lack of recreational opportunities, and poor physical layout of a neighborhood (Dahlberg & Krug, 2002). At the cultural level, bullying behaviors may be influenced by community-driven norms towards punishment and aggression (Lee, 2011).

Overview of Empathy

Basic Definition. Empathy has been defined as the ability to share and understand another person’s emotional state (Caravita, Di Blasio, & Salmivalli, 2008; Cohen & Strayer, 1996; Eisenberg & Strayer, 1987) as well as their pain and distress (Randall, 2013). According to Eisenberg and Strayer (1987), empathy has also been defined as the affective reaction that occurs in response to overt cues (e.g., facial expressions) or indirect cues (e.g., the nature of another person’s situation). These forms of empathy are known as cognitive and affective empathy, respectively. Cognitive empathy refers to the ability to take the role or perspective of another’s emotional state, whereas affective empathy refers to a response that is congruent with someone else’s situation over one’s own situation (Dadds et al., 2008; Eisenberg & Fabes, 1990).
Empathy and Bullying

Children lacking empathy typically have difficulty interpreting visual cues regarding others’ emotions, and also express difficulty relating to others and understanding how others might feel (Bossenmeyer, 2010). Research has shown that some children who bully show little empathy (Bullock, 2002). One study has demonstrated that low levels of empathy have been related to more frequent involvement in bullying (Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007). Furthermore, it has been shown that students who bully tend to display less empathic awareness than their peers who do not engage in bullying behaviors (Warden & Mackinnon, 2003). Some researchers argue that students who bully are actually adept at reading social cues; these students use their ability to engage in perspective-taking to prey on other students (Olweus, 1999).

However, a lack of empathy has been found to be common among those who fail to appropriately react when witnessing the distress of others. Watching others in pain appears to serve as a reward for those who bully others, thus suggesting that a lack of empathy leads to inappropriate responses when a student is being victimized (Decety, Michalska, Akitsuki, & Lahey, 2010).

Lack of Empathy through Moral Disengagement. Students generally engage in bullying behaviors because they either have strong needs for power and dominance or find satisfaction in causing injury and suffering to other individuals (Olweus, 1999). An additional characteristic that may set those who bully apart from their peers is moral disengagement; individuals will act aggressively in order to achieve what they perceive as morally right and will subsequently consider any aggressive actions take to obtain such a goal to be justifiable (Alvarez & Bachman, 2008). Numerous studies have advocated
for the role of moral disengagement, especially high levels of moral disengagement, in the development and maintenance of bullying behaviors (Gini, 2006; Gini, Pozzoli, & Hymel, 2013; Hymel, Schonert-Reichel, Bonanno, Vaillancourt, & Rocke Henderson, 2010; Pozzoli, Gini, & Vieno, 2012). In a study looking at the moral emotions experienced by bullies, compared to victims and bystanders (Menesini, Sanchez, Fonzi, Costabile, & Feudo, 2003), results showed that bullies endorsed higher moral disengagement and displayed more egocentric reasoning. Specifically, one form of moral disengagement is indifference, which is expressed by the lack of emotions in response to a harmful behavior towards victimized students (Menesini, Sanchez, Fonzi, Costabile, & Feudo, 2003). This lack of empathetic feelings has been found among many children who bully others, thus strengthening the connection that low levels of empathy appear to be a contributing factor for children’s engagement in bullying behaviors.

Lack of Empathy through Cognitive Distortions. Similarly, research on cognitive distortions suggests individuals displaying antisocial, unempathetic behavior (e.g., bullying, aggression) exhibit distortions in greater numbers than the general public (Lardén, Melin, Holst, & Långström, 2006). Cognitive distortions have been defined as inaccurate interpretations of experiences (Barriga, Gibbs, Potter, & Liau, 2001), and may be separated into two types, self-serving and self-debasing (Barriga, Landau, Stinson, Liau, & Gibbs, 2000). Self-serving cognitive distortions are related to externalizing behaviors while self-debasing cognitive distortions are related to internalizing behaviors. Previous research on aggressive youth has suggested individuals who endorse more self-serving cognitive distortions have lower empathy for their victimized individuals (Barriga, Sullivan-Cosetti, & Gibbs, 2009). Additionally, the bullying (Farrington &
Gender Differences in Empathy

Empathy has also been found to relate to whether or not students intervene when they witness bullying situations (Eisenberg, Morris, McDaniel, & Spinrad, 2009). Research has found that gender differences regarding reasons for defending may exist; for girls empathy towards victimized peers related to their willingness to intervene, whereas for boys, perceived social status (e.g., being well-liked by peers) related to whether or not they would defend their victimized peers (Barchia & Bussey, 2011). Boys have even been found to have less empathetic awareness than girls (Warden & Mackinnon, 2003) and were found less likely to intervene and defend than girls (Pozzili & Gini, 2010). Thus, empathy and bystanders’ willingness to intervene appear to be influenced by gender.

Intervening in bullying situations is further complicated by the mere presence of other bystanders, which is enough to influence whether or not a person intervenes or not. Typically, the presence of others yields inaction (Darley and Latané, 1968); this phenomenon is known as the bystander effect. The bystander can occur because of diffusion of responsibility. When others are around, in the presence of an emergency situation, a given individual may feel less personal obligation to help the person in need (Darley and Latané, 1968). Research has found that diffusion of responsibility is a contributing factor to the lack of responding to victimized peers’ distress in bullying situations (Caplan & Hay, 1989; Rutkowski, Gruder, & Romer, 1983). Caplan and Hay (1989) found that while students knew how to respond to their distressed peers, they did
not feel obligated to intervene when competent adults (i.e., teachers) were present. Rutkowski, Gruder, and Romer (1983) found that students’ diffusion of responsibility falls onto teachers or onto friends of the victimized student, particularly if the student determines that he or she is not friends with the victim. Furthermore, Haidt and Graham (2007) suggest that a moral foundation is related to in-group/loyalty; individuals tend to be more trusting and cooperative with members of their in-group and are distrustful of members of other groups. If victims are not within bystanders’ in-groups, bystanders may fail to recognize when victims are in need of help and may distrust them. This speaks to the importance of social groups (e.g., in-groups, out-groups) on bystander behaviors in bullying situations.

In addition to the importance of social groups, particularly in-groups and out-groups as being associated with bystander intervention, social status also appears to be related to whether or not bystanders intervene in bullying situations. One study found that a student’s social status did moderate self-efficacy and affective empathy of defending behaviors. Self-efficacy for defending behaviors as it relates to bullying refers to one’s belief about whether or not they could defend a victimized peer. Even if children indicated high feelings of empathy towards a victimized peer, it appeared that they were more likely to act on these feelings when they were liked by others or perceived as popular. Perceived popularity was found to be a significant moderator for both self-efficacy for defending, as well as for affective empathy (Pöyhönen, Juvonen, & Salmivalli, 2010). Another study found the same effects were more prevalent for boys; boys seemed to be more motivated than girls to engage in prosocial behaviors for group membership acceptance and popularity (Warden & Mackinnon, 2003).
Theoretical Models of Emotional Intelligence and Empathy

**Emotional Intelligence.** Gardner developed the concepts of intrapersonal and interpersonal intelligence, which became the foundation for models of emotional intelligence. According to Gardner (1983), intrapersonal intelligence is the ability to know one’s own emotions, whereas interpersonal intelligence is the ability to understand other individuals’ motivations, emotions, and intentions. Individuals who exhibit a high level of intrapersonal intelligence are believed to be able to detect and express their emotions (Chen, 1995; Gardner, 1983; Schutte & Malouff, 1999). Conversely, individuals with a high level of interpersonal intelligence are believed to be able to determine subtle intentions and desires of other individuals, as well as recognize emotions within others (Chen, 1995; Schutte & Malouff, 1999). Researchers have found that recognizing others’ emotions enables an individual to act more adaptively with others (e.g., maintain enjoyable conversations, make others feel better when they are upset, elicit others’ positive views about themselves; Fast, 1970; Schutte & Malouff, 1999). It seems as though individuals with lower levels of interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligences would have a difficult time expressing empathy or understanding others’ emotions.

Salovey and Mayer (1990) further developed Gardner’s notions of intrapersonal intelligence and interpersonal intelligence, with respect to defining emotional intelligence. They suggested that emotional intelligence consists of three specific adaptive abilities: appraisal and expression of emotion, regulation of emotion, and utilization of emotions in solving problems and decision making. Within this model, appraisal and expression of emotions allow individuals to recognize their own and others’
verbal and non-verbal expressions and empathize (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Schutte & Malouff, 1999). Regulation of emotion allows individuals to maximize happy feelings, pull out of depressed moods, and control harmful impulses (Goleman, 1995; Salovey & Mayer, 1990). Goleman (1995) believed there was specific adaptive value in being able to control harmful impulses and being able to soothe anxiety or depressed moods, particularly in school settings. While he recognized the importance of cognitive intelligence in school settings, he emphasized that emotional intelligence determines an individual’s success in school settings (Goleman, 1995). Given that perpetrators of bullying tend to have a difficult time regulating harmful impulses or behaviors towards others, it seems likely that they express lower levels of emotional intelligence. Lastly, utilization of emotions enables individuals to be flexible in their planning, creative thinking, and motivation (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Schutte & Malouff, 1999). According to Mayer and Salovey (1997), application of all components within the model can foster intellectual and emotional growth.

Other researchers have conceptualized emotional intelligence as an individual’s ability to understand and express himself or herself, to understand and relate well to others, and to successfully cope with life demands (Bar-On & Parker, 2000; Bar-On, Maree, & Elias, 2007). Bar-On and Parker (2000) argued that in order for individuals to be able to effectively be aware of the feelings and needs of others, they must first have an ability to be aware of their own emotions and express their feelings in a non-destructive way. Only then can they fully understand and empathize with the feelings and needs of others, as well as maintain cooperative, positive, and satisfying relationships (Bar-On & Parker, 2000). Given that perpetrators of bullying do express their feelings in destructive
ways, it seems likely that they are either unable to fully understand their own emotions or that there is a gap when trying to apply their understanding of emotions onto victimized students. According to Bar-On and Parker (2000), being emotionally intelligent also involves being flexible in problem-solving and coping across various social and environmental contexts. Bar-On, Maree, and Elias (2007) emphasize that emotional intelligence has significant and positive impacts on individuals’ physical and psychological well-being, social interactions, performance at school or workplace, and self-actualization and it is therefore believed it is important to help foster individuals’ emotional and social skills.

When individuals advance their emotional and social skills and become more emotionally intelligent, researchers have found that they are more likely to develop a greater capacity for empathy and sympathy (Bar-On, Maree, & Elias, 2007; Eisenberg, 2003). Empathy involves understanding another person’s emotions and then being able to relate to the other person based on this understanding (Schutte & Malouff, 1999). It also is considered an immediate emotional response, as an individual vicariously experiences a similar emotional reaction as another person in response to a particular event or stimulus (Eisenberg, 2003). Conversely, sympathy does not involve vicariously experiencing another person’s emotional reaction. It enables an individual to be aware of another person’s emotional plight and experience sorrow or concern for that individual (Eisenberg, 2003).

**Theory of Moral Development.** Kohlberg (1975) developed a stage-based theory of moral reasoning. According to the model, individuals sequentially move through six stages across three levels of moral development. Kohlberg posited that all individuals
will go through the stages sequentially, without skipping any of the stages, in order to fully develop moral reasoning skills.

**Pre-conventional morality.** According to Kohlberg (1975), the first level of moral development is pre-conventional morality. At this level, individuals encounter two stages: punishment-avoidance and obedience, and exchange of favors. At the punishment-avoidance and obedience stage, individuals have a tendency to make decisions based on what is best for themselves, without consideration for others’ needs or feelings. They will follow rules established by people in authoritative positions. At the exchange of favors stage, individuals recognize that others have needs. They may try to help satisfy others’ needs; however, they will only do so if their own needs are also met. Individuals still maintain egocentric reasoning at this stage and will consider what is right and wrong in terms of how they will be impacted by consequences. These early stages coincide with development; preschool children and elementary school-aged students comprise this level of moral development.

**Conventional morality.** According to Kohlberg (1975), the second level of moral development is conventional morality. At this level, individuals encounter two stages: good boy/girl, and law and order. At the good boy/girl stage, individuals make decisions based on actions that will please others, particularly others who are in positions of authority (i.e., parent, teacher). Individuals are focused on developing and maintaining relationships with others and will take others’ perspectives into account when making decisions. At the law and order stage, individuals rigidly evaluate societal guidelines to determine behaviors that are right and wrong. These next stages also coincide with
development and are typically seen in older elementary school-aged students, as well as junior and high school-aged students.

**Post-conventional morality.** According to Kohlberg (1975), the final level of moral development is post-conventional morality. At this level, individuals encounter two final stages: social contract and universal ethical principle. At the social contract stage, individuals recognize that rules can help foster order within society, as well as protect individual rights. However, individuals at this stage are able to realize that rules are less rigid, and are meant to be flexible in order to adapt to whatever is in society’s best interest. Lastly, at the universal ethical principle stage, individuals firmly believe that all people are equal and have a commitment to justice. College-aged individuals and adults are primarily at this level of development.

Research has shown that not all children and adolescents appear to demonstrate moral reasoning. In fact, research has shown that children and adolescents who engage in bullying behaviors actually show moral disengagement. However, it is possible that students who display limited moral reasoning may just be stuck at an earlier stage of development, which would cause them to act in their self-interests when choosing to bully others for their personal gain or choosing not to intervene towards victimized peers. Particularly with bystander behaviors, research on empathy and bystander behaviors in response to bullying has found that empathy relates to whether or not students intervene when they witness bullying situations (Eisenberg, Morris, McDaniel, & Spinrad, 2009). Advanced morality requires empathy and perspective taking, which consists of both cognitive and emotional abilities. Therefore, bystanders who show less empathy towards
victims (in an out-group), may be doing so because they do not yet have advanced morality, thus prohibiting them from intervening during bullying situations.

Some researchers have argued that Kohlberg’s model is too “male-oriented,” and has limited generalizability to females (Gilligan, 1982). Alternative models for moral reasoning were developed in an attempt to create a more gender-balanced view of morality (Gilligan, 1982). According to Gilligan (1982), there are masculine and feminine moral voices; masculine voices were considered to be “logical and individualistic” and placed emphasis on making moral decisions to protect the rights of others to uphold justice, whereas feminine voices were considered to be focused on a “care perspective” and placed emphasis on protecting interpersonal relationships to take care of others (Kyte, 1996; Muuss, 1988). Gilligan (1982) developed three stages of moral development that encompassed both moral and gender development. Specifically, she developed stages that progressed from selfishness, to social and conventional morality, to post-conventional and principled morality (Gilligan, 1982). Additionally, Gilligan (1982) posited that men and women “follow different voices” throughout these developmental stages (Muuss, 1988). While both of these models are considered equally valid (Muuss, 1988), it will be important to integrate both male and female orientations when considering the impact of moral development on students’ involvement in bullying behaviors.

**Overview of Multiple Intelligences**

**Basic Definition.** Multiple intelligences are the abilities that individuals possess, which can enable them to process information best and excel at certain tasks (Gardner, 1985; Gardner, 2000). Howard Gardner (1993) suggested that intelligence should be
viewed in a pluralistic way, as opposed to a one-dimensional view. He felt that existing intelligence measures evaluated students along a single intellectual dimension, and while he recognized that this approach was effective, he believed that it was only effective for some people. He realized that individuals had different cognitive strengths and contrasting cognitive styles. Furthermore, he wanted schools to get away from testing as he felt it was not a naturalistic way to gather information about how students develop their skills or solve problems (Gardner, 1993). When Gardner first posited his theory of multiple intelligences, he wanted to capture all possible abilities that individuals possessed. He claimed that there are seven categories of abilities; musical, spatial, linguistic, logical-mathematic, bodily/kinesthetic, interpersonal, and intrapersonal (Gardner, 1985; Gardner, 1993). According to Gardner (1985), musical intelligence allows individuals to create and interpret different types of sound patterns and rhythmic combinations. Spatial intelligence allows individuals to create maps, mental models, or graphic information to navigate complex environments. Linguistic intelligence enables individuals to create and understand products that involve language or verbal information. Logical-mathematic intelligence allows individuals to develop equations, solve abstract problems, and think about information sequentially. Bodily/kinesthetic intelligence facilitates individuals’ use of their own body to create products or solve problems. Interpersonal intelligence allows individuals to observe and understand other people’s moods, desires, skills, and motivations. Lastly, intrapersonal intelligence enables individuals to reflect on and recognize internal characteristics. Gardner (1983) posited that individuals possess all of the intelligence types; however, the levels of intelligences within individuals will vary. Gardner (1983) also suggested that while individuals do
differ in their levels of strengths and weaknesses for each intelligence type, there is no certainty that individuals will display superior aptitude in a given intelligence type.

**Process of Identifying Intelligences**

Some researchers consider Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences to be controversial because it drastically differs from other theories of intelligence, particularly those that entirely rely on empirical data collected from psychometric instruments or experimental studies (Gardner & Connell, 2000; Waterhouse, 2006). Proponents of Gardner’s theory argued that his theory of multiple intelligences was developed through synthesizing research from diverse fields (e.g., biology, neuroscience, psychology; Chen, 2004; Gardner, 1983; Gardner, 1993). Gardner (1998) devised a set of criteria for identifying intelligences: (1) It should be seen in relative isolation in prodigies, autistic savants, or other exceptional populations; (2) It should have a distinct developmental trajectory; (3) It should be supported by evidence from psychometric tests of intelligence; (4) It should be distinguishable from other intelligences through experimental psychological tasks; and (5) It should demonstrate a core, information-processing system. Some researchers believe that the theory of multiple intelligences has yet to generate sufficient empirical evidence (Gardner & Connell, 2000; Sternberg & Grigorenko, 2004; Waterhouse, 2006). Chen (2004) argued that empirical evidence for multiple intelligences is not necessary, especially as the debate over the scientific method has increased and suggested that any objectivity of a given methodology is illusory. Furthermore, the theory of multiple intelligences has generated support and validation through its classroom applications (Chen, 2004; Gardner, 2004), which can be viewed as empirical support. Chen (2004) also argued that multiple intelligences are novel constructs and require new
measures in order to be evaluated fairly. Measures would have to be able to identify all of the different facets of each intelligence type in order to accurately assess the theory of multiple intelligences. Therefore, in order to validate Gardner’s theory of multiple intelligences, it is clear that either the development of new or assessment of existing measures is necessary.

**Using Multiple Intelligences to Inform Assessment**

Individuals possess all seven intelligence types, and the varying degree to which they possess each intelligence type causes people to think, learn, and express themselves differently. Students who are more linguistic are more likely to perform well on tasks that require writing. Gardner (1983) saw people who were verbally intelligent as being able to speak well and understand meanings of words. While these abilities enable individuals to perform well on writing and speaking tasks, their linguistic intelligence may fail to transfer to other areas, such as mathematics. In this case, linguistic intelligence does not transfer to logical/mathematical intelligence (Armstrong, 2009). Similarly, students who are more visual/spatial may be less likely to perform as well on linguistic tasks given that their strengths are best evidenced in an artistic domain. When they are asked to complete tasks outside of the scope of their intelligence type, they may not have the opportunity to apply their strengths to that task (Armstrong, 2009). It is possible that by using only a quantitative, verbal approach to assess bullying and/or empathy in research studies, only a limited number of students endorse bullying or having empathy because they are responding favorably, according to their (verbal) strengths, to the format of the assessment. Students who may actually possess visual/spatial or interpersonal intelligence
may not have the opportunity to demonstrate their involvement in bullying or their empathy of others using this format of assessment.

**Summary**

Bullying is a serious issue among school-aged youth and it is important to examine the underlying causes of these behaviors. Studies have shown that one characteristic that is found among children who bully is a lack of empathy. Previous literature that has examined empathy and bullying has typically relied on the use of self-report data; few studies have involved other ways of evaluating empathy. Self-report data can be limiting, particularly for individuals who may possess strengths other than verbal/linguistic, which is needed on self-report reading tasks. Conversely, drawings provide individuals with an alternative mechanism to demonstrate their understanding of bullying and empathy. Drawings have been found to provide insight into children’s emotions (Kosslyn, Heldmeyer, & Locklear, 1977; Malchiodi, 1998; Skybo, Ryan-Wenger, & Su, 2007). Additionally, drawings may allow children to qualitatively express bullying and reveal their empathetic understanding of how victims may feel. Studying children’s drawings of bullying, in addition to their self-reported empathy may help extend the research related to empathy and bullying. Additionally, researchers have not investigated this relationship between multiple intelligences, empathy, and bullying. This study sought to examine the relationship between bully/victim status and empathy through the evaluation of children’s drawings of a bullying situation, in conjunction with their self-reported empathy. The following section will describe issues regarding the assessment of bullying and empathy before presenting the research questions and hypotheses for the study.
Assessment of Constructs

The current study aimed to explore how the assessment of empathy within a bullying intervention influences participants’ ability to demonstrate their understanding of bullying. It is therefore important to examine the most common methodologies, specifically observations and self-report surveys, currently used in the literature to assess empathy and consider any critical gaps impacting research.

Observations. Researchers have attempted to differentiate measurements of empathy into two categories: situational and dispositional (Zhou, Valiente, & Eisenberg, 2003). Situational empathy is the reaction to a specific situation, whereas dispositional empathy is a stable character trait. Situational empathy is often measured immediately following participants’ exposure to a certain situation, typically by studying their facial gestures and empathetic verbalizations. Situational empathy can also be measured by monitoring an individual’s heart rate. There is substantial variability and subjectivity when utilizing observational data to assess for participants’ empathy (Zhou, Valiente, & Eisenberg, 2003).

Self-report. Dispositional empathy is typically measured by using self-reports surveys or accounts from others. Several questionnaires exist that purport to measure empathy. These include Hogan’s Empathy Scale (EM; Hogan, 1969), Mehrabian and Epstein’s Questionnaire Measure of Emotional Empathy (QMEE; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972), and Davis’s Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1980). These questionnaires aim to consider the complexity of empathy. The EM focuses on the cognitive aspect of empathy, whereas the QMEE exclusively focuses on the affective component of empathy. Davis (1983) argued that empathy cannot be viewed exclusively
using a cognitive or emotional framework; it is best considered to be a combination of these constructs because they both concern the responsivity to others. The EM was found to yield low reliability. Specifically, the EM reliability was estimated at .57, and stability was estimated at .41 over a 12-month period (Froman & Peloquin, 2001). The IRI addresses these limitations, as it considers both the cognitive and affective components of empathy, thus allowing for better exploration of empathy and its complexities (Davis, 1980). Furthermore, alpha levels on the subscales of the measure were found to range from .73-.78 thus suggesting that the IRI can be accurately measuring the construct of empathy (Davis, 1980). Additionally, Davis and Franzoi (1991) found that subscale scores remained stable over a two-year, test-retest time frame.

Despite the reliability and validity evidence of the IRI, the measure was normed with an adult population (Davis, 1980), which presents as a serious limitation when utilizing the measure with children and adolescents. Other researchers have attempted to adapt the IRI measure to make it more suitable for children and adolescents (Garton & Gringart, 2005; Litvack-Miller, McDougall, & Romney, 1997). They altered confusing wording and/or shortened the length of the measure. While the IRI appears to be the most encompassing self-report measure of empathy, it presents limitations when being used with children and adolescents given the complex wording. For students who possess limited linguistic intelligence, completing this self-report measure of empathy could be challenging and prevent them from having the opportunity to demonstrate their understanding of others in the context of bullying situations. Utilizing an alternative method of assessing empathy (i.e., drawings), may be particularly appropriate in helping to address this limitation.
Quantitative Research Questions and Hypotheses

Based on a review of theory and empirical research, the present study addressed the following quantitative research questions and hypotheses:

1. How do children’s bully/victim status relate to their scores on the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI), a quantitative assessment of bullying?
   a. Hypothesis 1: Children who identify as “bullies” or “bully-victims” will have lower Perspective Taking scores, than students who identify as “non-bullies” (i.e., “victims,” “bystanders,” “uninvolved”).
   b. Hypothesis 2: Children who identify as “bullies” or “bully-victims” will have lower Fantasy scores, than students who identify as “non-bullies.”
   c. Hypothesis 3: Children who identify as “bullies” or “bully-victims” will have lower Empathic Concern scores, than students who identify as “non-bullies.”
   d. Hypothesis 4: Children who identify as “bullies” or “bully-victims” will have lower Personal Distress scores, than students who identify as “non-bullies.”

2. How does participants’ gender identity relate to their scores on the IRI?
   a. Hypothesis 5: Participants who identify as female will have higher Perspective Taking scores than students who identify as male.
   b. Hypothesis 6: Participants who identify as female will have higher Fantasy scores than students who identify as male.
   c. Hypothesis 7: Participants who identify as female will have higher Empathic Concern scores than students who identify as male.
d. Hypothesis 8: Participants who identify as female will have higher Personal Distress scores than students who identify as male.

3. How does participants’ age impact their scores on the IRI?

a. Hypothesis 9: Older students (e.g., students in middle school and high school) will have higher Perspective Taking scores than younger students (e.g., students in elementary school).

b. Hypothesis 10: Older students will have higher Fantasy scores than younger students.

c. Hypothesis 11: Older students will have higher Empathic Concern scores than younger students.

d. Hypothesis 12: Older students will have higher Personal Distress scores than younger students.

**Qualitative Research Questions and Hypotheses**

Based on a review of theory and empirical research, the present study addressed the following qualitative research questions and hypotheses:

1. How do children’s bully/victim status relate to their empathic content in their “Draw a Bullying Situation (DABS)?”

   a. Hypothesis 1: Students who identified as “non-bullies” (i.e., “victims,” “bystanders,” “uninvolved”) would be more likely to draw bullying situations displaying empathic understanding toward others, compared to “bullies” or “bully-victims.”
2. How does gender impact a participant’s drawing of empathic content on the DABS?
   a. Hypothesis 2: Female participants will be more likely to draw bullying situations that display empathic understanding towards others involved in bullying than male participants.

3. How does age relate to a participant’s ability to draw empathic content on the DABS?
   a. Hypothesis 3: Older students will be more likely to draw bullying situations that display more empathic understanding towards others involved in bullying than younger participants.

4. How does a student’s multiple intelligence type relate to the ability to draw empathic content on the DABS?
   a. Hypothesis 4: Participants who possess dominant intelligent types other than verbal/linguistic will be more likely to draw bullying situations that display more empathic understanding towards others involved in bullying than participants who possess dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence.

**Mixed Methods Research Question and Hypothesis**

1. How do participants’ bully/victim status relate to their scores on the IRI in conjunction with their empathy-based drawings and multiple intelligence type, to provide a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of empathy and bullying?
   a. Hypothesis 1: Overall, participants who identify as “bully-victims” and “bullies” will display more empathic understanding of others when their
IRI scores are considered in conjunction with the empathy shown in their drawings, then when their IRI scores are used alone, particularly for students who have intelligence types that support the application of a non-verbal assessment. The addition of using a non-quantitative (i.e., projective) assessment of empathy in conjunction with a quantitative assessment of empathy will give a better assessment of empathy.

This question is important because the literature suggests that children who bully others express little empathy for others. However, the literature has primarily relied on self-report, quantitative approaches to assessing empathy. Utilizing quantitative approaches alone can be limiting, especially for participants who do not possess strong verbal or linguistic abilities. Using a multimodal approach to assess empathy may enhance our understanding of empathy in youth who bully by demonstrating that more youth who bully actually possess more empathy than once thought. This could inform intervention efforts seeking to promote social and emotional learning in schools to help reduce bullying behaviors.
CHAPTER 3:

METHOD

Participants

Participants for the current study were drawn from a larger research study, the Target Bullying Intervention Program (T-BIP). The T-BIP is a direct psychological treatment provided to students who have exhibited bullying behaviors at school. Research has shown that group interventions are not helpful for aggressive youth and may actually have aversive effects (Dishion, McCord, & Poulin, 1999). Therefore, the T-BIP was designed to be a one-on-one intervention (Domitrovich & Bradshaw, 2008). The T-BIP is specifically designed to identify undiagnosed psychological and/or social issues via a battery of assessments, which may be contributing to a student’s bullying behaviors. Additionally, the intervention provides students with psychoeducation on bullying and cognitive restructuring to help reduce the occurrence of future bullying behaviors. The research study from which participants were drawn was approved by the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board for ethical research (IRB #2008079128, see Appendix A).

Participants were students recruited from elementary, middle, and high schools in Lincoln, Nebraska. Students had to be between the ages of 7-18, to be eligible to participate in the dissertation study. As a part of the recruitment process, school administrators contacted the research team if they were interested in referring students who were exhibiting bullying behaviors to receive the T-BIP. Once school administrators referred students, parents/guardians were asked to consent to their participation. A graduate student interventionist was then assigned to work with the student and obtain the
student’s assent prior to the administration of the T-BIP. Once a student assented to the T-BIP, the interventionists administered the students a series of self-report instruments that asked about their experiences with bullying, experiences at school, and their social and emotional status. Participants were also provided with psychoeducation and cognitive restructuring as part of the intervention. Based on the previous year’s recruitment in the intervention program, it was expected that at least 30 students would participate. A power analysis for an independent samples t-test was conducted in Mplus Version 7.2 (Muthén & Muthén, 2014) by a statistical consultant at the Nebraska Evaluation and Research (NEAR) Center to estimate the detectable effect size given the expected sample size. Power was set at .8, which was considered an acceptable value for sufficient power (Hedges & Rhoades, 2009; Muthén & Muthén, 2002). A total sample size of 30 was set, and alpha was set at .05. Assuming tenability of the t-test assumptions the effect size that should be detectable was determined to be .62 (using Cohen’s d). Therefore, it was anticipated that there would be an 80% chance that standardized mean empathy differences of .62 between the two groups of participants (e.g., bullies, victims) could be detected with a total sample size of 30.

Participants in the current study received no direct benefits. No payment or incentives were given for participation. However, indirect benefits were possible. Students undergoing the intervention may have learned about their reactions to bullying situations, as well as their coping strategies for dealing with school aggression and peer relations. Additionally, students may have learned new perspectives on bullying behaviors and peer interactions. By encouraging participants to examine their own behaviors, they may have sought additional resources or positive outlets for their bullying
behaviors. During the parent meeting, participants and their parents were provided with a referral list of counselors available to talk to them about bullying and victimization.

There were some risks for participation in this study. It was possible that students would experience mild discomfort when completing the questionnaires, particularly when they were asked about any bullying that they may have personally experienced or when they were asked about their feelings about their perpetration of bullying behaviors. Additionally, some students may have reflected on negative thoughts, feelings, and behaviors associated with their involvement in bullying. Precautions (e.g., providing a detailed description of procedures) were taken to minimize these risks for participants in the study. For participants who endorsed suicidal ideation or any clinically significant scores of concern, the interventionist conducting the T-BIP contacted their supervising psychologist, as well as the school counselor at the student’s school. The parents of the student were provided with additional references for community assistance, to help address any of their concerns.

**Setting**

The T-BIP intervention occurred at either the student’s school or in a room in the Counseling and School Psychology Clinic at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The interventionist only worked with the referred student at the time of the intervention. Approximately two weeks after the intervention, a follow-up meeting took place at the student’s school, in a conference room in the Main Office or Counseling Center. The interventionist met with the student, student’s parent(s)/guardian(s), and a counselor and/or teacher to address the results of the intervention and provide evidence-based recommendations.
**Instrumentation**

**Demographics.** Demographics were collected through a brief, self-report questionnaire. Selected items from the Bully Survey – Student Version (Swearer, 2001) were used to collect demographic information. Participants reported their gender, age, grade, and ethnicity. The demographics form is available in Appendix D.

**Bullying Behaviors.** The *Bully Survey – Student Version* (BYS-S; Swearer, 2001) is a 45-item survey assessing bullying experiences, perceptions, and attitudes of youth in middle and high school. Students were asked to report on the bullying in which they have been involved, directly and indirectly, since the beginning of the academic year (Swearer, 2001). Research has found that asking students to report on bullying involvement since the beginning of the school year is both practical and feasible (Solberg, 2003). The survey is divided into four parts. Parts A-C asks students to report on their involvement in bullying as a victim, bystander, and perpetrator. Students were provided with the definition of bullying at the beginning of each of these sections on the survey. The definition is as follows: “Bullying happens when someone hurts or scares another person on purpose and the person being bullied has a hard time defending himself or herself. Usually, bullying happens over and over. Examples of bullying are: Punching, shoving and other acts that hurt people physically; spreading bad rumors about people; keeping certain people out of a group; teasing people in a mean way; getting certain people to gang up on others.” This definition helped to ensure that students were thinking about bullying in a congruent manner with the definition utilized in research (i.e., harmful, purposeful behavior that is repeated and characterized by an imbalance in power; CDC, 2013; Gladden et al., 2014; Olweus, 1991).
In Part A of the survey, students answered questions about when they were victims of bullying during the past year using a 5-point Likert-type scale, in which they indicated how often bullying behaviors happened to them (e.g., “Called me names,” “Nobody would talk to me”). In Part B of the survey, students were asked about their observations of bullying behaviors among their peers during the past year, specifically, in the role of a bystander of bullying. They were asked to report how their peers were bullied using a 5-point Likert-type scale indicating how often these behaviors occurred (e.g., “Made fun of him/her,” “Got pushed or shoved”). In Part C of the survey, participants reported on instances when they have bullied other students, using the same 5-point Likert scale as the other two sections. Verbal and physical bullying scales were used in all of these sections; internal consistency for Part A has been reported as .87. Finally, in Part D of the survey, students provided their general perceptions and attitudes of bullying behaviors. Part D contains the Bully Attitudinal Scale (BAS), which is a 15-item scale that measures attitudes towards bullying and prosocial attitudes. Students were asked to indicate how much they agreed with given statements using a 5-point Likert scale (e.g., “I don’t like bullies,” “Bullies make kids feel bad”). Internal consistency reliability for the BAS has been reported as .75 (Haye, 2005) and .71 (Swearer, Turner, Givens, & Pollack, 2008).

Quantitative Assessment of Empathy. The Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI, Davis, 1980) is a 28-item self-report measure of empathy used to assess perspective taking, empathic fantasy, empathetic concern, and empathic personal distress. Perspective taking is the ability to adopt the point of view of others, fantasy is the tendency to identify strongly with fictional ideas, empathic concern is the tendency to feel warmth
and concern for others when they experience negative situations, and personal distress is the experiencing of anxiety or discomfort when others experience negative situations.

The perspective taking and empathic concern scales are closely related to emotional intelligence, as empathy involves understanding another person’s emotions and reacting appropriately towards others based on this understanding (Schutte & Malouff, 1999).

Internal consistency was found for each of the four scales: Perspective taking has been reported as .75, fantasy as .78, empathic concern as .73, and personal distress as .77. Davis and Franzoi (1991) found that subscale scores remained stable over a two-year, test-retest time frame. Higher scores on the Perspective Taking scale were found to be related to increased interpersonal functioning and high self-esteem. Higher scores on the empathic concern and fantasy subscales were found to be associated with selfless concern for others. Additionally, high scores on the fantasy scale were related to verbal intelligence. Higher scores on both the perspective taking and empathic concern scales have found to be related to aware of others’ experiences and of one’s own experiences, as well as greater social interest (Davis, 1980).

The adapted version of the IRI was selected for this study, given that research has found it to be more accommodating for children (Garton & Gringart, 2005; Litvack-Miller, McDougall, & Romney, 1997) due to its shortened length and readability (see Figure E). Internal consistency was found to be .77 for the current study.

**Projective Assessment of Empathy in Bullying.** The *Draw a Bullying Situation* (DABS, Schwartz & Swearer, 2015). Projective testing through the use of human figure drawings can be considered a symbolic representation of the inner reality of the individual (Prout & Phillips, 1974). One projective assessment, the Kinetic School
Drawing, was created to provide clinicians and school psychologists with a way to assess children’s perceptions of important relationships at school (Knoff & Prout, 1985). Prout and Celmer (1984) considered the measure to be valid and found significant correlations with school relationships, academic achievement, and mood. Given that bullying is a social relationship problem that often occurs with a school-based context, drawings were considered an important form of assessment for this study. A projective-drawing based measure (the DABS) was subsequently developed, along with a specific protocol to allow interventionists to explore relevant themes (e.g., emotionality of characters, bullying situation) within students’ drawings. Previous research that has attempted to utilize drawing-based measures to examine bullying or empathy have failed to integrate students’ drawings with narrative descriptions of the content drawn (Andreou & Bonoti, 2011). The DABS was developed to not only examine the graphical content drawn in participants’ depictions of bullying situations, but it also was developed to include students’ narrative descriptions of their drawings. Procedures were adapted from other projective drawing measures (i.e., Draw-A-Person, Kinetic-School-Drawing; Goodenough, 1926; Knoff & Prout, 1985; Thoringer & Roberts, 2014), which have been found to yield high inter-rater reliability. These measures have been found to yield high inter-rater reliability ranging from .87-.97, particularly due to clear and consistent scoring criteria being utilized (Knoff & Prout, 1985).

The interventionist provided the student with a pencil and piece of paper that contained the instructions, “Think of a bullying situation. Please draw a picture of it below.” Additionally, the interventionist read a brief script that states, “I’d like you to draw a bullying situation. This can be something you’ve seen or experienced, or it can be
an example of what you think bullying might look like. Include at least two people in your drawing and tell me when you’ve finished. Try not to draw stick people, and make the best drawing you can.” After the student completed the drawing (after several minutes), the interventionist then asked what was happening in the picture and whether it was something that happened to the student. If the answer to the second question was “yes,” the student was asked to draw an arrow to the person in the drawing that best represents himself or herself. The interventionist also reviewed the drawing for any indication of emotionality (e.g., smiling, tears, frown, angry face) and asked the participant to tell about the drawing, specifically who was in the picture and what was happening in the picture. The interventionist asked the participant how each person in the picture was feeling, and why each person was feeling that way. Lastly, participants were asked about their understanding of why each person was feeling that way (i.e., “How can you tell that each person is feeling that way?”) This drawing activity and discussion of the student’s thoughts and feelings about the bullying situation depicted was intended to not only reveal information on the student’s perceptions of bullying, but to provide students with an alternative, non-quantitative method of expressing their thoughts and feelings (e.g., empathy) in relation to those impacted by bullying.

**Multiple Intelligences.** *Mi³ Talent Key* (Wiseman, Golden, & Meers, 2013). The Mi³ Talent Key is an online instrument designed to identify an individual’s dominant multiple intelligences and explore how that individual is motivated. The talent key assessment presented pictures and questions about various scenarios; the student selected which scenarios were more appealing. The talent key asked questions across all seven intelligences. Upon completion of the talent key, a profile was also generated that
evaluated a student’s strengths and weaknesses across all seven intelligence types. Research has primarily utilized the Talent Key to determine dominant intelligences by grade level. One study found that test-retest reliability within a two-week period for the Talent Key ranged from .65 to .88 (Wiseman, 1997).

**T-BIP Procedures**

**T-BIP training.** All T-BIP interventionists were doctoral students who underwent a formal training by a supervising psychologist and completed at least two observations, as well as a supervised administration of a T-BIP in order to become specialized in independently conducting the intervention. The interventionists administering T-BIP’s for this current study had at least two years of experience administering the T-BIP. Interventionists differed across the participants in the study; however, all interventionists received the same training and administered the same intervention protocol for all participants.

**T-BIP intervention.** The T-BIP procedures that were utilized in the larger, ongoing study, as well as the current study, are described below.

**Pre-intervention.** Berry (2015) used similar procedures to study the impact of the T-BIP on students’ bullying behaviors. Once a referral was received by the interventionist team and the student was found to meet inclusionary criteria for the larger study (i.e., student was referred for bullying behaviors, as reported by school staff) and parent/guardian consent for the student’s participation in the T-BIP was obtained, background information (i.e., demographic information, office referral history) was collected on the student participant in order to learn about his or her past and current bullying behaviors (Berry, 2015). It was felt that by learning about the student’s bullying
behaviors, as documented by school staff, the T-BIP could be tailored to more appropriately and effectively address the student’s past and current concerns.

**Intervention.** The T-BIP was divided into four parts: initial rapport building, assessment administration, psychoeducation, and cognitive restructuring. Berry (2015) utilized similar procedures to conduct an evaluation study of the T-BIP. First, the interventionist explained the purpose and content of the intervention, as well as limits of confidentiality. The student was informed of the length of the intervention (i.e., approximately 3 hours), as well as his or her ability to request breaks throughout the T-BIP. The student was asked to sign a youth assent form, which provided more detailed information about the study and explained that the participant has the right to withdraw from the study at any time (Berry, 2015). Once the student assented to the T-BIP, the interventionist built rapport with the student by discussing interests and hobbies (Berry, 2015). The interventionist asked about general demographic information (e.g., birthday, family members and dynamics), as well as peer groups and perceptions about school (Berry, 2015). This initial introduction to the T-BIP and rapport-building took approximately 10-15 minutes.

Second, the interventionist administered the assessments in a counter-balanced, randomized order (Berry, 2015). The interventionist presented each assessment, one-at-a-time, to the participant, and explained the instructions. Additionally, the interventionist demonstrated sample item(s) as needed, and encouraged the student to ask any questions either prior to beginning an assessment or during the assessment (Berry, 2015). The interventionists acknowledged that there was no right or wrong answer and that the student should answer questions honestly, in a way that aligns with how he or she thinks
or feels (Berry, 2015). If a student had a question about how to complete a given assessment, the interventionist could help students understand key words or phrases in the instructions; however, the interventionist was unable to provide any more information than necessary, so as not to skew the student’s interpretation of items (Berry, 2015). The assessment component of the intervention took approximately 60-90 minutes. Given the length of this component, students were offered breaks, particularly if they felt fatigued.

As part of the larger study, students completed assessments on bullying, depression, anxiety, school climate, aggression, self-perception, empathy, and callousness. After each assessment was completed, the interventionist examined each page. The purpose of checking each assessment was twofold. First, it was important to ensure that each assessment was completed correctly, as interventionists would need to be able to accurately score and interpret each assessment (Berry, 2015). When checking each assessment, interventionists looked for items that may have been left blank or may have had multiple responses selected. Second, it was important that interventionists pay close attention to the actual items that students endorsed, and ask follow-up questions if necessary (Berry, 2015). In particular, on the measure of depression, there is one item that assesses suicidality. If a student participant endorsed this item, the interventionist followed-up according to the procedures approved via IRB (i.e., contact the supervising psychologist, discuss suicidal ideation with the student, establish a safety plan, inform the student’s counselor of the conversation, set up a meeting with the student and counselor, and contact the student’s parent/guardian). Reviewing each assessment also helped interventionists check for participants’ honest reporting (Berry, 2015). In some instances, students denied having perpetrated any bullying behaviors when completing the Bully
Survey. In such cases, the interventionist explained that the student was referred for the intervention as a result of bullying behaviors, and asked the student if he or she wanted to change his or her answer (Berry, 2015). If the student declined to change an answer, the intervention continued as planned. The student was asked again at the end of the intervention whether he or she wanted to go back and change his or her responses on the Bully Survey.

Following the assessment portion of the intervention, the student was then asked to complete the DABS. The interventionist provided the student with a pencil and piece of paper, and provided instructions to complete the protocol. Once the student completed his or her drawing, the interventionist then scanned the drawing for any indication of emotionality (e.g., tears, frown, angry face) and asked the participant to talk about the drawing, specifically who was in the picture and what was happening in the picture. The interventionist asked the participant how each person in the picture was feeling, and why each person was feeling that way. Lastly, participants were asked about their understanding of why each person was feeling that way (i.e., “How can you tell that each person is feeling that way?”): This drawing activity and discussion of the student’s thoughts and feelings about the bullying situation depicted was intended to not only reveal information on the student’s perceptions of bullying, but to provide students with an alternative assessment of expressing their thoughts and feelings (e.g., empathy) in relation to bullying.

Following the administration of the DABS was the bullying pre-quiz. This was the final assessment before the psychoeducation component of the intervention. The pre-quiz contained ten multiple-choice questions that tested a student’s knowledge about
bullying. Questions asked about the definition of bullying, consequences of bullying, and reasons for bullying. All of the questions were derived from the material included in the PowerPoint presentation.

Immediately following administration of the bullying pre-quiz was the presentation of the T-BIP PowerPoint. This presentation was intended to provide information to students covering: the definition of bullying, where bullying happens, who bullies, things students who bully do well and do not do well, who gets bullied, the “normalcy” of bullying, reasons why students bully, thoughts and feelings that bullies, victims, and bystanders typically experience, and prosocial behaviors that students can engage in if they see or experience bullying. There were two, age-sensitive versions of the T-BIP PowerPoint utilized (Berry, 2015). There was an elementary level (i.e., elementary school) and a secondary level version (i.e., middle and high school). Both versions were similar; however, the secondary level version contained information about dating aggression.

The PowerPoint was presented in an interactive format, designed to foster student participation via open-ended questions that related to the content of the slides and personal experiences with bullying. Interventionists often utilized a student’s pre-quiz responses to help facilitate a discussion about bullying throughout the presentation. At this time, the interventionist incorporated discussion of the bullying situation that the student was involved in that warranted the referral for the T-BIP. The interventionist discussed the student’s bullying perpetration in conjunction with the relevant material being presented. For example, if the student’s bullying situation was relational in nature, then the interventionist may have discussed the student’s involvement in relational
bullying when the definition and types of bullying were being described in the presentation.

After the T-BIP PowerPoint presentation, the student was given a bullying post-quiz. The items on the post-quiz were identical to the items on the pre-quiz. Students had the opportunity to demonstrate what they learned from the PowerPoint presentation. If a student made any mistakes, then the interventionist reviewed incorrect items and helped the student understand answers. This component of the T-BIP, the PowerPoint, and administration of the pre- and post-quiz took approximately 45-60 minutes.

The final, cognitive restructuring, component of the T-BIP began with showing a video on bullying. Depending on the age of the participant, one of two videos was shown. Elementary school students were shown *Bully Dance* (Page & Perlman, 2000; www.bullfrogfilms.com), a 10-minute, animated, nonverbal video that depicted physical, verbal, and relational bullying situations. The video demonstrated the various roles involved in bullying (e.g., victim, bystander), the consequences for those involved in bullying, and how bullying behaviors could stem from aggressive home environments.

Middle school and high school students were shown one of two videos in the *Stories of Us* (Faull, 2007; www.storiesofus.com) program, each of which were live-action depictions of bullying situations that could happen in school- and home-based settings (Berry, 2015). Each video was approximately 20 minutes and consisted of student actors who developed their own story lines. All dialogue in each video was fictional and improvised; however, the language used and story ideas was realistic. When showing a video to a participant, the interventionist either paused the video at random intervals (during the video), to help the participant understand what was happening to the
characters and how they were handling the bullying situations, or waited until the video concluded before discussing the bullying situations that were depicted. The video was intended to foster additional discussion about bullying, specifically, the student’s perceptions of bullying and reactions to the actors’ depictions of bullying.

Following the video, a discussion of the student’s referral for bullying behaviors occurred. Additionally, ways to handle future bullying situations were discussed. Interventionists encouraged students to generate their own options for handling future bullying situations. It was believed that if students took ownership of the ideas suggested, they would be more likely to implement the alternative behaviors in the future. Students had the opportunity to practice prosocial skills with the interventionist through the use of role plays. By providing the student with the opportunity to practice responding to a variety of bullying situations, he or she appeared better prepared should he or she encounter a bullying situation in the future. During the discussion of the student’s involvement in bullying and ways to handle future bullying situations, the student was encouraged to share his or her thoughts about bullying. Students were provided with praise and validation for their openness to sharing, as well as their ability to brainstorm alternative ways to respond to bullying.

The final portion of the cognitive restructuring component consisted of having the student complete one or more worksheets (Berry, 2015), selected based on the type of bullying behaviors exhibited, as well as the reason for the referral to the T-BIP. These worksheets came from the Bully Busters (Newman et al., 2000) curriculum, and are grade-sensitive. The worksheets provided additional opportunities for the student to
consider the interaction of thoughts, feelings, and behaviors as they related to bullying behaviors. This component of the T-BIP took approximately 45-60 minutes.

The final portion of the T-BIP also consisted of summarizing the content discussed during the T-BIP, as well as emphasizing alternative options for handling future bullying situations that the student suggested. Additionally, the student was administered the Bullying Intervention Rating Profile (BIRP), which allowed the student to provide feedback about the T-BIP. Once the student completed the BIRP, the interventionist briefly reviewed responses on the BIRP to ensure that no item was unintentionally skipped. The interventionist may have queried the student on responses to elicit feedback about T-BIP procedures that a student was either satisfied or unsatisfied with, so that the T-BIP could be improved when working with students in the future, or to elicit feedback about the relationship with the interventionist, so that therapeutic skills could be improved when working with students in the future.

**Post-intervention.** Following the T-BIP session, the interventionist or trained graduate student entered all of the assessment data into an SPSS database and scored all of the quantitative assessments. The interventionist scored all assessments by hand, using scoring matrices that correspond with a particular measure. Once all of the assessments were scored, the interventionist interpreted the data, specifically to assess how the participant’s assessment scores compared with normative data. Once the assessments were scored and interpreted, the interventionist used the assessment information together with information obtained from the participant during the intervention to write a comprehensive treatment report. Each report that was written contained: a client summary and reason for referral, a description of each assessment administered along
with the results of each assessment, a summary of the session, and recommendations. The T-BIP supervising psychologist read and edited all reports, and she and the interventionist signed the final, approved version of the report. To ensure confidentiality, all participant names were de-identified. Specifically, participants were given randomized names.

**Follow-up meeting.** Berry (2015) used a similar procedure in her evaluation study of the T-BIP. The student, student’s counselor and/or teacher, and parent/guardian attended the follow-up meeting with the interventionist. At the beginning of the meeting, the interventionist described the purpose of the meeting, and obtained consent from the parent and counselor to allow their responses about themselves and the student to be used for research. The parent was asked to complete the Bully Survey (parent version; BYS-P) on the student, and the counselor and/or teacher completed the Bully Survey (teacher version; BYS-T) on the student. The student was asked to complete three measures (two of which were completed during the intervention): the BAS from the Bully Survey-Student, the Thoughts About School measure, and the Multiple Intelligences measure. Once the measures were completed, the interventionist provided the parent/guardian with the signed copy of the T-BIP report. The interventionist notified all members present at the meeting that the report is confidential and indicated that it would only be given to the parent(s)/guardian(s), who could choose to share it with the school or other mental health practitioners. If the parent(s)/guardian(s) choose to allow their child’s school to have a copy of the T-BIP report, school personnel were told that they could then make and keep a copy to review during the remainder of the meeting.
Berry (2015) used a similar procedure to conduct her evaluation of the T-BIP on students’ bullying behaviors. The interventionist reviewed the report with all members present (Berry, 2015). The assessments administered during the intervention were described, and results were explained (Berry, 2015). When the interventionist reviewed the results of each assessment, he or she asked for input, specifically regarding whether or not results were consistent or inconsistent with the student’s behaviors observed at home or school. The interventionist then described the T-BIP session, and integrated anecdotes or responses made by the student during the intervention. Anecdotes and student responses were intended to help bridge the student’s thoughts, feelings, and behaviors during the session to the behaviors observed by school staff that led to the referral being made. All members present were encouraged to comment throughout the discussion of the report, and the student was asked to provide his or her thoughts as well. Lastly, the interventionist reviewed recommendations made (Berry, 2015), and facilitated a discussion on which recommendations would be realistic and most appropriate to utilize at school, home, or in the community. The interventionist expressed that if parent(s)/guardian(s) and/or teachers/counselors wish to modify recommendations, the interventionist would work with the team to develop a plan that met everyone’s needs and expectations. All members present at the meeting, including the student, concluded the discussion by considering how the student needs to be supported by adults in his or her life to help reduce or avoid involvement in bullying. Following the discussion, the interventionist provided the members at the meeting with his or her contact information, and asked the parent/guardian and counselor/teacher to complete a Treatment Evaluation Inventory (Berry, 2015).
Analyses

**Preliminary analyses.** The principle investigator and all CITI-trained graduate assistants in the Empowerment Initiative Lab were responsible for the maintenance of T-BIP protocols, as well as the quantitative and qualitative data. T-BIP protocols were stored in a locked filing cabinet in the principal investigator’s office (Dr. Susan Swearer). All data were entered into SPSS and electronically stored on a password protected computer. All graduate students completed the CITI and Responsible Conduct of Research training courses through UNL. The DABS drawings and protocols were scanned, coded, and analyzed using MAXQDA, a qualitative software package. The analysis produced a variable matrix. This software allowed for the exportation of variable matrices into SPSS, thus allowing the quantitative data to be connected with the qualitative counterparts.

**Quantitative analysis plan.** All statistical analyses were conducted using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) Version 22. One case had missing data and was subsequently deleted (Tabachnik & Fidell, 2012). Descriptive statistics (e.g., means, standard deviations, frequencies), as well as zero-order correlations, were calculated for the sample. Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for all continuous variables. A correlation table of the relationship between variables (e.g., bullying status, gender, empathy) was created.

**Pearson Product-Moment Correlations.** The Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient ($r$) assesses the degree to which quantitative variables are linearly related in a sample. The significance test then evaluates whether an observed linear relationship is due to chance or is reflective of the linear relationship between the
variables in the population of interest. The square of the correlation can be used as an index of the effect size. The relationships among these variables were assessed first, before moving to other analyses. Specifically, the strength of the relationships between the independent variables (i.e., bully/victim status, gender, age) and the dependent variables (i.e., participants’ scores on Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, Personal Distress of the IRI) were calculated.

**Data analytic strategy.** A series of one-way Analysis of Variances (ANOVAs) were one of the primary data analytic strategies utilized in this study. Given that this was one of the primary analytic strategies, it was important to describe and test assumptions. An ANOVA has several assumptions that must be met prior to interpretation (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2011): independence of observation within and between samples, normality of the sampling distribution, and equal variance (Keppel & Wickens, 2004). First, all observations must be independent and participants’ responses must not be systematically related to other participants’ responses (Keppel & Wickens, 2004; Leech, Barret, & Morgan, 2011). This assumption is generally met when random sampling is utilized (Keppel & Wickens, 2004). Second, the dependent variables within the study must be normally distributed (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009). Normality of the sample distribution can be determined by analyzing skewness (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2011). Third, there must homogeneity of variance so that the variances of each group within the study are approximately equal (Keppel & Wickens, 2004). This assumption can be tested using the Levene’s statistic; if the Levene’s statistic is significant, then the variances are significantly different from one another and the assumption of homogeneity of variances is violated (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009; Keppel & Wickens, 2004). Therefore, this
assumption is only met when the Levene’s statistic is not significant and the variances do not significantly differ from one another. All of these assumptions were tested prior to conducting other statistical analyses, to ensure that there were no violations.

Additionally, several independent samples t-tests were another primary data analysis strategy and were used to assess mean differences in empathy between groups (i.e., gender, age) in the sample. As with utilization of ANOVA, independent samples t-test data must meet several requirements and assumptions. First, the dependent variable must be continuous (i.e., interval or ratio level) and the independent variable must be categorical (i.e., two or more groups; Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009; Welch, 1947). Second, all observations must be independent and participants’ responses must not be systematically related to other participants’ responses (Keppel & Wickens, 2004; Leech, Barret, & Morgan, 2011). This assumption is generally met when random sampling is utilized (Keppel & Wickens, 2004). Violation of this assumption would likely produce an inaccurate p-value (Welch, 1947). Third, the dependent variables within the study must be normally distributed (Gravetter & Wallnau, 2009; Welch, 1947). Normality of the sample distribution can be determined by analyzing skewness (Leech, Barrett, & Morgan, 2011). Additionally, normality of the distribution can be assessed through the examination of probability plots (Chambers, William, Kleiner, & Tukey, 1983). Finally, there must homogeneity of variance so that the variances of each group within the study are approximately equal (Keppel & Wickens, 2004). Similar to the utilization of ANOVA, this assumption can be tested using the Levene’s statistic, and is only met when the Levene’s statistic is not significant (and the variances do not significantly differ from
one another). These assumptions were tested prior to conducting other statistical analyses, to ensure that there were no violations.

A series of ANOVAs and independent samples $t$-tests were selected as the primary data analysis strategies because of their usefulness in testing for significant differences between groups. The specific data analytic strategy for each research question is outlined below:

*Research Question 1.* To determine if children’s bully/victim status related to their scores on the four scales of the IRI, a series of four one-way ANOVAs were conducted. Students’ bully/victim status was entered as the independent, predictor variable and the continuous scores on the IRI subscales (i.e., Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, Personal Distress) were entered as the dependent variable. If there were significant differences among participants’ bully/victim status and their scores on the IRI, post-hoc analyses and mean differences were used to determine the direction of the effect. If participants identifying as “bullies” or “bully-victims” endorsed lower Perspective Taking than participants who identified as “non-bullies” (i.e., “victims,” “bystanders,” “uninvolved”), then Hypothesis 1 would be supported. If participants identifying as “bullies” or “bully-victims” endorsed lower Fantasy than participants who identified as “non-bullies,” then Hypothesis 2 would be supported. If participants identifying as “bullies” or “bully-victims” endorsed lower Empathic Concern than participants who identified as “non-bullies,” then Hypothesis 3 would be supported. If participants identifying as “bullies” or “bully-victims” endorsed lower Personal Distress than participants who identified as “non-bullies,” then Hypothesis 4 would be supported.
Research Question 2. To determine if participants’ gender related to their scores on the four scales of the IRI, a series of four independent samples t-tests were conducted. Students’ gender was entered as the independent, predictor variable and the continuous scores on the IRI subscales (i.e., Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, Personal Distress) were entered as the dependent variable. If there were significant differences among participants’ gender and their scores on the IRI, mean differences were used to determine the direction of the effect. If female participants endorsed greater Perspective Taking than male participants, then Hypothesis 5 would be supported. If female participants endorsed greater Fantasy than male participants, then Hypothesis 6 would be supported. If female participants endorsed greater Empathic Concern than male participants, then Hypothesis 7 would be supported. If female participants endorsed greater Personal Distress than male participants, then Hypothesis 8 would be supported.

Research Question 3. To determine if participants’ age related to their scores on the four scales of the IRI, a series of four independent samples t-tests were conducted. Students’ age was entered as the independent, predictor variable and the continuous scores on the IRI subscales (i.e., Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, Personal Distress) were entered as the dependent variable. If there were significant differences among participants’ age and their scores on the IRI, mean differences were used to determine the direction of the effect. If “older” (i.e., students in middle school and high school) participants endorsed greater Perspective Taking than “younger” (i.e., students in elementary school) participants, then Hypothesis 9 would be supported. If “older” participants endorsed greater Fantasy than “younger” participants, then Hypothesis 10 would be supported. If “older” participants endorsed greater Empathic
Concern than “younger” participants, then Hypothesis 11 would be supported. If “older” participants endorsed greater Personal Distress than “younger” participants, then Hypothesis 12 would be supported.

**Qualitative analysis plan.** Consistent with Merriam (2009), the current study primarily utilized two qualitative data analytic techniques in order to increase understanding and interpretation of the data: thematic analysis and constant comparison. These analytic techniques are also referred to as “coding” and are considered to be the most common data analytic strategies used in qualitative research (Bazeley, 2013; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007). Coding and analysis of qualitative data involve fracturing or breaking up the data in an effort to aggregate findings to create a deeper and fuller picture. This process was more than labeling data; it was linking and integrating data into a larger picture (Morse & Richards, 2002). Many qualitative researchers have proposed steps for data analysis in qualitative research; however the two approaches from Merriam (2009) and Creswell (2011) were used for the study. Merriam (2009) describes the overall process of qualitative data analysis as an inductive process of meaning making from the participants’ experiences. The first step of meaning making involves category construction in which the researcher begins to identify information that may be potentially relevant (Merriam, 2009). The second step involves sorting categories and data into similar clusters to simplify and narrow findings. The third step involves naming the categories to best describe relevant findings (Merriam, 2009).

Creswell (2002) proposes similar steps and expands the process to include connecting and interrelating themes. The first step involves coding data in an attempt to make sense out of the text and to later collapse codes into larger themes (Creswell, 2011).
The second step involves developing descriptions on the basis of these codes, followed by the third step of defining codes and creating themes from the coded data. The final step is comprised of connecting and interrelating these themes to demonstrate a sequence of events or to narrate individual stories (Creswell, 2011; Creswell, Klassen, Plano Clark, & Smith, 2011). The current study utilized a combination of the steps proposed by Merriam (2009) and Creswell (2011). Additionally, the data were approached in an inductive way, so that coding and theme development was directed by the content of the data in order to identify patterned meaning across the dataset. Specifically for this study, coding occurred in three distinct phases: open, axial, and selective. Open coding consisted of identifying any unit of data that could be considered relevant. Axial coding consisted of relating categories and properties discovered through open coding, in an attempt to refine patterns of codes that emerged. Selective coding consisted of developing core categories (Merriam, 2009). First, the principal investigator segmented participants’ drawings into small, meaningful parts (e.g., facial expressions, size differences between characters). These parts were labeled as “codes” and the principal investigator considered the “codes” in accordance with participants’ verbal descriptions and explanations of their bullying situations in the DABS corresponding protocol. The principal investigator then extracted themes from the data, by combining multiple codes that were similar (Creswell, 2011; Leech & Onwuegbuzie, 2007; Merriam, 2009), which were developed into categories. Codes and themes were maintained in a codebook; constant comparison was utilized to continuously compare segments of data until categories (based on similarities of data segments) emerged. Thematic analysis and constant comparison were utilized for each of the following qualitative research questions:
Research Question 1. To determine how children’s bully/victim status related to their empathic content in their DABS, thematic analysis and constant comparison yielded various codes and themes within participants’ drawings. If participants who identified as “non-bullies” (i.e., “victims,” “bystanders,” “uninvolved”) were more likely to draw indicators of empathic understanding towards others in their drawings, as compared to participants who identified as “bullies” or “bully-victims” then Hypothesis 1 would be supported.

Research Question 2. To determine how participants’ gender related to their empathic content in their DABS, thematic analysis and constant comparison yielded various codes and themes within participants’ drawings. If female participants were more likely to draw indicators of empathic understanding towards others in their drawings, as compared to male participants then Hypothesis 2 would be supported.

Research Question 3. To determine how participants’ age related to their empathic content in their DABS, thematic analysis and constant comparison yielded various codes and themes within participants’ drawings. If “older” (i.e., students in middle school or high school) participants were more likely to draw indicators of empathic understanding towards others in their drawings, as compared to “younger” (i.e., students in elementary school) participants then Hypothesis 3 would be supported.

Research Question 4. To determine how children’s multiple intelligence type related to their empathic content in their DABS, thematic analysis and constant comparison yielded various codes and themes within participants’ drawings. If participants who possessed dominant intelligence types other than verbal/linguistic were more likely to draw indicators of empathic understanding towards others in their
drawings, as compared to participants who possess dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence, then Hypothesis 4 would be supported.

**Validation procedures.** The current study utilized two validation strategies: triangulation and peer review. First, triangulation consists of the utilization of multiple and different sources to provide corroborating evidence (Creswell, 2003; Erlandson et al., 1993; Merriam, 1988) across constructs. This study utilized triangulation of multiple data sources (i.e., Bully Survey, IRI, MI Cubed, DABS drawing and protocol) to examine and corroborate the relationships among bullying, empathy, and multiple intelligences. Given that similar themes emerged from different data sources, it was determined that each measure utilized served as a valid modality of assessing the constructs of interest. Peer review was also utilized, specifically during the coding phase of analysis. Peer review serves to provide an unbiased, “external check” of the research process, as well as the meaning and interpretation of the data (Creswell, 2003; Erlandson et al., 1993; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Merriam, 1988). The peer review process evaluates the consistency with which multiple individuals apply similar criteria to make decisions about data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and is similar to interrater reliability. For this study, a percentage of drawings were collaboratively and independently reviewed, and then themes were discussed. Coders utilized the following coding procedure: The data were approached in an inductive way, so that coding and theme development were directed by the content of the data in order to identify patterned meaning across the dataset. Agreement of coding and themes was found on 96% of the drawings, thus supporting validity of the coding system and interpretation of themes. For disagreement on drawings, both coders
collaboratively re-coded those drawings utilizing a similar inductive coding process until selective themes emerged.

**Integration/Data Mixing Plan.** The current study served to connect quantitative and qualitative data, in order to compare and contrast findings and gain a fuller understanding of the relationships among bully/victim status, empathy, and multiple intelligences. Quantitative and qualitative data were integrated utilizing a Concurrent Mixed Methods Design and a triangulation protocol (Farmer, Robinson, Elliott, & Eyles, 2006). Both quantitative and qualitative analyses were combined in MAXQDA in order to examine the relationships among the variables. In accordance with utilizing a triangulation protocol all of the results from each component of the study were listed in a matrix in order to look for convergent, complementary, or discrepant findings (Farmer, Robinson, Elliott, & Eyles, 2006). Additionally, meta-themes across all of the findings were generated after careful comparison of quantitative and qualitative results. According to Creswell and Plano Clark (2011), mixed methods interpretation requires examining the combination of quantitative and qualitative results to evaluate how findings address the mixed methods research question and hypothesis. For this study, data mixing served to determine how participants’ bully/victim status related to their scores on the IRI in conjunction with their empathy-based drawings and multiple intelligence type, to contribute to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of empathy and bullying. If participants who identified as “bullies” and “bully-victims” displayed more empathic understanding of others when their IRI scores were considered in conjunction with the empathy shown in their drawings (particularly for students who have intelligence types that support the application of a non-verbal, projective assessment), then Hypothesis 1
would be supported. Specifically, data mixing served to demonstrate that the addition of using a projective assessment of empathy in conjunction with a quantitative assessment of empathy would give a better, overall assessment of empathy. This study places equal importance on both the quantitative and qualitative components; however, the mixed methods portion of the study was determined to be necessary in order to form a more complete picture of the relationships among bullying, empathy, and multiple intelligences.
CHAPTER 4:
QUANTITATIVE, QUALITATIVE, AND MIXED METHODS RESULTS

The goals of the analytic methods in this study were two-fold: a) to identify relationships between bully/victim status and empathy, endorsed by participants on a quantitative measure, and b) examine participants’ empathic understanding of bullying situations on a qualitative, drawing-based measure and compare their drawings with their responses on the quantitative measure to determine whether drawings can serve as an alternative or supplemental assessment of empathy.

Sample Characteristics

A total of 38 participants across 17 Midwestern schools (10 elementary schools, 6 middle schools, and 1 high school) received consent and assented to participate in this study. Demographic information was available for all 38 participants. In the total sample, the sex distribution was 47.4% male (n = 18) and 52.6% female (n = 20). Participants ranged in age from 7 to 15, with a mean age of 10.66 (SD = 2.017). The majority of participants were White (n = 13, 34.2%), followed by Other (n = 8, 21.1%), Black/African American (n = 6, 15.8%), Latino/Hispanic (n = 5, 13.2%), Biracial (n = 4, 10.5%), Native American (n = 1, 2.6%), and Asian (n = 1, 2.6%).

Preliminary Analysis

For this study, it was important to determine internal consistency for the primary dependent variable, empathy. Internal consistency measures how closely related a set of items are as a group (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010). Examination of internal consistency for the IRI was strong, Cronbach’s α = .773, and was consistent with alpha levels found in previous studies (i.e., .73-.78; Davis, 1980). Values of alpha that are above .90 may be
considered “too high”, and could indicate redundancy of items (Cohen & Swerdlik, 2010; Streiner, 2003). Therefore, items contained in the IRI for the purposes of this study do not appear to be redundant.

A series of Pearson product-moment and point-biserial correlations were run to determine the strength of the relationship between the independent variables of bully/victim status, gender, and age, as well as the dependent variable of empathy (i.e., participants’ empathy scores on Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, Personal Distress). There was a significant positive correlation between gender and participants’ scores on Perspective Taking ($r_{pb} = .338, p = .038$). Means moving from the male to female category were associated with an increase in empathy scores. There were no other significant correlations regarding independent variables. Regarding the dependent variables, there was a significant positive correlation between participants’ scores on Fantasy and scores on Perspective Taking ($r = .443, p = .005$). A significant positive correlation was also found between participants’ scores on Empathic Concern and Personal Distress ($r = .384, p = .017$). These correlations suggest that overall, as students’ scores on Fantasy increase their scores on Perspective Taking also increase. Additionally, as students’ scores on Empathic Concern increase, their scores on Personal Distress also increase.

**Quantitative Analyses**

**Research Question 1.** The goal of the first research question was to assess how youths’ bully/victim status related to their scores on the four scales of the IRI: Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress. Hypothesis 1 predicted that children who identified as “bullies” or “bully-victims” would have lower
Perspective Taking than children who identify as “non-bullies” (i.e., “victims,” “bystanders,” “uninvolved”). Hypothesis 2 predicted that children who identify as “bullies” or “bully-victims” would have lower Fantasy than children who identify as “non-bullies.” Hypothesis 3 predicted that children who identified as “bullies” or “bully-victims” would have lower Empathic Concern than children who identified as “non-bullies.” Hypothesis 4 predicted that children who identify as “bullies” or “bully-victims” would have lower Personal Distress than children who identify as “non-bullies.” To address these hypotheses, a series of one-way analyses of variance (ANOVAs) were conducted to compare children’s bully/victim status with their empathy scores (as measured by the IRI). Participants’ bully/victim status was the predictor variable and scores on the empathy measure were the dependent variable. A participant’s status was grouped as either “bully,” “bully-victim,” or “non-bully.” The Levene’s test for the assumption of homogeneity of variances (Levene, 1960) was not significant for Perspective Taking ($F(2, 35) = .814, p = .451$), Fantasy ($F(2, 35) = 1.036, p = .366$), Empathic Concern ($F(2, 35) = 2.470, p = .099$), and Perspective Taking ($F(2, 35) = .428, p = .655$). Thus the ANOVAs for each continuous variable were considered interpretable. Additionally, examination of probability plots (Chambers, William, Kleiner, & Tukey, 1983) suggests that empathy scores were normally distributed by status.

According to the results of the one-way ANOVAs, there was not a significant effect of children’s bully/victim status on their Perspective Taking scores at the $p<.05$ level, $F(2, 35) = 2.172, p = .129$. There was not a significant effect of children’s bully/victim status on their Fantasy scores at the $p<.05$ level, $F(2, 35) = .109, p = .897$. 
There was not a significant effect of children’s bully/victim status on their Empathic Concern scores at the $p<.05$ level, $F(2, 35) = 2.778, p = .076$; however, there was a significant effect of children’s bully/victim status on their Personal Distress scores at the $p<.05$ level, $F(2, 35) = 3.331, p = .047$. Thus, Hypotheses 1-3 were not supported, while Hypothesis 4 was supported. Therefore, post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean Personal Distress score for the “bully” status ($M = 10.10, SD = 5.49$) was significantly different ($p = .037$) than the mean Personal Distress score for the “bully-victim” status ($M = 15.33, SD = 5.27$). However, the mean Personal Distress score for the “non-bully” status ($M = 13.70, SD = 4.523$) did not statistically differ from the mean Personal Distress scores for the “bully” status ($p = .274$) or “bully-victim” status ($p = .703$). Post hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean Empathic Concern score for the “bully” status ($M = 15.90, SD = 5.80$) approached a significant difference ($p = .081$) from the mean Empathic Concern score for the “bully victim” status ($M = 19.67, SD = 2.66$). However, the mean Empathic Concern score for the “non-bully” status ($M = 17.10, SD = 4.95$) did not statistically differ from the mean Empathic Concern scores for the “bully” status ($p = .807$) or “bully-victim” status ($p = .295$). Taken together, these results suggest that a student’s bully/victim status did have an effect on empathy, specifically Personal Distress. It should be noted that these results only emerged when comparing students’ endorsements of a “bully” and “bully-victim” status only. These results indicated findings in an unexpected direction. Specifically, it was expected that participants endorsing a “bully” status would have lower empathy than participants endorsing a “non-bully” status, and these findings did not emerge. Instead, it
was found that “bully-victims” have higher Personal Distress than “bullies.” Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 1.

Research Question 2. The goal of the second research question was to assess how participants’ gender impacted their quantitative and qualitative displays of empathy, on the IRI measure. Hypothesis 5 predicted that female participants would endorse greater empathy than male participants on Perspective Taking. Hypothesis 6 predicted that female participants would endorse greater empathy than male participants on Fantasy. Hypothesis 7 predicted that female participants would endorse greater Empathic Concern than male participants. Hypothesis 8 predicted that female participants would endorse greater empathy than male participants on Personal Distress. To address this hypothesis, a series of independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare children’s gender (i.e., males, females) with their empathy scores. Given that the examination of probability plots (Chambers, William, Kleiner, & Tukey, 1983) showed that empathy scores were normally distributed, the independent samples t-test for each continuous variable were considered interpretable.

According to the results of the independent samples t-tests, there was a significant difference in Perspective Taking scores for males ($M = 13.61, SD = 3.534$) and females ($M = 16.35, SD = 4.234$); $t(36) = -2.15, p = .038$. This result indicated that females’ Perspective Taking scores were significantly higher than males’ Perspective Taking scores on the IRI. However, there was not a significant difference in Fantasy scores for males ($M = 13.50, SD = 4.668$) and females ($M = 14.35, SD = 6.491$); $t(36) = -.459, p = .649$. There was not a significant difference in Empathic Concern for males ($M = 18.00, SD = 4.602$) and females ($M = 18.00, SD = 4.507$); $t(36) = .000, p = 1.000$. Further, there
was not a significant difference in Personal Distress for males ($M = 14.89, SD = 5.759$) and females ($M = 12.30, SD = 5.006$); $t(36) = 1.483, p = .147$. These results suggested that male and females’ Perspective Taking differs (i.e., females possess higher Perspective Taking than males on the IRI), thus Hypothesis 5 was supported. This result indicated findings in an expected direction (i.e., female participants endorsing greater empathy than male participants), specifically with Perspective Taking. However, other empathic factors assessed on the IRI appeared to be less sensitive to gender differences. It should also be noted, that the mean Fantasy score for females was higher (albeit non-significant) than the mean Fantasy score for males. Therefore, Hypotheses 6-8 were not supported. While there were findings in an expected direction, these results also indicated an unexpected direction, particularly regarding mean scores on Empathic Concern and Personal Distress. Specifically, it was unexpected that both males and females would yield the same mean Empathic Concern, suggesting that no gender difference was found for this particular factor. Additionally, it was unexpected that males yielded a higher mean Personal Distress Score than females, indicated that males endorsed greater empathy than females on this particular factor. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 2.

**Research Question 3.** The goal of the third research question was to assess how children’s age related to their scores on the four scales of the IRI: Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress. Specifically, Hypothesis 9 predicted that older participants (e.g., students in middle school and high school) would endorse greater empathy than younger participants (e.g., students in elementary school) on Perspective Taking. Hypothesis 10 predicted that older participants would endorse
greater empathy than younger participants on Fantasy. Hypothesis 11 predicted that older participants would endorse greater empathy on Empathic Concern than younger participants. Hypothesis 12 predicted that older participants would endorse greater empathy on Personal Distress than younger participants. To address this hypothesis, a series of independent samples t-tests were conducted to compare children’s gender (i.e., males, females) with their empathy scores. Given that the examination of probability plots (Chambers, William, Kleiner, & Tukey, 1983) revealed that empathy scores were normally distributed, the independent samples t-test for each continuous variable were considered interpretable.

According to the results of the independent samples t-tests, there was not a significant effect of student’s age on their Perspective Taking scores for younger students ($M = 15.20, SD = 4.618$) and older students ($M = 14.89, SD = 3.579$); $t(36) = .230, p = .819$. There was not a significant difference in Fantasy scores for younger students ($M = 14.55, SD = 5.286$) and older students ($M = 13.28, SD = 6.095$); $t(36) = .689, p = .495$. There was not a significant difference in Empathic Concern for younger students ($M = 18.55, SD = 3.620$) and older students ($M = 17.39, SD = 5.337$); $t(36) = .792, p = .434$. Further, there was not a significant difference in Personal Distress for younger students ($M = 13.65, SD = 5.994$) and older students ($M = 13.39, SD = 4.972$); $t(36) = .145, p = .885$. Thus, Hypotheses 8-12 were not supported. Taken together, these results indicated an unexpected direction and suggest that older students endorsed slightly less (albeit, non-significant) empathy than younger students. These results indicated that a student’s age really did not have an effect on empathy at all. Means and standard deviations are presented in Table 3.
Qualitative Analyses

Qualitative analyses were conducted in MAXQDA, in order to code the 38 participant drawings and protocols, utilizing thematic analysis and constant comparison. The data were approached in an inductive way, so that coding and theme development were directed by the content of the data in order to identify patterned meaning across the dataset. Similar instances of data were compared, which led to the development of categories. Three phases of coding took place, before categories were developed: open, axial, and selective. Open coding consisted of identifying any unit of data that could be considered relevant. Axial coding consisted of relating categories and properties discovered through open coding, in an attempt to refine patterns of codes that emerged. Selective coding consisted of developing core categories (Merriam, 2009). Through this multiphase process, two core themes emerged from analyzing students’ drawings and responses on the DABs protocol related to bullying and empathy, and several relevant subthemes emerged as well (See Table 4). Several miscellaneous themes emerged as well. The following core themes and subthemes, as well as miscellaneous themes were generated during the selective coding phase and defined detailed below:

Contextual Awareness. The first core theme that emerged was contextual awareness. This was defined a participant’s understanding of key components occurring within the bullying situation. Specifically, contextual awareness consisted of students’ depictions of the type of bullying situation, depictions of understanding of the bullying situation through reliance on situational cues, depictions of power imbalance, depictions of bodily awareness of characters drawn, and depictions of cause-and-effect outcomes (i.e., understanding intent, understanding of repetition or repeated history of bullying
behaviors, understanding of consequences and resolutions of bullying situations, understanding of barriers to intervening).

Type of bullying situation. The bullying situation type was defined as a participant’s depiction of the type of bullying situation occurring among the characters drawn. Specifically, student’s indicated three types of bullying: physical, verbal, and relational. Consistent with research on bullying (Swearer, Espelage, & Napolitano, 2009), data analysis revealed that students indicated a physical type of bullying situation when the use of any kind of physical force was drawn or described to negatively impact the “victim” character. Students indicated a verbal type of bullying situation when verbalizations were used or described to negatively impact the “victim” character. Data analysis revealed that students depicted a relational type of bullying situation when actions were indicated or drawn intended to negatively impact the “victim” character at an emotional level. This subtheme was associated with drawings and/or protocols where the “bully” character was engaging in physical, verbal, or relational bullying towards the “victim” character, regardless of the “victim” character’s response.

Understanding of bullying situation. Another subtheme that emerged was participants’ understanding of the bullying situation. This was defined as a participant’s understanding of “what” was occurring among the characters involved in the bullying, as well as “how” the participants could tell what was happening. Data analysis revealed that students depicted an understanding of the bullying situation when they were able to draw and/or describe the situation occurring between the “bully” and “victim” characters, often through the reliance on situational cues. Specifically, data analysis indicated that participants utilized situational cues to describe the bullying situation when they drew
and/or verbalized indicators of relying on situational components (i.e., sequence of the story, “what” was happening) of the bullying in the drawing.

**Power imbalance.** The next subtheme that emerged was power imbalance. This was defined as a participant’s depiction of the “bully” character being drawn or described in a disproportionate manner, relative to other characters drawn in the picture. Data analysis revealed that students had a tendency to depict power imbalance through size, age, popularity status, group size, gender, or intellectual differences between the “bully” character and other characters drawn. Specifically, students indicated a size difference when the “bully” character was drawn as being larger (i.e., height) than other characters. Students indicated an age difference when the “bully” character was depicted as being older or in a higher grade than other characters drawn. Differences in popularity status were determined if students drew or described the “bully” character as being more popular than the other characters drawn. Students indicated group size differences as a form of power imbalance when “bully” characters “outnumbered” other characters drawn. Intellectual differences were determined if students drew or described the “bully” character as being more intellectually capable (i.e., “smarter”) than other characters drawn. In being consistent with the definition of power imbalance, as defined in bullying literature (Andreou & Bonoti, 2010; Olweus, 1993; Rigby & Smith, 2011), a theme of power imbalance was only associated with a student’s drawing if the imbalance favored the “bully” character.

**Bodily awareness.** Another subtheme that emerged was bodily awareness. This was defined as a participant’s depiction of all physical aspects and body parts of drawn characters involved in the bullying situation. In other words, bodily awareness included
“what” the characters looked like, as well as “how” the participant drew the characters. Data analysis revealed that bodily awareness was found in evaluating a single character drawn, as well as through evaluating multiple characters in relation to each other. Specifically, student’s depictions of bodily awareness included hand size (i.e., small, large) drawn on the “bully” or “victim” character. Bodily awareness also included the presence or absence of body parts or details of body parts (i.e., hands, pupils of eyes). Body posture (i.e., open, closed) and movement (i.e., arms reaching towards another character) were also determinants of bodily awareness depicted in drawings of bullying situations. Lastly, data analysis revealed that an obscuring of details of body parts (i.e., claw-like hands) was a determinant of bodily awareness within the drawing of a bullying situation.

**Cause-and-effect outcomes of bullying.** Another subtheme that emerged was cause-and-effect outcomes related to bullying. This was defined as any factor that could cause bullying behaviors or could be caused by bullying behaviors. Data analysis specifically revealed that intent, repetition, consequences and resolutions, and barriers to intervening emerged as being related to cause-and-effect outcomes of bullying. Specifically, data analysis found that students depicted an understanding of the “bully” character’s intent when they provided a visual or verbal rationale for the character’s decision to engage in bullying. The accuracy of the intent in a given bullying situation drawn was not factored into a participant receiving this code. Additionally, data analysis revealed that students depicted an understanding of repetition when they described that the bullying situation drawn had previously occurred or that the “bully” character drawn had previously engaged in other bullying situations. Data analysis revealed that
participants depicted an understanding of consequences or resolution when they drew or provided a verbal description of any consequences or conclusion that sequentially followed their drawn bullying situation. The type of consequence or resolution (i.e., positive, negative) was not considered when assigning this code. Lastly, data analysis indicated that participants depicted an understanding of barriers to intervening when they specifically included at least one “bystander” character in their drawings that was unable to intervene. The participant either drew or described the difficulties in intervening or terminating the bullying situation.

**Emotional Awareness.** The second core theme that emerged was emotional awareness. This was defined a participant’s understanding of key emotional components occurring within the bullying situation. Specifically, emotional awareness consisted of participants’ depictions of emotional attribution and depictions of understanding of emotions drawn on characters through reliance on emotional cues.

**Emotional attribution.** One subtheme that emerged from emotional awareness was emotional attribution. This was defined as a participant’s ability to attach an emotion to a given character (e.g., “bully,” “victim”) in his or her drawing. The emotion was either drawn, directly labeled in their drawing, or was described verbally in their responses on the DABs protocol. The specific emotion attached to a drawn character varied across participants because the situations drawn significantly varied across participants. Assignment of an emotional attribution theme did not account for the accuracy of the emotion identified or the congruence of a specific emotion to the situation drawn by a participant; it only accounted for a participant’s ability to attach an emotion to
a given character. Within this theme, participants had the opportunity to attribute emotion to the “bully,” “victim,” and/or “other (i.e., bystander, teacher)” character(s).

**Understanding of emotions.** Another subtheme that emerged was participants’ understanding of emotions experienced by characters involved in the bullying situation drawn. This was defined as a participant’s ability to understand what emotions were being experienced by the characters involved in the bullying, as well as a participant’s understanding of why the drawn characters were experiencing those emotions. Data analysis indicated that participants often relied on emotional cues within the bullying situation to help them understand the drawn characters’ feelings. Specifically, data analysis revealed that participants utilized emotional cues to help them understand how and why characters felt a certain way in a drawn bullying situation. Students depicted emotional cues when they drew and/or described indicators of relying on characters’ facial expressions or emotions. Data analysis indicated that participants tended to draw or describe emotions experienced by the “bully,” “victim,” and/or “other (i.e., bystander, teacher)” character(s).

**Miscellaneous awareness.** It is important to note that there were few miscellaneous subthemes that emerged, that either blended core subthemes together (thus creating a unique subtheme), or did not align with any of the core themes or subthemes.

**Congruence of situation and emotion.** First, participants indicated themes of congruence between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by characters, and indicated themes of explicitly connecting the bullying situation and the emotions experienced by characters involved in the bullying. Specifically, students depicted congruence between the situation and emotion when they were able to accurately connect
the bullying situation to appropriate and relevant emotions experienced by the “bully” and/or “victim character. This particular code was distinct from students’ explicitly connecting the situation and emotion.

Explicit connection between situation and emotion. Data analysis indicated that some participants depicted an explicit connection between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by characters drawn when they verbalized their understanding of “why” and “how” the characters were feeling a certain way (as identified by a given participant). Participants had to verbalize the direct connection between the characters’ bullying situation and their emotional reactions. Conversely, some participants also indicated themes of disconnect between the situation and emotions experienced by characters involved in the bullying. Also, some participants indicated themes of disconnect between the emotions experienced by characters and the emotions drawn on characters’ faces.

Personal connection. Some participants indicated subthemes of personal connection to the bullying situation, and others indicated subthemes of fantasy. Personal connection was defined as a participant’s personal experience or direct association with his or her drawn bullying situation. Personal connection was depicted when students drew and/or verbally indicated that the bullying situation “really happened” or that they shared a related personal experience.

Fantasy. Data analysis found that some participants depicted situations that were fantasy-based. Specifically, fantasy was defined as a participant’s indication of the situation being “pretend” or “fake.”
**Research Question 1.** The goal of the first qualitative research was to assess how students’ bully/victim status related to empathic content drawn in their DABS measure. Hypothesis 1 predicted that students who identified as “non-bullies” (i.e., “victims,” “bystanders,” “uninvolved”) would be more likely to draw bullying situations displaying empathic understanding toward others, compared to “bullies” or “bully-victims.” It is important to note that students’ self-identified bully/victim status (as indicated on the *Bully Survey*) was utilized to explore the relationship between students’ status and their drawings, so that consistent comparison across measures could be maintained. However, data analysis found that several students, across all of the different bully/victim statuses, endorsed a different status in their drawings.

Specifically for students who identified as “non-bullies,” 90% of students maintained the same “non-bully” role in their drawings. Further analysis revealed that 10% of participants endorsed a “bystander” role, 40% of participants endorsed an “uninvolved” role, and 40% of participants endorsed a “victim” role in their drawings. It was also found that 10% of participants endorsed a different role from their self-identified status, as indicated on the *Bully Survey*. Specifically, these participants endorsed a “bully-victim” role in their drawing. It was found that for students who identified as “bullies” on the *Bully Survey*, only 20% of students maintained the same “bully” role in their drawings. Therefore, 80% of students endorsed an alternative, “non-bully” role in their drawings. Further analysis found that 40% of participants endorsed an “uninvolved” role, while 40% of participants endorsed a “victim” role. It was also found that for students who identified as “bully-victims” on the *Bully Survey*, none of the students maintained the same role in their drawings. Specifically, 22% of participants...
endorsed a “bully” role in their drawings and 72% of participants endorsed a “non-bully” role. Of the students that endorsed a “non-bully” role, 5% endorsed a “bully” and a “bystander” role, 11% endorsed a “bystander” role, 5% endorsed a “bystander” and a “victim” role, 11% endorsed an “uninvolved” role, and 50% endorsed a “victim” role (See Table 5).

**Contextual awareness: Type of bullying situation.** Data analysis indicated that 50% of students who identified as “non-bullies” drew or described physical bullying situations. One participant (Dennis) described the following situation: “A girl is pushing a boy. She is happy because she is teasing him, and he feels scared because he is being teased.” Data analysis found that 30% of students who identified as “non-bullies” drew or described verbal bullying situations. One participant (Miley) described the following situation: “An older white boy is bullying a younger black girl. He is more powerful, with better grades. He is making fun of her because she’s black and thinks she’s dumb. He is pointing his finger and laughing. She is crying and sad, and he is making her lose her temper.” Another participant (Paige) described the following situation: “The bully is making fun of the victim, and pointing and laughing at him. He told him he has a big head.”

Data analysis showed that 20% of students who identified as “non-bullies” drew or described relational bullying situations. One participant (Ken) described the following situation: “Students are playing a game in their classroom. Boys are bullying another boy, and girls are bullying another girl. The girl is asking the other girls to be in their group, and they refuse to let her join. The boys are pointing and laughing at the other boy.” In examining the type of bullying situation that was drawn, data analysis indicated that 70%
of students who identified as “bullies” drew or described physical bullying situations.

One participant (Fabian) who identified as a “bully” described the following situation: “A kid comes up to the victim and grabbed him, so the victim pushed back. Both the bully and the victim are mad” Another participant (Gwen) described the following situation: “Some girl punched another girl. The bully said something mean, so the victim punched her. They are both angry because they are fighting each other.” Conversely, it was found that only 33% participants who identified as “bully-victims” drew or described physical bullying situations. One participant (Ace) who identified as a “bully-victim” indicated the following situation: “Two students are about to fight. The victim feels scared and the bully feels mad. The victim is scared because he doesn’t have big hands and he is going to get beaten up. The bully feels mad because he has big hands.”

For participants who identified as “bullies” and “bully-victims,” data analysis found that 30% of students who identified as “bullies” drew or described verbal bullying situations. One participant (Kai) described the following situation: “A boy is making fun of a girl’s shirt because the show is dumb and for little kids. The victim doesn’t care, but the bully is trying to bring her down.” Another participant (Rex) described the following situation: “The victim is trying to talk to the bully. They’re at recess and the victim tries to talk to the bully. The bully calls the victim ugly because he does not like younger kids because they’re annoying. He thinks the victim is annoying and feels irritated. The victim now feels afraid.” Conversely, data analysis illustrated that 67% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” drew or described verbal bullying situations. Specifically, one participant (Bryn) who identified as a “bully-victim” described the following situation: “The person is deciding to bully, and says that the victim is stupid. The victim
tells the bully to leave her alone and cries. The bully feels happy because the victim started crying. The victim feels sad because she started crying.” Data analysis found that none of the participants who identified as “bullies” or “bully-victims” drew or described relational bullying situations.

**Contextual awareness: Understanding of the bullying situation.** Data analysis determined that 100% of participants drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Clyde) described the following situation: “Two bullies need bikes, so they are trying to steal the victim’s bikes and trying to be sneaky. But they got caught, so they had to give them back. The two bullies feel happy, and the two victims feel sad.” Another participant (Felicia) described the following situation: “The victim is being calm and the bully is being mean. The victim thinks the bully is going to put his hands on the victim, so the victim starts to fight him. The victim begins fighting because he thinks the bully is going to put his hands on the victim. The victim has an understanding that the bully has started stuff and has disrespected the victim in the past, by talking about his mother. They fight.” It was found that 30% of participants relied on situational cues to understand what was happening in the bullying situation. Specifically, one participant (Dennis) relied on situational cues and indicated: “The victim is happy because she pushes a lot, and the victim is scared because he is falling.” Another participant (Hailey) also relied on the situational cues and expressed: “The bully and victim are sad and angry because they are having a fight.”

It was found that 100% of participants who identified as “bullies” drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Manny) described the following situation: “The bully pushed the victim down because the victim told the
bully’s ex-boyfriend that she was doing stuff with a guy. The bully and victim are not friends.” Another participant (Serena) described the following situation: “The bully threw a football at the victim’s leg to make him feel unhappy or sad.” Similarly, data analysis discovered that 100% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Clark) described the following situation: “A younger kid gets picked on by an older kid. There are bystanders who are the same age as the victim, and a bystander who is older. The bystander tells the bully to leave the victim alone, but he doesn’t listen. The bystander goes to the principal, and the adult tells the bully to stop. He goes to the office and his mom gets called. The victim goes to the nurse to see if he has bruises. The other bystanders get in trouble for just standing there and not doing anything.” Data analysis indicated that only 20% of participants who identified as a “bully” relied on situational cues to describe their understanding of the bullying situation. Specifically, it was found that one participant (Eliza) relied on situational cues: “The bully was pushing the victim.” Another participant (Fabian) relied on situational cues and indicated: “There was physical pushing and grabbing between the victim and the bully.” Data analysis showed that for participants who identified as a “bully-victim,” 22% of participants relied on situational cues. One participant (Ace) who identified as “bully-victim” utilized situational cues to explain the bullying situation: “The victim feels scared and the bully feels mad. The victim is scared because he doesn’t have big hands and he is going to get beaten up.” Another participant (Curtis) also relied on using situational cues: “The bully is happy because he’d feel happy if he bullied because he’s bullied before and felt happy. The victim feels sad because he was told that he sucks.”
**Contextual awareness: Power imbalance.** Data analysis indicated that 21% of participants who identified as “non-bullies” drew or described themes of power imbalance overall, within their bullying situations. Specifically, data analysis revealed that 60% of participants drew or described a size difference, where the “bully” character appeared to be larger than the “victim” character (see Figure 2). Additionally, 40% of participants who identified as “non-bullies” drew or described an age difference, where the “bully” character was older than the “victim” character. One participant (Cleo) described the following age difference: “The victim is five and the bully is eight.” Another participant (Miley) described the following age difference: “The older boy is 11 and in 5th grade, and he is the bully. The younger girl is five and in kindergarten, and she is the victim.” It was discovered that 30% of participants drew or described gender as a form of power imbalance. All of these participants expressed that the “victim” character was female and that the “bully” character was male. Data analysis indicated that 10% of participants drew and described group size as a form of power imbalance. Specifically, one participant (Ken) drew an instance of bullying, which the number of “bully” characters was greater than the number of “victim” characters. It was found that 10% of participants drew and described intellectual differences as a form of power imbalance. The participant (Miley) described that the “bully” character believed that the “victim” character was “dumb,” and indicated that the “bully” character engaged in verbal bullying towards the “victim” character “because he thinks she’s dumb.” Participants who identified as “non-bullies” did not indicate differences in popularity status. No other indicators of power imbalance were observed through analysis of participants’ drawings.
Data analysis indicated that 20% of participants who identified as “bullies” drew or described themes of power imbalance overall, within their bullying situations. Specifically, data analysis revealed that 70% of participants drew or described a size difference, where the “bully” character appeared to be larger than the “victim” character. Additionally, it was found that 70% of participants who identified as “bullies” drew or described an age difference, where the “bully” character was older than the “victim” character. One participant (Eliza) described the following age difference: “An old wise man is pushing the younger character, and he is 16 years old.” Another participant (Gus) described the following age difference: “The bully is in 5th grade and is 11 years old, and the victim is in 3rd grade and is eight years old.” It was found that 10% of participants who identified as a “bully” drew or described gender as a form of power imbalance. Participants expressed that the “victim” character was female and that the “bully” character was male. Data analysis determined that 10% of participants who identified as a “bully” drew and described popularity status as a determinant of power imbalance. Specifically, one participant (Grant) described: “A kid is getting a new hair style and a popular girl is making fun of the guy. The girl is popular and the guy is unpopular. The girl feels amused because she thinks he looks stupid and wants him to know what she thinks. The guy feels sad because he thought it looked cool.” No other factors related to power imbalance were noted or observed when reviewing drawings completed by participants who identified as “bullies.” Data analysis indicated that 18% of participants who identified as a “bully-victim” drew or described themes of power imbalance in their drawings of bullying situations. Specifically, it was found that 38% of participants who identified as a “bully-victim” drew or described size difference as a form of power
imbalance. As with participants who identified as “non-bullies” and “bullies”, participants who identified as “bully-victims” tended to draw the “bully” character as being larger than the “victim” character.

Data analysis found that 67% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” drew or described age difference as a form of power imbalance. It was found that “bully” characters were drawn or described as being older than “victim” characters. Popularity status as a form of power imbalance was indicated by 5% of participants who identified as a “bully-victim.” Specifically, one participant (Rita) described: “The bully is telling the victim that he is not good at basketball and that he can’t make the shot. The bully likes the bystander, and wants to feel cool. She is trying to show off and impress the bystander. The victim feels sad and bad because he was bullied by a popular girl.” Data analysis showed that group size difference as a form of power imbalance was indicated by 5% of participants who identified as a “bully-victim.” Specifically, one participant (Penny) drew an instance of verbal bullying in which the main “bully” character, as well as friends of the “bully” character were bullying the victim because of what she looked like and what she was wearing. She stated: “The bully is bullying the victim because of what she looks like and what she is wearing. The victim has been bullied before, and has been pushed into a locker. The main bully and friends feel cool because that’s just how bullies feel picking on others. The victim feels scared because she has experienced bullying before.” No other indicators of power imbalance were noted or observed through analysis of participants’ drawings.

**Contextual awareness: Bodily awareness.** Various markers of bodily awareness were discovered within the drawings and descriptions completed by participants who
identified as “non-bullies.” Overall, it was found that 16% of participants provided indicators of bodily awareness. Specifically, data analysis indicated that 40% of participants drew larger hands on the “bully” character than on the “victim” character (see Figure 9). It was revealed that 20% of participants drew varying body posture on the “bully” and “victim” characters. One participant (Dennis) drew the victim as having an open body posture “because he was being pushed.” Similarly, another participant (Hailey) drew the victim in a supine posture “because he was in a fight” (see Figure 18). Data analysis determined that 30% of participants who identified as “non-bullies” drew characters without hands. One participant (Ken) did not include hands on any of the characters drawn. This participant did not include feet on any of the characters either. One participant (Paige) did not include hands on the “victim” character, but did include hands on the “bully” character (see Figure 28). Data analysis found that 20% of participants omitted other details in their drawings. Specifically, these participants omitted characters’ eyes or pupils. One participant (Felicia) drew poorly defined eyes on both the “bully” character and on the “victim” character. Similarly, another participant (Wynter) omitted pupils on the eyes of both the “bully” character and the “victim” character (see Figure 37). It was found that 20% of participants drew “claw-shaped” hands on certain characters in their bullying situation. Specifically, one participant (Clyde) drew elongated, “claw-like” hands on a “victim” and a “bully” character involved in the bullying situation (See Figure 8). Through data analysis, it was revealed that participants who identified as “non-bullies” did not draw or describe instances of movement (i.e., arms reaching outwards), or draw large hands on “victim” characters. No
other indicators of bodily awareness were observed or noted through analysis of “non-bully” participants’ drawings.

Various markers of bodily awareness were discovered within the drawings and descriptions completed by participants who identified as “bullies” and “bully-victims.” Overall, it was found that 15% of participants who identified as “bullies” provided indicators of bodily awareness, whereas 10% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” provided indicators of bodily awareness in their drawings of bullying situations. Specifically, data analysis revealed that 20% of participants who identified as “bullies” drew or described instances of movement (i.e., arms reaching outward). Specifically, one participant (Grant) drew the “bully” character reaching outward and pointing towards the “victim” character. Another participant (Fabian) drew the “bully” and “victim” characters as reaching towards each other, engaging in a physical fight (see Figure 13). Similarly, data analysis revealed that 11% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” also drew or described instances of movement (i.e., arms reaching outward). One participant (Alex) who identified as a “bully-victim” drew the “bully” character reaching arms towards the “victim” character (See Figure 2).

Data analysis indicated that 10% of participants who identified as a “bully” drew larger hands on the “bully” character than on the “victim” character, whereas 17% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” drew larger hands on the “bully” character, relative to other characters drawn in the bullying situation. It was discovered that 30% of participants who identified as “bullies” drew varying body posture on the “bully” and “victim” characters. One participant (Gwen) who identified as a “bully” drew the “victim” character as having a closed body posture, and drew the “bully” character as
having an open body posture (see Figure 17). One participant (Grant) elaborated on his drawing and described: “The victim is slouching and has his hands in his pockets.” Conversely, it was revealed that only 5% of participants who identified as a “bully-victim” drew varying body postures on the “bully” and “victim” characters. Specifically, one participant (Curtis) drew the “bully” character as having open body posture and the “victim” character as having closed body posture. The participant drew the “victim” character’s arms as being close to his body throughout the entirety of the bully situation that was drawn. Data analysis indicated that 20% of participants who identified as “bullies” drew characters without hands. One participant (Theo) did not include hands on either the “bully” character or the “victim” character. It was found that 11% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” did not include hands on either the “bully” character or the “victim” character. One participant (Otto) who identified as a “bully-victim” omitted hands only on the “victim” character drawn; all other characters drawn in the bullying situation had hands. Conversely, one participant (Phillip) who identified as a “bully-victim” omitted hands only on the “bully” character drawn; the “victim” character drawn in the bullying situation had hands.

Data analysis determined that 20% of participants who identified as “bullies” omitted other details in their drawings. Specifically, these participants omitted characters’ eyes or pupils. One participant (Eliza) omitted pupils on the eyes of the “victim” character (see Figure 12). Data analysis revealed that all participants who identified as “bully-victims” drew detailed eyes on the characters involved in their bullying situations. It was found that 10% of participants who identified as a “bully” drew large hands on all of the characters drawn. Similarly, data analysis found that 22% of participants who
identified as “bully-victims” drew or described indicators of large hands on all of the characters drawn in the bullying situation. Data analysis did not reveal any instances of participants who identified as “bullies” drawing large hands on the “victim” character only. Conversely, it was found that 11% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” did draw indicators of the “victim” character having larger hands than other characters involved in the bullying situation. Specifically, one participant (Lee) drew the “victim” character’s hands as being slightly larger than the “bully” character’s hands, whereas another participant (Zoe) drew the “victim” character as having hands in fists and the “bully” character having no hands (See Figure 38). It was found that 10% of participants who identified as a “bully” drew “claw-shaped” hands on certain characters in their bullying situation. Specifically, one participant (Eliza) drew elongated, “claw-like” hands on a “bully” character involved in the bullying situation, while the “victim” character had no hands drawn (See Figure 12). Through data analysis, it was shown that participants who identified as “bully-victims” did not draw or describe instances of characters having “claw-like” hands. No other indicators of bodily awareness were observed through analysis of the drawings of participants who identified as either a “bully” or “bully-victim.”

**Contextual awareness: Cause-and-effect outcomes.** Data analysis determined that few participants who identified as “non-bullies” indicated markers of cause-and-effect outcomes. There were 20% of participants who indicated the intent of the “bully” character. Specifically, one participant (Felicia) stated: “The victim initiates fighting because he thinks the bully is going to put his hands on the victim.” This was determined to be a possible motive for the “bully” character to engage in the bullying situation.
Another participant (Paige) identified that “the bully is picking on the victim because he has no friends.” This was determined to be a possible intent for the “bully” character to engage in the bullying situation. It was found that 10% of participants displayed markers of repetition. Specifically, (Felicia) stated: “The victim has an understanding that the bully has started stuff, and has disrespected the victim in the past by talking about his mother.” Participants who identified as “non-bullies” did not display any markers of consequences, resolutions, or barriers to intervening in their drawings.

It was found that 20% participants who identified as “bullies” revealed determinants of intent in their bullying situations. One participant (Theo) who identified as a “bully” indicated: “The bully is mad. He got bullied and is now doing the bullying.” This likely indicates that the “bully” character may have learned to engage in bullying through modeling. It was found that 38% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” revealed determinants of intent in their bullying situations. One participant (Bryn) indicated: “The bully initially felt sad because she has been bullied. She is mad and wants to go bully to make herself feel better. She then feels happy because she bullied the other girl and feels better than the way she felt when she was bullied.” This likely indicates that the “bully” character may have learned to engage in bullying through modeling. Data analysis showed that no participants who identified as “bullies” indicated markers of repetition, consequences, or barriers to intervening. Conversely, it was found that 22% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” displayed markers of barriers to intervening in their bullying situation. One participant (Phillip) stated: “Bystanders don’t intervene because they don’t want to be picked on.” One participant (Dora) who
identified as a “bully-victim” described a consequence and stated: “The bully got an office referral because she said mean things to her friend.”

Data analysis revealed that most participants who identified as a “bully” did not indicate a form of resolution to the bullying situation in their drawings. It was found that 70% of participants did not include a resolution, whereas 30% of participants did draw or describe a resolution. Specifically, one participant (Rex) described that the “bully” character resumed playing soccer after the bullying situation. Another participant (Serena) described that the “victim” went inside to calm down after experiencing the bullying. It was found that most participants who identified as a “bully-victim” also did not indicate a form of resolution to the bullying situation in their drawings. Specifically, data analysis revealed that 78% of participants did not include a resolution, whereas 22% of participants did draw or describe a resolution to the bullying situation. One participant (Otto) described that the “bully” character apologized to the “victim,” and asked to be his friend.

**Emotional awareness: Emotional attribution.** Data analysis revealed that 100% of students who identified as “non-bullies” attributed emotions to both “bully” characters and “victim” characters. Participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “bully” characters: happy, sad, laughing, apathetic, bored, and rude. Participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “victim” characters: sad, nervous, mad, shocked, scared, sad, crying, and okay. None of the participants who identified as “non-bullies” attributed emotions to other characters drawn (i.e., “bystanders,” “adults”). Data analysis also indicated that 100% of participants drew or described an awareness of the emotions experienced in the bullying situation. Specifically, it was found that 100% of participants
described the facial expressions of the “bully” and “victim” characters drawn. Participants tended to draw frowns on “victims” who were feeling sad, tears on “victims” who were feeling sad, open mouths on “victims” who were feeling scared, downward facing eyebrows and large eyes on “victims” who were feeling mad, flat mouths on “bullies” who were feeling mad, and smiles on “bullies” who were feeling happy.

Additionally, participant’s described their understanding of characters’ emotions. One participant (Wynter) indicated: “The victim feels sad and is crying. The victim may feel nervous because he is scared of the bully. The bully just feels like being rude and is saying things about the victim.” Another participant (Paige) described: “The victim is getting picked on and feels mad. The bully is feeling bored, and is smirking.” One participant (Dennis) indicated: “The bully is happy because she pushes the victim a lot, and the victim is scared because he is falling backwards.”

Data analysis determined that 90% of students who identified as “bullies” attributed emotions to “bully” characters drawn in a bullying situation. It was also found that 100% of students who identified as “bullies” attributed emotions “victim” characters. It was found that 10% of participants who identified as a “bully” attributed emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystander,” “adults”). Participants who identified as “bullies” tended to attribute the following emotions to “bully” characters: rude, mad, angry, amused, happy, good, and irritated. These participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “victim” characters: afraid, sad, upset, bad, apathetic, mad, and angry. Additionally, these participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “other” characters: happy. Data analysis indicated that 100% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” attributed emotions to both “bully” characters and “victim” characters
drawn in the bullying situations. Data analysis also indicated that 22% of participants attributed emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystanders,” “adults”) drawn in the bullying situation. Specifically, students who identified as “bully-victims” tended to attribute the following emotions to “bully” characters: mad, powerful, sad, happy, angry, funny, upset, laughing, bored, disgusted, cool, and irritated. These participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “victim” characters: angry, sad, scared, embarrassed, lonely, shocked, crying, happy, weak, and low. These participants also tended to attribute the following emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystanders,” “teachers”) drawn: hyper, excited, worried, bad, guilty, disappointed, upset, sad, mad, and happy.

Data analysis revealed that 100% of participants who identified as “bullies” drew or described an awareness of the emotions experienced in the bullying situation. Specifically, it was found that 90% of participants who identified as “bullies” described the facial expressions of the “bully” and “victim” characters drawn. These participants tended to draw frowns on “victims” who were feeling sad, tears on “victims” who were feeling bad or mad, smiling mouths on “victims” who were feeling apathetic, teeth on “bullies” who were feeling rude, and smiling and open mouths on “bullies” who were feeling mad, happy, or amused. One participant (Gwen) who identified as a “bully” drew no indicators of facial expression on the characters in the bullying situation (see Figure 17). Additionally, the participants who identified as “bullies” described their understanding of characters’ emotions. One participant (Rex) indicated: “The bully thinks that the victim is annoying and feels irritated. The victim initially felt happy before he got yelled at by the bully, and now feels afraid because of what the bully said.” Another participant (Manny) expressed: “The bully is feeling good because she pushed the victim
down and is feeling good about beating her up for spreading a rumor. The victim feels bad because she is hurt.”

Data analysis also revealed that 100% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” drew or described an awareness of the emotions experienced in the bullying situation. Specifically, it was found that 100% of participants who identified as “bully-victims” described the facial expressions of the “bully” and “victim” characters drawn. These participants tended to draw flat mouths on “victims” who were feeling scared, open mouths and upward facing eyebrows on “victims” who were feeling afraid or weak, frowns and tears on “victims” who were feeling sad, frowning and downward eyebrows on “bullies” who were feeling mad, and smiling or open mouths on “bullies” who were feeling mad or happy. Additionally, the participants who identified as “bully-victims” described their understanding of characters’ emotions. One participant (Mae) described: “The bully took a note out of the victim’s locker and is gonna read it. The victim is going to try and get it, but he is too small. The note is something to his parents and may be embarrassing. The bully is feeling happy, and the victim is feeling sad.”

*Emotional awareness: Understanding of emotions.* It was found that 50% of participants who identified as a “non-bully” relied on emotional cues to understand how and why characters felt a certain way in their drawn bullying situations. Specifically, one participant (Cleo) stated: “The girl feels sad because she has a frown face, and the boy feels happy because he has a smiley face. You can tell how they are feeling because of their facial expressions.” Similarly, another participant (Miley) indicated: “The bully is feeling happy, and the victim is feeling sad. You can tell because of their facial expressions. The victim is frowning and crying, and the bully is smiling.”
For participants who identified as a “bully,” it was found that 60% of participants relied on emotional cues to understand how and why characters felt a certain way in the bullying situations. Specifically, one participant (Gus) stated: “The bully is smiling and thinks it is fun. The victim is sad because he’s not smiling and is being bullied. I can tell by looking at their facial expressions.” For participants who identified as a “bully-victim,” it was determined that 66% of participants relied on emotional cues to understand the bullying situation. Specifically, one participant (Phoebe) indicated: “One boy is making fun of the other boy’s clothes. The bully wanted to make fun of the victim’s clothes to hurt his feelings. The victim feels sad because he’s getting bullied and indicated that he wanted to kill himself. I could tell by looking at the facial expressions of the characters.”

**Miscellaneous awareness: Congruence and explicit connection between situation and emotion.** Data analysis found that 100% of participants who identified as a “non-bully” displayed congruence between the situation and the emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Of these participants, it was found that 40% explicitly reported a connection between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Specifically, one participant (Cleo) indicated: “The girl is feeling sad because the bully stole her money, and the bully is feeling happy because he got to take her money.” Another participant (Felicia) stated: “The bully will feel sad because the victim is beating him up. You can tell through because of their faces and the situation.” Data analysis revealed that 100% of participants who identified as a “bully” displayed congruence between the situation and the emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Of these participants, it was found that 60% explicitly reported a connection between the bullying
situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Specifically, one participant (Kayla) stated: “The bully is making fun of the victim’s shirt because the show is dumb and for little kids. The bully has been trying to bring her down, but she doesn’t care because she is comfortable with what she is wearing.” Similarly, data analysis revealed that 100% of participants who identified as a “bully-victim” displayed congruence between the situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Of these participants, it was found that 72% explicitly described a connection between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Specifically, one participant (Penny) indicated: “The bully is bullying the victim because of what she looks like and what she is wearing. The victim feels scared because she has experienced bullying before. She feels scared because she thinks the bully might do something to her or spread rumors. The main bully and friends feel cool because that’s just how bullies feel picking on others.”

**Miscellaneous awareness: Personal connection and fantasy.** There were no participants who identified as a “non-bully” that indicated a personal connection to the bullying situation. It was found that 20% of participants who identified as a “non-bully” expressed that the bullying situation was “pretend” or “not real.” Data analysis revealed that 30% of participants who identified as a “bully” indicated a personal connection to the bullying situation. Specifically, one participant (FAB) imposed himself into the situation: “My friend and I are playing football and another kid comes up to the victim and grabbed him, so the victim pushed back.” No participants who identified as a “bully” indicated that the situation was “pretend” or “not real.” Data analysis also found that 17% of participants who identified as a “bully-victim” indicated a personal connection to the
bullying situation, and only 5% of participants endorsed that the bullying situation was “pretend.”

Overall, data analysis revealed that participants who identified as a “non-bully,” “bully,” or “bully-victim” were equally likely to draw bullying situations focused on the role of the “victim” and display empathic understanding toward victims. Additionally, participants who identified as a “non-bully,” “bully,” or “bully-victim” were equally likely to draw situations focused on the role of the “bully” and display empathic understanding towards bullies. Participants who identified as “bully-victims” and “non-bullies” appeared to be slightly more able to attribute emotion to all characters drawn in the bullying situation than participants who identified as “bullies.” Regarding power imbalance, participants who identified as “bullies” appeared to indicate more elements of size difference than participants who endorsed other roles. Participants who identified as “bully-victims” were more likely to indicate age differences, and participants who identified as “non-bullies” were more likely to indicate gender differences than participants who endorsed other roles. Regarding the type of bullying situation that was drawn, participants who identified as “bullies” were more likely to draw physical bullying situations, whereas participants who identified as “bully-victims” were more likely to draw verbal bullying situations. Participants who identified as “non-bullies” were more likely to draw relational bullying situations than participants who endorsed other bullying roles. Participants who identified as “bullies” and “non-bullies” were nearly equally likely to indicate markers of bodily awareness in their bullying situations.

Participants who indicated that they were “bullies” were more likely to recognize body posture, whereas participants who indicated that they were “non-bullies” were more
likely to recognize a large hand size on “bully” characters. Participants who indicated that they were “bully-victims” were more likely to draw large hands on all of the characters in the bullying situation, as compared to participants who endorsed other roles. Regarding contextual awareness, participants who indicated that they were “bully-victims” appeared to have a greater sense of contextual elements than participants who endorsed other roles. Additionally, participants who endorsed a “bully-victim” role were most likely to make an explicit connection between characters’ emotions and the bullying situation. Participants who identified as a “bully-victim” were also more likely to utilize cues, both emotional and situational, to describe their understanding of the characters’ feelings in the bullying situation. Therefore, Hypothesis 1 was not supported, given that all participants (regardless of the bully/victim role) were able to describe and understand the context and emotions of all character roles drawn within the bullying situations.

**Research Question 2.** The goal of the second qualitative research was to assess how students’ gender related to empathic content drawn in their DABS measure. Hypothesis 2 predicted that female participants would be more likely to draw situations that display empathic understanding towards others involved in bullying than male participants.

**Contextual awareness: Type of bullying situation.** In examining the type of bullying situation that was drawn, data analysis found that 45% of female participants drew or described physical bullying situations. One female participant (Alice) described the following situation: “Two brothers are fighting. They are saying they hate each other, and the older brother started it. The older brother is feeling mad because of his face and his eyebrows. The younger brother is feeling kind of sad and crying.” Another participant
(Zoe) described the following situation: “There are two boys, and the bully is older. The bully stole something from the victim. The victim is angry that his stuff was stolen and he is ready to fight. The bully denies taking it and is selfish.” It was found that 50% of male participants drew or described physical bullying situations. One male participant (Theo) indicated the following situation: “The bully told the victim to give him lunch money. The victim started to cry because they didn’t have lunch money anymore.” Data analysis revealed that 50% of female participants drew or described verbal bullying situations. One female participant (Wynter) described the following situation: “There is a victim and a bully, and they are both boys in 5th grade. The bully is making fun of the victim’s clothes.” Similarly, data analysis revealed that 44% of male participants drew or described verbal bullying situations. Specifically, one male participant (Phillip) described the following situation: “Three other kids are yelling at the victim. The bully is saying bad things to him to try to act cool. The victim is afraid and tried to hide.” Data analysis indicated that no female participants depicted a relational bullying situation. Conversely, it was found that 5% of male participants depicted relational bullying. Specifically, this participant (Ken) described the following situation: “Students are playing in the classroom. Boys are bullying another boy, and girls are bullying another girl. The girl asks the other girls if she can be in their group, and they refuse.”

**Contextual awareness: Understanding of the bullying situation.** Data analysis found that 100% of female participants drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Claire) described the following situation: “The bully is mad because he is not as smart as the victim. The victim is sad and he feels that there was no reason for him to be picked on. The victim was too scared to stand up for himself.”
Similarly, data analysis revealed that 100% of male participants drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Manny) described the following situation: “The bully pushed the victim down because the victim told the bully’s ex-boyfriend that she was doing stuff with a guy. The bully and victim are not friends.” It was found that 30% of female participants relied on situational cues to understand what was happening in the bullying situation. One participant (Felicia) indicated: “The victim initiates fighting because he thinks the bully is going to put his hands on the victim. The victim has an understanding of the history that they bully has started stuff and is disrespecting the victim by talking about his mother. The bully will feel sad because the victim is beating him up. I can tell from the situation.” It was found that 16% of male participants relied on situational cues.

**Contextual awareness: Power imbalance.** Data analysis demonstrated that 18% of female participants drew or described themes of power imbalance overall, within their bullying situations. Specifically, data analysis revealed that 45% of female participants drew or described a size difference, where the “bully” character appeared to be larger than the “victim” character. Additionally, it was revealed that 45% of females drew or described an age difference, where the “bully” character was older than the “victim” character. One participant (Alice) described the following age difference: “There are two brothers fighting. One brother is eight, and the other is seven. The older brother started it.” It was revealed that 20% of female participants drew or described gender as a form of power imbalance. These participants all expressed that the “victim” character was female and that the “bully” character was male. Additionally, data analysis revealed that one female participant (Penny) drew or described group size differences as a form of power
imbalance. Specifically, the participant described: “The bully is bullying the victim because of what she looks like and what she is wearing. The victim has been bullied before, and has been pushed into a locker. The main bully and friends feel cool because that’s just how bullies feel picking on others. The victim feels scared because she has experienced bullying before.” No other factors related to power imbalance were noted or observed when reviewing drawings completed by female participants.

Data analysis indicated that 21% of male participants drew or described themes of power imbalance in their drawings of bullying situations. Specifically, it was found that 61% of male participants drew or described size difference as a form of power imbalance. As with female participants’ depictions of size differences, male participants tended to draw the “bully” character as being larger in size than the “victim” character. Data analysis indicated that 67% of male participants drew or described age difference as a form of power imbalance. It was found that “bully” characters were drawn or described as being older than “victim” characters. Popularity status as a form of power imbalance was indicated by 5% of male participants. Specifically, the participant (Grant) described: “A kid is getting a new hair style and a popular girl is making fun of the guy. The girl is popular and the guy is unpopular. The girl feels amused because she thinks he looks stupid and wants him to know what she thinks. The guy feels sad because he thought it looked cool.” Data analysis revealed that group size difference as a form of power imbalance was indicated by 1% of male participants. Specifically, the participant (Ken) described the following situation: “Students are playing in the classroom. Two girls bully another girl, and two boys bully another boy.” Additionally, gender as a form of power imbalance was indicated by 5% of male participants. This participant (Pedro) expressed
that the “victim” character was female and that the “bully” character was male. No other indicators of power imbalance were noted or observed through analysis of male participants’ drawings.

**Contextual awareness: Bodily awareness.** Various markers of bodily awareness were discovered within the drawings and descriptions completed by female and male participants. Overall, it was found that 12% of female participants provided indicators of bodily awareness, whereas 14% of male participants provided indicators of bodily awareness in their drawings of bullying situations. Specifically, data analysis revealed that 20% of female participants drew larger hands on the “bully” character than other characters in the bullying situation. Similarly, it was found that 22% of male participants drew larger hands on the “bully” character than other characters involved in the bullying. Data analysis indicated that 15% of female participants drew varying body posture on the “bully” and “victim” characters. Similarly, it was found that 16% of male participants drew varying body posture on the “bully” and “victim” characters, often drawing the “bully” character as having open body posture and the “victim” character as having closed body posture. Data analysis indicated that 10% of female participants drew characters without hands, whereas 28% of male participants drew characters without hands. It was found that that 15% of female participants omitted other details in their drawings. Specifically, these participants omitted characters’ eyes or pupils. Conversely, it was found that 5% of male participants omitted details (i.e., eyes or pupils) in their drawings. Data analysis revealed that 20% of female participants drew large hands on both the “bully” and “victim” characters, 5% of female participants drew large hands on only the “victim” character, and 10% of female participants drew the “bully” figure with
“claw-like” hands. It was found that only 5% of male participants drew large hands on both the “bully” and “victim” characters, drew large hands on the “victim” character, and drew “claw-like” hands on the “bully” figure.

**Contextual awareness: Cause-and-effect outcomes.** Data analysis found that 10% of female participants indicated markers of repetition and barriers to intervening. It was found that 25% of female participants revealed determinants of intent in their bullying situations. One female participant (Felicia) indicated: “The victim initiates fighting because he thinks the bully is going to put his hands on the victim. The bully has started stuff in the past and is disrespecting the victim by talking about his mother. They fight.” This likely indicates the “victim” character initiates fighting to seek revenge for experiencing past bullying behaviors. No female participants identified markers of consequences in their drawings of bullying situations. It was found that 28% of male participants revealed determinants of intent in their bullying situations. One participant (Lee) indicated: “The victim said something online about the bully and the bully wants revenge, and then says something.” This indicates that the “bully” character engaged in bullying behaviors to seek revenge on the “victim” character. Data analysis determined that 5% of male participants revealed markers of repetition, consequences, and barriers to intervening in their drawings of bullying situations. It was found that 85% of female participants did not include a resolution, whereas 15% of female participants did draw or describe a resolution. Specifically, one female participant (Dora) described that the “bully” got an office referral. Data analysis revealed that 67% males did not include a resolution, whereas 33% of male participants did draw or describe a resolution to the
bullying situation. One participant (Ken) described that the “bystander” character attempted to intervene and tell the “bully” characters to stop.

**Emotional awareness: Emotional attribution.** Data analysis revealed that 95% of female students attributed emotions to “bully” characters drawn in a bullying situation. It was found that 100% of female students attributed emotions “victim” characters. It was also found that 10% of female participants attributed emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystander,” “adults”). Female participants who tended to attribute the following emotions to “bully” characters: mad, selfish, angry, happy, good, rude, and irritated. These participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “victim” characters: afraid, scared, apathetic, sad, upset, bad, happy, shocked, and angry. Additionally, these participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “other” characters: happy. Data analysis indicated that 100% of male participants attributed emotions to both “bully” characters and “victim” characters drawn in the bullying situations. Data analysis also illustrated that 22% of male participants attributed emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystanders,” “adults”) drawn in the bullying situation. Specifically, males tended to attribute the following emotions to “bully” characters: bored, amused, sad, mad, happy, angry, funny, upset, laughing, disgusted, cool, and irritated. These participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “victim” characters: angry, sad, scared, embarrassed, lonely, crying, happy, weak, and low. These participants also tended to attribute the following emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystanders,” “teachers”) drawn: happy, guilty, disappointed, and upset. Data analysis determined that 100% of female participants drew or described an awareness of the emotions experienced in the bullying situation. Specifically, it was found that 95% of female participants described the facial
expressions of the “bully” and “victim” characters drawn. These participants tended to
draw frowns or flat mouths on “victims” who were feeling sad or mad, open mouths on
“victims” who were feeling scared or shocked, downward eyebrows on “victims” who
were sad, tears on “victims who were feeling sad, and smiling mouths on “victims” who
were feeling apathetic. Female participants also tended to draw smiling and open mouths
on “bullies” who were feeling happy or mad. One female participant (Gwen) drew no
indicators of facial expression on the characters in the bullying situation.

Additionally, the female participants described their understanding of characters’
emotions. One participant (Kayla) indicated: “The victim doesn’t care. The bully is trying
to bring her down, but she doesn’t care because she’s comfortable with wearing it
anyway. I can tell because she is still smiling and wearing it anyway.” Data analysis also
showed that 100% of male participants drew or described an awareness of the emotions
experienced in the bullying situation. Specifically, it was found that 100% of male
participants described the facial expressions of the “bully” and “victim” characters
drawn. These participants tended to draw flat mouths on “victims” who were feeling
scared, open mouths and upward facing eyebrows on “victims” who were feeling afraid
or weak, frowns and tears on “victims” who were feeling sad, frowning and downward
eyebrows on “bullies” who were feeling mad, and smiling or open mouths on “bullies”
who were feeling mad or happy. Additionally, these participants described their
understanding of characters’ emotions. One participant (Alex) indicated: “A guy is
going picked on, and the group is telling them to fight. The victim feels scared and the
bully is evil. The bully feels powerful, and the victim feels weak and low.”
Emotional awareness: Understanding of emotions. It was found that 65% of female participants relied on emotional cues to understand how and why characters felt a certain way in their drawn bullying situations. Specifically, one female participant (Mae) stated: “The bully took a note out of the victim’s locker and stole it, and is gonna read it. The victim is going to try and get it, but he is too small. The note is something to his parents, and may be embarrassing. The bully is feeling happy and the victim is feeling sad. I can tell by look at their faces and because the bully is laughing.” Similarly, data analysis indicated 78% of males relied on emotional cues. One male participant (Lee) indicated: “The bully and victim used to be good friends, until the victim said something about the bully online. The bully says something, and the victim is crying and scared. I can tell through their facial expressions.” Another participant (Kai) described: “A middle school girl is coming to bully the middle school boy. She came up and is making fun of his face. The boy is sad, you can tell by his face. He is sad because the girl is making fun of his face. The girl feels it’s funny because she’s bullying and thinks it’s funny. I can tell how they’re feeling because of their faces.”

Miscellaneous awareness: Congruence and explicit connection between situation and emotion. Data analysis demonstrated that 100% of female participants displayed congruence between the situation and the emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Of these participants, it was found that 65% explicitly reported a connection between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Specifically, one participant (Cleo) indicated: “The girl is feeling sad because the bully stole her lunch money, and the bully is feeling happy because he got to take her money.” Similarly, data analysis revealed that 100% of male participants displayed
congruence between the situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Of these participants, it was found that 55% explicitly described a connection between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Specifically, one male participant (Kai) described: “A girl is bullying a boy. She came up and is making fun of his face. The boy is sad because the girl is making fun of his face. The girl feels it’s funny because she’s bullying and thinks it’s funny.”

There were some female participants who appeared to experience a disconnection between the emotions described in the situation and the emotions that were drawn on the characters. One female participant (Gwen) drew a situation where the characters were feeling angry “because they’re fighting each other.” She did not draw any emotion on the faces of the “bully” character and “victim” character. Additionally, the female participant (Dora) drew a situation where the “bully” character was being mean to the “victim” character. She indicated that both characters “felt sad,” but then drew smiling faces on both of the characters. No other instances of disconnection between the emotions described in the bullying situation and the emotions that were drawn on the characters were noted or observed in male participants or any other female participants.

**Miscellaneous awareness: Personal connection and fantasy.** Data analysis showed that 15% of female participants indicated a personal connection to the bullying situation, either through indication that they were a character in the situation or shared a related anecdote. Conversely, only 5% of female participants indicated that the situation was “pretend” or “not real.” Similarly, data analysis found that 16% of male participants indicated a personal connection to the bullying situation, whereas only 11% of male participants endorsed that the bullying situation was “just pretend.”
Overall, data analysis revealed that female and male participants were equally likely to draw bullying situations displaying empathic understanding toward others. Male participants appeared to be slightly more able to attribute emotion to all characters drawn in the bullying situation than female participants. Regarding power imbalance, male participants appeared to indicate more elements of size and age difference than female participants. Female participants were more likely to reveal determinants of gender imbalance than male participants. Regarding the type of bullying situation, female participants were slightly more likely to draw instances of verbal bullying, whereas male participants were more likely to draw instances of physical bullying. Females and males were equally likely to indicate markers of bodily awareness in their bullying situations. Specifically, females and males were equally likely to recognize a large hand size on the “bully” character, relative to other characters in the bullying situation. Female and male were also equally likely to recognize body posture differences between the “bully” and “victim” characters drawn.

Females appeared more likely than males to draw situations where characters were missing eyes or pupils, whereas males appeared more likely to draw situations where characters were missing their hands. Regarding contextual awareness, female and male participants were equally likely to have a sense of contextual elements involved in a bullying situation. Specifically, female and male participants were equally likely to have awareness of both the situation and emotions involved, and were equally likely to display congruence between the situation and emotions experienced by characters drawn in the bullying situation. Female participants were more likely than male participants to make an explicit connection between characters’ emotions and the bullying situation. Male
participants were more likely than female participants to utilize cues, both emotional and situational, to describe their understanding of the characters’ feelings in the bullying situation. Males were more likely to rely on emotional cues, whereas females were more likely to rely on situational cues. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was not supported, given that all participants (regardless of gender) were able to describe and understand the context and emotions of all character roles drawn within the bullying situations.

**Research Question 3.** The goal of the third qualitative research question was to assess how students’ age related to empathic content drawn in their DABS measure. Hypothesis 3 predicted that older students would be more likely to draw situations that display empathic understanding towards others involved in bullying than younger students. Younger participants indicated that they were 7-11 years old, and were in elementary school; older participants indicated that they were 11-15 years old, and were in either middle school or high school.

**Contextual awareness: Type of bullying situation.** In examining the type of bullying situation that was drawn, data analysis illustrated that 55% of younger participants drew or described physical bullying situations. One younger participant (Alice) described the following situation: “Two brothers are fighting. They are saying they hate each other, and the older brother started it. The older brother is feeling mad because of his face and his eyebrows. The younger brother is feeling kind of sad and crying.” It was found that 38% of older participants drew or described physical bullying situations. One older participant (Mae) indicated the following situation: “The bully stole a note out of the locker and is gonna read it. The victim is going to try and get it, but he is too small. The note is something to his parents, and may be embarrassing.” Data analysis
showed that 40% of younger participants drew or described verbal bullying situations. One younger participant (Miley) described the following situation: “An older white boy is bullying a younger black girl. He is more powerful, with better grades. He is making fun of her because she’s black and thinks she’s dumb.” Similarly, data analysis revealed that 55% of older participants drew or described verbal bullying situations. Specifically, one older participant (Paige) described the following situation: “The bully is a senior and the victim is a freshman. The bully is making fun of the victim, and pointing and laughing at him. He told the victim he has a big head.” Data analysis found that 5% of younger participants depicted a relational bullying situation. Similarly, it was found that 5% of older participants depicted relational bullying.

**Contextual awareness: Understanding of the bullying situation.** Data analysis indicated that 100% of younger participants drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Fabian) described the following situation: “A kid comes up to the victim and grabbed him, so the victim pushed back. Both the bully and the victim are mad.” Similarly, data analysis revealed that 100% of older participants drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Mya) detailed the following situation: “The victim is washing her hands. They are talking in the bathroom and the bully tells the victim that he is going to shoot her. The bully might have a crush on the victim. He is pointing a finger at the victim and is grinning. The victim is feeling scared and shocked.” It was found that 25% of younger participants relied on situational cues, and that 22% of older participants relied on situational cues to understand what was happening in the bullying situation.
**Contextual awareness: Power imbalance.** Data analysis indicated that 21% of younger participants drew or described themes of power imbalance overall, within their bullying situations. Specifically, data analysis demonstrated that 65% of younger participants drew or described a size difference, where the “bully” character appeared to be larger than the “victim” character. Additionally, it was revealed that 65% of younger participants drew or described an age difference, where the “bully” character was older than the “victim” character. It was revealed that 10% of younger participants drew or described gender as a form of power imbalance. These participants all expressed that the “victim” character was female and that the “bully” character was male. Data analysis discovered that 5% of younger participants drew and described group size differences (depicted by “bully” characters outnumbering “victim” characters) as a form of power imbalance, and 5% of younger participants drew and described intellectual differences as a form of power imbalance. As an indicator of intellectual differences as a form of power imbalance, (Miley) drew and described: “That bully is making fun of the victim because she’s black and thinks she’s dumb.” No other factors related to power imbalance were noted or observed when reviewing drawings completed by younger participants.

Data analysis indicated that 17% of older participants drew or described themes of power imbalance in their drawings of bullying situations. Specifically, it was found that 39% of older participants drew or described size difference as a form of power imbalance. As with younger participants’ depictions of size differences, older participants also tended to draw the “bully” character as being larger in size than the “victim” character. Data analysis revealed 44% of older participants drew or described age difference as a form of power imbalance. It was found that “bully” characters were drawn
or described as being older than “victim” characters. Popularity status as a form of power imbalance was indicated by 11% of older participants. One older participant (Rita) described: “A girl was bullying a boy, while another student was playing basketball. The victim is not wearing athletic clothes and is not good at basketball. The bully is watching and sees that he is not good at basketball. The bully tells the victim that he can’t make a shot. He starts to cry and feel sad. The bully likes the bystander, and wants to feel cool. She is trying to show off and impress the bystander. The victim feels sad and bad because he was bullied by a popular girl.” Data analysis indicated that group size difference as a form of power imbalance was indicated by 5% of older participants. The participant depicted a situation involving “bully” characters outnumber the “victim” character. Additionally, gender as a form of power imbalance was indicated by 17% of older participants. These participants expressed that the “victim” character was female and that the “bully” character was male. No other indicators of power imbalance were noted or observed through analysis of older participants’ drawings.

**Contextual awareness: Bodily awareness.** Various markers of bodily awareness were discovered within the drawings and descriptions completed by female and male participants. Overall, it was found that 12% of younger participants provided indicators of bodily awareness, whereas 14% of older participants provided indicators of bodily awareness in their drawings of bullying situations. Specifically, data analysis illustrated that 10% of younger participants revealed character movement (e.g., “bully” character reaching towards the “victim” character). Similarly, it was found that 11% of older participants also revealed character movement. Data analysis determined that 20% of younger participants drew larger hands on the “bully” character than other characters in
the bullying situation. Similarly, it was found that 22% of older participants also drew larger hands on the “bully” character than other characters involved in the bullying. Data analysis revealed that only 5% of younger participants drew varying body posture on the “victim” characters (i.e., closed body posture). Conversely, it was found that 22% of older participants drew varying body posture on the “bully” and “victim” characters, often drawing the “bully” character as having open body posture and the “victim” character as having closed body posture. Data analysis indicated that 25% of younger participants drew characters without hands, whereas only 11% of older participants drew characters without hands. It was found that that 10% of younger participants omitted other details in their drawings. Specifically, these participants omitted characters’ eyes or pupils. Similarly, it was found that 11% of older participants also omitted details (i.e., eyes or pupils) in their drawing. Data analysis determined that 10% of younger participants drew large hands on both the “bully” and “victim” characters and 10% of younger participants drew the “bully” figure with “claw-like” hands. No younger participants drew large hands on the “victim” character only. Data analysis found that 16% of older participants drew large hands on the “bully” and “victim” characters, 11% of older participants drew large hands on the “victim” character, and only 5% of older participants drew “claw-like” hands on the “bully” figure.

**Contextual awareness: Cause-and-effect outcomes.** It was found that 25% of younger participants revealed determinants of intent in their bullying situations. One younger participant (Phoebe) indicated: “The bully is making fun of the victim’s clothes. Maybe the bully had a bad past so he’s not very respectful.” This likely indicates the “bully” may have experienced modeling of bullying behaviors. It was found that 28% of
older participants revealed determinants of intent in their bullying situations. One participant (Manny) indicated: “The bully pushed down the victim because the victim told the bully’s ex-boyfriend that she was doing stuff with a guy. The bully is feeling good because she pushed the victim down and is feeling good about beating her up for spreading a rumor.” This indicates that the “bully” character engaged in bullying behaviors to seek revenge on the “victim” character. Additionally, data analysis revealed that 10% of younger participants indicated markers of repetition and barriers to intervening. It was found that 5% of younger participants identified markers of consequences, and that 5% of younger participants identified markers of barriers to intervening. Data analysis showed that 5% of older participants indicated markers of repetition and that 16% of older participants identified markers of barriers to intervening. No markers for consequences were found among older participants. It was found that 60% of younger participants did not include a resolution, whereas 40% of participants did draw or describe a resolution. Specifically, one participant (Rex) described that the “bully” continued playing soccer after the bullying occurred. Data analysis determined that 94% of older participants did not include a resolution, whereas only 5% of older participants did draw or describe a resolution to the bullying situation. This participant (Kayla) described that the “victim” character wore her shirt (despite being made fun of), and didn’t care because she was comfortable with what she was wearing.

**Emotional awareness: Emotional attribution.** Data analysis revealed that 100% of younger students attributed emotions to “bully” characters drawn in a bullying situation. It was also found 100% of younger students attributed emotions “victim” characters. It was found that 15% of younger participants attributed emotions to “other”
Younger participants who tended to attribute the following emotions to “bully” characters: mad, angry, happy, smiling, good, and rude. These participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “victim” characters: sad, afraid, scared, upset, bad, and angry. Additionally, these participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “other” characters: happy. Data analysis indicated that 94% of older participants attributed emotions “bully” characters drawn in bullying situations, and 100% of older participants attributed emotions to “victim” characters drawn in bullying situations.

Data analysis also found that 17% of older participants attributed emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystanders,” “adults”) drawn in the bullying situation. Specifically, older participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “bully” characters: bored, amused, sad, mad, happy, angry, funny, cool, and irritated. These participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “victim” characters: sad, scared, embarrassed, lonely, angry, crying, happy, weak, and low. These participants also tended to attribute the following emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystanders,” “teachers”) drawn: happy, guilty, disappointed, and upset. Data analysis determined that 100% of younger participants drew or described an awareness of the emotions experienced in the bullying situation. Specifically, it was found that 100% of participants described the facial expressions of the “bully” and “victim” characters drawn. These participants tended to draw frowns or flat mouths on “victims” who were feeling sad or mad, open mouths on “victims” who were feeling scared or shocked, downward eyebrows on “victims” who were sad, and tears on “victims who were feeling sad. Younger participants tended to draw smiling or open mouths on “bullies” who were either feeling
happy or mad, and frowns on “bullies” who were mad. Additionally, younger participants described their understanding of characters’ emotions. One participant (Gus) described: “One person is carrying stuff to the locker and the other person pushed them causing stuff to fall. The bully feels happy and the victim feels sad. The bully is smiling and thinks it is fun, and the victim is sad because he’s not smiling and is being bullied.”

Data analysis also illustrated that 100% of older participants drew or described an awareness of the emotions experienced in the bullying situation. Specifically, it was found that 94% of older participants described the facial expressions of the “bully” and “victim” characters drawn. These participants tended to draw flat mouths on “victims” who were feeling scared, open mouths and upward facing eyebrows on “victims” who were feeling afraid or weak, frowns and tears on “victims” who were feeling sad, frowning and downward eyebrows on “bullies” who were feeling mad, and smiling or open mouths on “bullies” who were feeling mad or happy. One older participant (Gwen) drew no indicators of facial expression on the characters in the bullying situation.

**Emotional awareness: Understanding of emotions.** Data analysis found that 65% of younger participants relied on emotional cues to understand how and why characters felt a certain way in their drawn bullying situations. Specifically, one participant (Clyde) indicated: “There are two bullies and two victims. The two bullies need new bikes, so they are trying to steal the victims’ bikes and trying to be sneaky, but they got caught so they had to give it back. The two bullies feel happy and the two victims feel sad. I can tell how they’re feeling by looking at their faces, and because they’re either laughing or frowning.” It was also found that 55% of older participants relied on emotional cues to understand the emotions of the characters in the bullying situations. One participant
(Pedro) expressed: “A guy is bullying a girl because she looks funny. She doesn’t have any shoes and doesn’t have a lot of money. The people who are watching feel sad because they don’t want to say anything because they think they’ll get picked on and beaten up. They can’t stop the bullying. The bully feels angry and the victim is feeling sad. He is mad because he doesn’t think the victim should go to school because she is poor. The victim feels sad that people think she is poor. Bystanders feel sad because they can’t stop the bullying. I can tell through looking at their faces. She is crying and the bully has mean eyes.”

**Miscellaneous awareness: Congruence and explicit connection between situation and emotion.** Data analysis found that 100% of younger participants displayed congruence between the situation and the emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Of these participants, it was found that 55% explicitly reported a connection between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Specifically, one participant (Phoebe) indicated: “One boy is making fun of another boy’s clothes because he wants to hurt the victim’s feelings. The victim said that he wanted to kill himself. The victim feels sad because he’s getting bullied.” Similarly, data analysis revealed that 100% of older participants displayed congruence between the situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn. Of these participants, it was found that 66% explicitly described a connection between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn.

There was one younger participant who appeared to experience a disconnection between the emotions described in the situation and the emotions that were drawn on the characters. Specifically, the participant (Dora) drew a situation where the “bully”
character was being mean to the “victim” character. She indicated that both characters “felt sad,” but then drew smiling faces on both of the characters. Additionally, there was one older participant (Gwen) who drew a situation where the characters were feeling angry “because they’re fighting each other.” The participant did not draw any emotion on the faces of the “bully” character and “victim” character. No other instances of disconnection between the emotions described in the bullying situation and the emotions that were drawn on the characters were noted or observed for participants.

**Miscellaneous awareness: Personal connection and fantasy.** Data analysis revealed that 25% of younger participants indicated a personal connection to the bullying situation, whereas 15% of younger participants indicated that the situation was “pretend” or “not real.” Conversely, data analysis revealed that only 5% of older participants indicated a personal connection to the bullying situation. No older participants endorsed that the bullying situation was “pretend.”

Overall, data analysis determined that younger and older participants were equally likely to draw bullying situations displaying empathic understanding toward others. Younger participants appeared to be slightly more able to attribute emotion to all characters drawn in the bullying situation than older participants, who were less able to attribute emotion to “bully” characters than “victim” characters. Regarding power imbalance, younger participants appeared to indicate more elements of size and age difference than older participants. Older participants were more likely to reveal determinants of popularity status and gender imbalance than younger participants. Regarding the type of bullying situation, older participants were slightly more likely to draw instances of verbal bullying, whereas younger participants were more likely to draw
instances of physical bullying. Older participants were slightly more able to indicate markers of bodily awareness in their bullying situations than younger participants. Specifically, older participants were more likely to recognize body posture differences between the “bully” and “victim” characters than younger participants. Younger and older participants were equally likely to recognize a large hand size on the “bully” character, relative to other characters in the bullying situation. Younger participants appeared more likely than older participants to draw situations where characters were missing their hands. Younger and older participants appeared equally likely to draw situations where characters were missing eyes or pupils.

Regarding contextual awareness, younger and older participants were equally likely to have a sense of contextual elements involved in a bullying situation. Specifically, younger and older participants were equally likely to have awareness of both the situation and emotions involved, and were equally likely to display congruence between the situation and emotions experienced by characters drawn in the bullying situation. Older participants were more likely than younger participants to make an explicit connection between characters’ emotions and the bullying situation. Younger participants appeared more likely to identify markers of remorse, repetition, and consequences in bullying situations than older participants. Older participants were more likely to reveal markers of barriers to intervening in bullying situations than younger participants. Older participants were slightly more likely than younger participants to recognize the intent of the “bully” character in the drawn bullying situations. Younger participants were slightly more likely to rely on emotional and situational cues to understand the feelings of characters involved in the bullying situation than older
participants. Therefore, Hypothesis 3 was not supported, given that all participants (regardless of age) were able to describe and understand the context and emotions of all character roles drawn within the bullying situations.

**Research Question 4.** The goal of the fourth qualitative research question was to assess how students’ multiple intelligence type related to empathic content drawn in their DABS measure. Hypothesis 4 predicted that students who possess dominant intelligence types other than verbal/linguistic would display more empathic understanding towards others involved in a bullying situation than students who possess dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence. Multiple intelligences data were only available for 30 participants. Within the sample, 60% of participants identified dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence, 20% of participants that identified dominance in musical intelligence, 7% of participants that identified dominance in interpersonal intelligence, 7% of participants that identified dominance in spatial intelligence, 3% of participants that identified dominance in math/logic, and 3% of participants that identified dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence. No participants endorsed dominance in intrapersonal intelligence. Therefore, six out of seven of the possible multiple intelligence types were represented by the sample. It is important to note that for the remaining participants who were unable to complete the MI Cubed measure, several of these participants were older males and identified as being “bully-victims.”

**Contextual awareness: Type of bullying situation.** In examining the type of bullying situation that was drawn, data analysis found that 72% of participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence drew or described physical bullying situations. One participant (Ace) described the following situation: “Two
students are about to fight. The victim is 12 and the bully is 13. The victim feels scared and the bully feels mad. The victim is scared because he doesn’t have big hands and he is going to get beaten up. The bully has big hands. The victim feels scared because he’s running away. The bully feels mad because he has big hands.” It was revealed that 22% of participants who endorsed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence drew or described verbal bullying situations. Conversely, only 5% of participants of this intelligence type drew or described a relational bullying situation. Participants who possessed dominance in musical intelligence also presented a range of bullying situation types. Specifically, 33% of participants who possessed dominance in musical intelligence drew or described physical bullying situations. There were 50% of participants who indicated dominance in musical intelligence that drew or described verbal bullying situations. One participant (Dora) described the following situation: “The bully and her friend are sitting at their desks. The bully is mean and gets an office referral. She is telling her friend that she is ugly. The friend feels sad because the bully said mean things that she shouldn’t have said. The bully feels sad because she said things she shouldn’t have said.” Conversely, only 17% of participants of this intelligence type drew or described a relational bullying situation.

There were 100% of participants who identified dominance in interpersonal intelligence that drew or described verbal bullying situations. One participant (Pedro) stated: “A guy is bullying a girl because she looks funny. She doesn’t have any shoes and doesn’t have a lot of money. The people who are watching feel sad because they don’t want to say anything because they’ll get picked on and beaten up. They can’t stop the bullying.” Similarly, there were 100% of participants who possessed spatial intelligence
that drew or described verbal bullying situations. There was only one participant who possessed dominance in math/logic intelligence; she (Claire) drew and described a verbal bullying situation: “The bully is mad because he is not as smart as the victim. The victim is sad and he feels that there was no reason for him to be picked on. The bully is calling the victim stupid. The victim is too scared to stand up for himself.” There was only one participant who possessed dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence; she drew and described a physical bullying situation. Specifically, (Zoe) expressed: “There are two boys. The bully stole something from the victim. He is angry that his stuff was stolen and he is ready to fight. The bully denies taking it and is selfish.”

**Contextual awareness: Understanding of the bullying situation.** Data analysis indicated that 100% of participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. Data analysis found that 100% of participants who possessed dominance in interpersonal intelligence drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Lee) indicated: “There are two girls. They used to be friends until the victim said something about the bully online. The bully tells the victim she is ugly, and the victim is crying and scared.” Data analysis revealed that 100% of participants who possessed dominance in spatial intelligence drew or described awareness of the bullying situation. For participants who possessed dominance in musical intelligence, it was found that 100% indicated awareness of the bullying situation. One participant (Miley) expressed: “An older white boy is bullying a younger black girl. He is more powerful, with better grades. He is making fun of her because she’s black and thinks she’s dumb. He is pointing his finger at her and laughing. She is crying and sad, and he is making her lose her temper.” There was one participant
who possessed dominance in math/logic intelligence; she (Claire) indicated awareness of the bullying situation: “The bully is mad because he is not as smart as the victim. The victim is sad and he feels that there was not reason for him to be picked on. He is too scared to stand up for himself.” Additionally, 100% of participants with verbal intelligence indicated awareness of the bullying situation.

**Contextual awareness: Power imbalance.** Data analysis revealed that 23% of participants who indicated dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence drew or described themes of power imbalance overall, within their bullying situations. Specifically, data analysis found that 72% of participants who possessed this intelligence drew or described size difference, where the “bully” character was drawn larger than the “victim” character. Additionally, it was revealed that 67% of participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence drew or described an age difference, where the “bully” character was older than the “victim” character. It was also found that 11% of participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence drew or described gender as a form of power imbalance, where the “bully” character was male and the “victim” character was female. There were no participants of this intelligence type who indicated popularity, group size differences, or intelligence differences as forms of power imbalance.

It was found that 23% of participants who indicated dominance in musical intelligence drew or described themes of power imbalance in their drawn bullying situations. Data analysis determined that there were 33% of participants who identified dominance in musical intelligence that drew or described size difference, where the “bully” character was drawn larger than the “victim” character. Additionally, it was
revealed that 67% of participants who identified this intelligence type indicated an age
difference, where the “bully” character was older than the “victim character, as a form of
power imbalance. It was found that only one 17% of participants who possessed
dominance in musical intelligence drew or described gender differences as a form of
power imbalance, where the “bully” character was male and the “victim” character was
female. Data analysis revealed that 29% of participants who indicated dominance in
interpersonal intelligence drew or described themes of power imbalance in their bullying
situations. Specifically, it was found that 50% of participants indicated a size difference
as a form of power imbalance, where the “bully” character was drawn larger than the
“victim” character. Conversely, it was found that 100% of participants indicated age
differences as a form of power imbalance, where the “bully” character was drawn or
described as being older than the “victim” character. There were 50% of participants who
presented with dominance in interpersonal intelligence that indicated gender differences
as a form of power imbalance. Specifically, this participant drew or described that the
male character was the “bully” and the female character was the “victim” in the bullying
situation. No other indicators of power imbalance were drawn or described in bullying
situations created by participants who possessed dominance in interpersonal intelligence.

It was found that 14% of participants who presented with dominance in spatial
intelligence revealed markers of power imbalance in their drawings of bullying situations.
Data analysis showed that 50% of participants indicated size differences as a form of
power imbalance, and 50% of participants indicated age differences as a form of power
imbalance. In both cases, the “bully” character was either drawn as being larger or older
than the “victim” character. No other markers of power imbalance were indicated by
participants who had dominance in spatial intelligence. There was only one participant (Claire) who had dominance in math/logic intelligence; data analysis illustrated that she only indicated age and gender as forms of power imbalance. Specifically, she drew and described a bullying situation with the “bully” character being drawn larger and older than the “victim” character. Similarly, there was only one participant (Zoe) who identified dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence; data analysis found that she did not draw or describe any markers of power imbalance in her bullying situation.

**Contextual awareness: Bodily awareness.** Various markers of bodily awareness were discovered within the drawings and descriptions completed by participants possessing differing intelligence types. Data analysis revealed that 13% of participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence indicated markers of bodily awareness in their drawings. Specifically, it was found that 11% of participants of this intelligence type drew or described movement (i.e., arms reaching towards the “victim” character,). Similarly, it was found that 11% of participants who endorsed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence drew hands that were larger on the “bully” character than on the “victim” character. Data analysis found that 22% of participants indicated awareness of body posture differences (e.g., “victim” character in a closed or supine position) between the “bully” character and the “victim” character. It was found that 28% of participants did not draw hands on either the “victim” or the “bully” character, whereas only 11% of participants omitted other details in their drawings. Specifically, these participants omitted characters’ eyes or pupils. It was found that 11% of participants drew both the “bully” character and “victim” character as having large hands. It was also found that 11% of participants drew “claw-like” hands on the “bully” or
“victim” characters involved in the bullying situation. Participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence drew no other indicators of bodily awareness.

Data analysis indicated that 8% of participants who had dominance in musical intelligence drew or described markers of bodily awareness in their drawings of bullying situations. Specifically, it was found that 17% of participants drew or described movement (i.e., arms reaching towards the “victim” character), 17% of participants drew larger hands on the “bully” character than on other characters involved in the bullying situation, 17% of participants omitted drawing hands on the “bully” and “victim” characters, and 17% of participants drew large hands on both the “bully” and “victim” characters. No other indicators of bodily awareness were drawn or described by participants who indicated musical intelligence. Data analysis determined that 13% of participants who identified dominance in interpersonal intelligence drew or described markers of bodily awareness in their bullying situations. Specifically, 50% of participants drew hands that were larger on the “bully” character than on the “victim” character, and 50% of participants drew hands that were larger on the “victim” character than on the “bully” character. No other indicators of bodily awareness were drawn or described. It was found that 19% of participants who endorsed dominance in spatial intelligence drew or described indicators of bodily awareness in their bullying situations. Specifically, 50% of participants drew hands that were larger on the “bully” character. Additionally, it was found that 50% of participants drew body posture differences between the “bully” and “victim” characters, and 50% drew large hands on both the “bully” and “victim” characters. No other markers of bodily awareness were drawn or described by
participants who identified dominance of spatial intelligence. There was one participant who endorsed dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence; she drew larger hands on the “victim” character than on the “bully” character. No other markers of bodily awareness were drawn or described by this participant. There were no indicators of bodily awareness drawn or described in the bullying situation by the participant who possessed dominance in math/logic intelligence.

**Contextual awareness: Cause-and-effect outcomes.** There were 11% of participants who presented with dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence that indicated intent, as a marker of contextual awareness in the bullying situation. There were 5% of participants who indicated consequences related to the bullying situation. One participant (Otto) described the following cause-and-effect outcomes: “There are three adolescent males. At the beginning of the story, the bully thought that little kids should be bullied because he was bullied when he was younger. The bully believed it was okay to bully others. A bystander didn’t think it was a good idea to bully the victim. The bully went alone into the locker room and bullied the victim by calling him mean names. The bully then reflected on his behavior, talked to himself, and thought it was not good to bully kids anymore. He apologized to the victim. The bully just felt that way because he had a smile and wanted to be recognized and powerful.” No other markers of contextual awareness were drawn or described by participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence. It was found that 50% of participants who presented with interpersonal intelligence indicated intent as a marker of contextual awareness in the bullying situation. Similarly, it was found that 50% of participants who possessed dominance in interpersonal intelligence revealed barriers to intervening as a marker of
contextual awareness. No other markers of contextual awareness were drawn or described by these participants. It was found that 50% of participants presenting with dominance in spatial intelligence indicated repetition. No other indicators of contextual awareness were drawn or described by participants possessing dominance in spatial intelligence.

Data analysis revealed that 33% of participants who possessed dominance in musical intelligence indicated barriers to intervening as a component of contextual awareness. It was found that 17% of participants indicated repetition, and 17% indicated intent, as it related to contextual awareness. Specifically, (Penny) indicated: “The victim feels scared because she has experienced bullying before. The main bully and friends want to feel cool because that’s just how bullies feel picking on others.” No other markers of contextual awareness were drawn or described by participants who possessed dominance in musical intelligence. The participant with math/logic intelligence (Claire) indicated barriers to intervening as a factor of contextual awareness; no other indicators were drawn or described. The participant with verbal intelligence (Zoe) did not identify any cause-and-effect outcomes in her drawing. Regarding the inclusion of a resolution to the drawn bullying situation, data analysis revealed that all participants possessing dominance in interpersonal intelligence, math/logic intelligence, and verbal intelligence did not provide a resolution to their bullying situation. Similarly, data analysis found that 67% of participants possessing dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence, 67% participants possessing dominance in musical intelligence, and 50% of participants possessing dominance in spatial intelligence also did not provide a resolution to their bullying situation. Conversely, it was found that 28% of participants possessing bodily/kinesthetic intelligence, 33% of participants possessing musical intelligence, and
50% of participants possessing dominance in spatial intelligence drew or described a resolution to the bullying situation.

**Emotional awareness: Emotional attribution.** Data analysis determined that all 30 participants across intelligence types attributed emotions to the “bully” and “victim” characters. Specifically, participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence tended to attribute the following emotions to “bully” characters: happy, smiling, mad, bored, disgusted, and irritated. These participants tended to attribute the following emotions to “victim” characters: sad, upset, scared, embarrassed, and lonely. It was also found that 11% of participants attributed the following emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystanders,” “adults”): happy. Participants who possessed dominance in musical intelligence tended to attribute the following emotions to the “bully” character: cool, powerful, mad, happy, and angry. These participants tended to attribute the following the “victim” character: weak, low, afraid, sad, scared, and upset. It was also found that 17% of participants attributed the following emotions to “other” characters (i.e., “bystanders,” “adults”): happy. Similarly, participants who possessed dominance in interpersonal intelligence tended to attribute the following emotions to the “bully” character: upset and angry. These same participants tended to attribute the following emotions to the “victim” character: sad, crying, and scared. It was found that participants who possessed dominance in spatial intelligence tended to attribute the following emotions to the “bully” character: happy, sad, and mad. These participants also attributed the following emotions to the “victim” character: sadness.

It was found that 50% of participants who possessed dominance in spatial intelligence attributed anger to the “other” characters in the bullying situation. Data
analysis indicated that the participant who possessed dominance in math/logic intelligence attributed feelings of anger to the “bully” character. This participant also attributed feelings of sadness to the “victim” character. Lastly, data analysis revealed that the participant who possessed dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence attributed feelings of selfishness to the “bully” character. This participant also attributed feelings of anger to the “victim” character. Regarding emotional awareness, it was found that all participants tended to describe the facial expressions of the “bully” and “victim” characters. Specifically, participants tended to draw frowns on “victims” who were feeling sad, tears on “victims” who were feeling sad, open mouths on “victims” who were feeling scared, downward facing eyebrows and large eyes on “victims” who were feeling mad, flat mouths on “bullies” who were feeling mad, and smiles on “bullies” who were feeling happy. Additionally, participant’s described their understanding of characters’ emotions. One participant (Dennis) indicated: “A girl is pushing a boy. She feels happy because she is teasing him and he feels scared because he is being teased.”

*Emotional awareness: Understanding of emotions.* Data analysis found that participants tended to rely on emotional cues to understand how and why characters felt a certain way in their drawn bullying situations. Specifically, it was found that 100% of participants who possessed dominance in interpersonal intelligence relied on emotional cues. One participant (Lee) who presented with dominance in interpersonal intelligence indicated: “The bully and victim used to be good friends, until the victim said something about the bully online. The bully says something, and the victim is crying and scared. I can tell through their facial expressions.” For participants who possessed dominance in spatial intelligence, 50% relied on emotional cues. It was found that 67% of participants
who presented with dominance in musical intelligence relied on emotional cues. For participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence, there were 50% of participants who relied on emotional cues. One participant (Gus) indicated: “One person is carrying stuff to a locker and the other person pushed them causing stuff to fall. The bully feels happy and the victim feels sad. I can tell the victim is sad because he’s not smiling and is being bullied. I can tell by looking at the faces.” No other participants or intelligence types utilized emotional cues to understand the emotions experienced by the characters drawn in a given bullying situation.

Miscellaneous awareness: Congruence and explicit connection between situation and emotion. Data analysis determined that several participants indicated themes of congruence between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters. For participants who presented with dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence, it was found that 95% displayed congruence between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters. One participant (Mya) expressed: “The bully and victim are in the bathroom, and tells the victim that he is going to shoot her. The bully might have a crush on the victim. The bully is feeling happy and does not care what he says. The victim is feeling scared and shocked.” It was also found that 44% of these participants who possessed this intelligence type explicitly connected the situation to the characters’ emotions. Specifically, one participant (Gwen) indicated: “There are two girls, and one girl punched the other girl. The other girl said something mean to the victim, so the victim punched her. Both are angry because they are fighting each other. They’re angry because someone punched the other one.” Data analysis found that 100% of participants who possessed dominance in interpersonal intelligence drew or described
congruence between the situation and characters’ emotions. Further, these participants also explicitly connected the situation to the characters’ emotions.

Data analysis revealed that 100% of participants who possessed dominance in interpersonal intelligence drew or described congruence between the situation and the characters’ emotions. Further, these participants also explicitly connected the situation to the characters’ emotions. Data analysis indicated that 100% of participants who possessed dominance in spatial intelligence drew or described congruence between the situation and the characters’ emotions. Specifically, one participant (Bryn) expressed: “A person is deciding to bully and calls the victim stupid, and the victim cries. The bully feels bad at first, because she kept it to herself and started to think what she could do. The bully felt happy because the victim started crying. The victim feels sad because she is crying and because someone mad fun of her.” Additionally, it was found that all participants explicitly connected the situation to the characters’ emotions. For participants who possessed dominance in musical intelligence, it was found that 100% displayed congruence between the situation and characters’ emotions. It was found that only 50% of participants explicitly connected the situation and the characters’ emotions. There was one participant (Penny) who possessed dominance in math/logic intelligence; she indicated congruence between the situation and emotions experienced by characters. She also explicitly connected the bullying situation and the emotions experienced by the characters: “The main bully is bullying the victim at her locker for what she looks like and what she is wearing. The victim has been bullied before, and pushed into a locker. The victim feels scared because she has experienced bullying before. She feels scared because she thinks the bully might do something to her or spread rumors. The main bully
and friends feel cool because that’s just how bullies feel picking on others.” Conversely, the participant who possessed dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence only displayed congruence between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters drawn; she did not explicitly connect the bullying situation and the emotions experienced by the characters.

**Miscellaneous awareness: Personal connection and fantasy.** Data analysis illustrated that 22% of participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence indicated a personal connection to the bullying situation (e.g., drew themselves as a character in the situation). It was found that 17% of participants who possessed dominance in musical intelligence also indicated a personal connection to the bullying situation. Data analysis showed that 11% of participants who possessed dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence, as well as 50% of participants who possessed dominance in spatial intelligence indicated that the bullying situation was “pretend” or “not real.”

Overall, data analysis indicated that participants possessing dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence were equally likely to display empathic understanding and recognize varying facial expressions of the characters involved the drawn bullying situations, compared to participants possessing dominance in other intelligence types. Specifically, participants endorsing verbal/linguistic intelligence were just as able to attribute emotions to “victim” and “bully” characters drawn in a bullying situation. However, there were some differences among participants based on their intelligence type. Regarding power imbalance, participants possessing dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence did not reveal any determinants of power imbalance in their drawings,
whereas participants of other intelligence types did. Specifically, participants presenting with dominance in either verbal bodily/kinesthetic or math/logic intelligence were most likely to reveal elements of size and age difference as a determinant of power imbalance. Participants possessing dominance in interpersonal intelligence were also likely to reveal elements of an age difference as a marker of power imbalance, as compared to other participants of differing intelligence types.

Regarding the type of bullying situation, participants identifying dominance in either verbal/linguistic or bodily/kinesthetic intelligence were most likely to draw instances of physical bullying situations. Participants possessing dominance in either math/logical, interpersonal, or spatial intelligence were most likely to draw instances of verbal bullying situations. Participants endorsing dominance in musical intelligence were most likely to draw instances of relational bullying situations. Regarding bodily awareness, participants identifying with either dominance in interpersonal intelligence or spatial intelligence were most likely to recognize a large hand size on the “bully” character, relative to participants possessing other intelligence types. Participants presenting with dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence or spatial intelligence were most likely to recognize body posture differences between the “bully” and “victim” characters. Participants possessing dominance in bodily/kinesthetic or musical intelligence were most likely to omit details in their drawings (i.e., hands, eyes), relative to participants presenting with other intelligence types. Participants identifying with dominance in verbal intelligence were most likely to recognize large hands on the “victim” character only, in the bullying situation.
Regarding contextual awareness, participants possessing dominance in interpersonal, logical, or spatial intelligence were most likely to have a sense of contextual elements involved in a bullying situation. However, all participants were equally likely to understand the bullying situation and the emotions experienced by characters. Participants presenting with dominance in verbal intelligence appeared least able to make explicit connections between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters involved in the bullying situation. Participants possessing dominance in interpersonal intelligence were most able to express intent of the “bully” character. Regarding reliance on cues to understand the bullying situation, participants presenting with dominance in interpersonal intelligence were most likely to rely on emotional cues, whereas participants with dominance in math/logical intelligence were most likely to rely on situational cues. Conversely, participants possessing dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence were least likely to utilize any cues to understand the bullying situation. Ultimately, Hypothesis four was not supported, given that all participants (regardless of intelligence type) were able to describe and understand the context and emotions, of all character roles drawn within the bullying situations.

**Mixed Methods Analysis**

Following both quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, the data were connected in order to compare and contrast the findings. Additionally, data were connected to examine the relationships among bully/victim status, empathy (as endorsed by quantitative and qualitative approaches), and multiple intelligences. Data were integrated for 30 participants who completed all quantitative and qualitative measures, utilizing a triangulation protocol (Farmer, Robinson, Elliott, & Eyles, 2006).
quantitative and qualitative analyses were combined in MAXQDA, in order to examine the relationships among the variables. In accordance with utilizing a triangulation protocol, all of the results from each component of the study were listed in a matrix in order to look for convergent, complementary, or discrepant findings (Farmer, Robinson, Elliott, & Eyles, 2006). Additionally meta-themes across all of the findings were generated after careful comparison of quantitative and qualitative results. Through this process two meta-themes emerged across the quantitative and qualitative measures, along with complementary and discrepant findings between the quantitative and qualitative measures. These findings are described below:

**Cognitive Empathy.** The first meta-theme that emerged was cognitive empathy. Research has found that cognitive empathy refers to the intellectual understanding and recognition of another’s mental or emotional state, often through perspective taking (i.e., “I understand what you feel;” Batson, 2009; Blair, 2005; Henry, Bailey, & Rendell, 2008; Shamay-Tsoory, Aharon-Peretz, & Perry, 2009; Wlodarski, 2015). In his development of the IRI, Davis (1980) viewed empathy as a set of distinct, but related constructs (i.e., cognitive, affective). Two of the subscales on the IRI attempted to measure this cognitive dimension of empathy; Perspective Taking and Fantasy (Davis, 1983). Specifically, these subscales were intended to measure a person’s awareness of different types of situations that would result in the experiencing of emotions in response to the emotions felt by others (Davis, 1983). Therefore, for this study, cognitive empathy was defined as a participant’s awareness or understanding of different types of situations that would result in the experiencing of emotions, as well as a participant’s awareness of another’s emotional state. Cognitive empathy was found across measures utilized; it was found in
both the IRI and the DABS. Specifically, consistent with previous research, the two subscales that measured cognitive empathy within the IRI were Perspective Taking and Fantasy. Within the DABS, cognitive empathy was found through themes of contextual awareness (e.g., understanding of the bullying situation, depictions of power imbalance, depictions of cause-and-effect outcomes), as well as emotional awareness (e.g., understanding of the emotions experienced by characters in the bullying situation).

**Affective Empathy.** The second meta-theme that emerged was affective empathy. Batson (2009) has found that affective empathy refers to the elicitation of a congruent emotional by an observer, in response to another person’s emotional experiences (i.e., “I feel what you feel”). Davis (1980) considered affective empathy to be the vicarious participation in another person’s emotions. In his development of the IRI, Davis (1980) considered Empathic Concern and Personal Distress to be factors related to affective empathy. Specifically, these subscales were intended to measure a person’s emotional reactions and sharing of emotional states of another person (Davis, 1983). Therefore, for this study, affective empathy was defined as the alignment of a participant’s emotions with another’s emotional state in response to distressing situations. Affective empathy was found across measures utilized; it was found in both the IRI and the DABS. Specifically, consistent with previous research, the two subscales that measured affective empathy within the IRI were Empathic Concern and Personal Distress. Within the DABS, affective empathy was found if participants took on the role of one of the characters drawn in the bullying situation. It was determined that a participant’s projection of the emotions onto the character drawn was congruent with his
or her own actual emotions, given that the participant overtly identified with that character.

**Research Question 1.** The goal of the first research question was to determine how participants’ bully/victim status related to their scores on the IRI, in conjunction with their empathy-based drawings and multiple intelligence type, to contribute to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of empathy. It was hypothesized that participants who identified as “bully-victims” and “bullies” would display more empathic understanding of others when their IRI scores are considered in conjunction with the empathy shown in their drawings, then when their IRI scores were considered independently, particularly for students who have intelligence types that support the application of a non-verbal, projective assessment. For the purposes of mixing the data and for data analysis, students’ empathy scores on the IRI were assigned into one of three categories: high, moderate, and low. These categories were based on participants’ individual subscale scores across the IRI, and whether a participant’s scores deviated from the means generated for “bullies,” “bully-victims,” or “non-bullies” (depending on what role the participant identified).

Given that all scales on the IRI were positively correlated, all scores contained the same meaning. Specifically, a higher score on one subscale mean the same as a higher score on another subscale; higher scores were indicative of “more” of a given empathic trait. Therefore, participants were categorized as having low empathy if they had scores that were one standard deviation below their identified group’s mean, and were categorized as having high empathy if they had scores that were one standard deviation above their identified group’s mean. If participants had scores that fell within one
standard deviation, either below or above their identified group’s mean, then they were categorized as having moderate empathy. This process was conducted, so that both cognitive and affective empathy scores could be categorized. The categorizing of these data paralleled results found in the quantitative analysis. For the purposes of mixing the data and for data analysis, students’ drawings were dichotomously categorized as either containing elements of cognitive empathy and affective empathy. In categorizing participants’ responses on the quantitative and qualitative measures, three types of findings emerged: convergent, complimentary, and divergent.

**Convergent findings:** Data analysis revealed that 60% of participants consistently displayed cognitive and affective empathy on the IRI and in their drawings. Specifically, it was found that these participants had medium or high cognitive and affective scores on the IRI, and also indicated cognitive and affective elements within their drawings. Of these participants, 50% of participants identified as a “bully-victim,” 22% of participants identified as a “bully,” and 27% of participants identified as a “non-bully.” Several of these participants indicated having dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence. While specific cognitive and affective items did not appear to coincide with participants’ drawings, themes of perspective taking and empathic concern were observed. Specifically, participants were able to describe the perspectives of both the “bully” and “victim” characters in the bullying situations they drew, as well as describe the emotions experienced by those characters. Additionally, participants were able to describe their own feelings in response to the bullying situation, through the identification of a character role.
**Complementary findings.** Data analysis found that out of the 60% of participants who consistently displayed cognitive and affective empathy on the IRI and in their drawings, participants who identified as “bully-victims” tended to empathize with the “victim” character in their drawings more often than participants who identified with another bullying role. Specifically, participants who identified as “bully-victims” had higher affective empathy scores (empathic concern and personal distress) on the IRI, as compared to participants who identified as “bullies” or “non-bullies.” Data analysis revealed that 54% of “bully-victim” participants identified and associated feelings as the “victim” character in their drawing, and therefore displayed affective empathy towards the “victim” of the bullying situation. Whereas, only 18% of “bully” participants and 27% of “non-bully” participants identified and associated feelings as the “victim” character in their drawing. Nearly all of these participants endorsed bodily/kinesthetic, musical, spatial, or interpersonal intelligence.

**Divergent findings.** Quantitative data analysis revealed that participants who identified as “bullies” or “bully-victims” had lower cognitive empathy scores than “non-bullies,” particularly with perspective taking. Categorizing participants’ scores for the purposes of mixing and integrating the data showed a similar finding; specifically, participants who identified as a “bully” or a “victim” had low cognitive or affective empathy scores, as compared to participants who identified as a “non-bully.” While these participants appeared to have low cognitive or affective empathy as indicated by their scores on the IRI, data analysis revealed that 40% of participants actually displayed cognitive and/or affective empathy markers in their drawings. Therefore, there was incongruence among 40% of participants, between their IRI scores and their drawings of
bullying situations. Further analysis found incongruence for 33% of participants who identified as a “bully-victim,” for 29% of participants who identified as a “bully,” and for 38% of participants who identified as a “non-bully.” All of these participants drew markers of cognitive and/or affective empathy in their bullying situations, despite having “low” cognitive or affective scores on the IRI. Furthermore, all of the participants impacted by the incongruent findings presented with dominance in non-verbal intelligence types (i.e., bodily/kinesthetic, spatial, musical, math/logic). These results suggest that when participants were given the opportunity to display their cognitive and affective empathic understanding utilizing a modality that aligned with their intelligence type, they were more likely to reveal markers of empathy than through quantitative measurement. Therefore, the hypothesis that participants who identified as “bully-victims” and “bullies” would display more empathic understanding of others when their IRI scores were considered in conjunction with the empathy shown in their drawings, then when their IRI scores were considered independently, particularly for students with intelligence types that support the application of a non-verbal assessment was supported.
CHAPTER 5: QUANTITATIVE, QUALITATIVE, AND MIXED METHODS DISCUSSION

This study is one of the first mixed-methods investigations of the relationships among bullying, empathy, and multiple intelligences. Previous studies have shown that children who bully others lack empathy; however, these studies have only relied on the use of quantitative, self-report data. The purpose of this study was to expand the literature on bullying and empathy, by exploring the impact of an alternative, projective and non-verbal assessment of empathy among children involved in bullying, in conjunction with a quantitative assessment of empathy. Given that drawings have been found to reveal insight into children’s emotions, this study sought to examine participants’ drawings to determine whether youth express their understanding of bullying and reveal their empathic understanding towards others involved in bullying situations in unique ways that are not captured by quantitative measures. Additionally, this study aimed to explore the connection between multiple intelligence types and participants’ ability to draw empathy, given that drawings offer children who may not possess verbal strengths (i.e., bodily/kinesthetic, visual/spatial) a unique modality to express their thoughts and feelings.

Quantitative research questions examined how students’ bully/victim status related to their scores on the IRI, how participants’ gender identity related to their scores on the IRI, and how participants’ age impacted their scores on the IRI. Qualitative questions examined how students’ bully/victim status related to their empathic content in their DABS how students’ gender related to their empathic content drawn on the DABS, how students’ age related to their empathic content drawn on the DABS, and how
students’ age related to their ability to draw empathic content on the DABS. The data were integrated, in a mixed methods analysis in order to determine how participants’ bully/victim status related to their scores on the IRI, in conjunction with their empathy-based drawings and multiple intelligence type in order to contribute to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of empathy and bullying. Ultimately, the results of the study found evidence that drawings can provide students with an opportunity to demonstrate their cognitive and affective empathic understanding of others involved in a bullying situation, by shedding light on nuanced information that was likely being missed on the quantitative measure. In this chapter, the results of each hypothesis and their implications for research are discussed. Additionally, study limitations and directions for future research are reported.

**Quantitative Discussion**

The present study utilized a combination of ANOVAs and independent t-tests to examine mean differences between students involved in bullying.

**Research Question 1.** The goal of the first research question was to assess how children’s bully/victim status related to their scores on the four scales of the IRI: Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress. It was hypothesized that participants who identified as “bullies” or “bully-victims” would have lower Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress than participants who identified as “non-bullies (i.e., “victims,” “bystanders,” “uninvolved”). Contrary to what previous research has found, participants’ bully/victim status did not appear to impact differences in scores on Perspective Taking or Fantasy. It was found that bully/victim status significantly impacted differences in scores on Personal Distress.
Specifically, these differences were between participants who identified as “bullies” and “bully-victims.” These findings, albeit significant, were unexpected given that previous research (Gianluca, Paolo, Beatrice, & Gianmarco, 2007; Warden & Mackinnon, 2003) has only supported empathic differences between “bullies” and “non-bullies.” Research has found that personal distress may elicit feelings of arousal within an observer of a bullying situation, and that “bully-victims” tend to be most susceptible to high levels of arousal as compared to “bullies” (Woods & White, 2005). This may be related to why participants identifying as “bully-victims” had elevated Personal Distress scores, as compared to participants identifying as “bullies.”

While statistical findings offer valuable information regarding this study’s outcomes, it is also important to consider the potential clinical importance of differences that emerged among participants’ bully/victim status and their empathy scores that were not statistically significant. Specifically, participants who identified as “non-bullies” were higher in Perspective Taking than participants who identified as either “bullies” or “bully-victims.” Participants who identified as “bullies” had higher Fantasy scores than participants who identified as either “bully-victims” or “non-bullies.” Lastly, participants who identified as “bully-victims” had higher Empathic Concern scores than participants who identified as “bullies” or “non-bullies.” These findings, while not significant, were also unexpected given that previous research has supported that “bullies” endorse low empathy. It is unclear why participants who identified as “bullies” and “bully-victims” endorsed statistically significant differences on the IRI. However, one possible explanation is related to theory of mind. Researchers have found that some children who engage in bullying behaviors have high theory of mind skills (Miller, 2012; Sutton,
Smith, & Swettenham, 1999), thus making them socially skilled and able to exploit or manipulate their victims. Specifically, Sutton, Smith, and Swettenham (1999) indicated that some children who engage in bullying behaviors understand others and use this understanding for their own social gains. The connection between theory of mind and empathy is less clear; however, it is possible that participants who identified as “bullies” or “bully-victims” may have been so socially adept, that they responded to empathy items from a theory of mind, manipulative framework. Understanding the adeptness of participants’ social skills and behavioral motives is beyond the scope of this study; however, future research could focus on understanding the connection between empathy and theory of mind to understand the interplay between affective and cognitive functioning underlying bullying behaviors.

**Research Question 2.** The goal of the second research question was to assess how participants’ gender related to their scores on the four scales of the IRI: Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress. It was hypothesized that female participants would have higher Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress than male participants. It was found that gender significantly impacted differences in scores on Perspective Taking. Specifically, it was found that female participants had higher Perspective Taking scores than male participants. While not statistically significant, female participants had higher Fantasy scores than male participants. However, contrary to hypotheses within this research question, gender did not appear to impact meaningful differences on Empathic Concern, or Personal Distress subscales. Furthermore, results contraindicated previous research regarding the impact of gender on empathy (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Pozzili & Gini, 2010; Warden &
Mackinnon, 2003). In this study, it was found that male and female participants had similar scores on Empathic Concern, and that male participants had higher Personal Distress scores than female participants. These findings, while not significant, were unexpected given that previous research has found that females endorse higher empathy than males. It is unclear why female participants scored the same on Empathic Concern as males, as well as why female participants had lower scores on Personal Distress than male participants. One study found that gender was only related to components of cognitive empathy, not of affective or emotional empathy (Schwenck, Gohle, Hauf, Warnke, Freitag, & Schneider, 2014). Given that Empathic Concern and Personal Distress are the two factors that make up affective empathy it could be that by not assessing cognitive and emotional empathy, the gender effect found in previous research was attenuated. Therefore, it is possible that the IRI confirmed this finding, in that males and females do no differ in their affective empathy.

**Research Question 3.** The goal of the third research question was to assess how participants’ age related to their scores on the four scales of the IRI: Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress. It was hypothesized that older participants (e.g., students in middle school and high school) would have higher Perspective Taking, Fantasy, Empathic Concern, and Personal Distress than younger participants (e.g., students in elementary school). Contrary to this hypothesis, age did not appear to have any meaningful effect on participants’ empathy scores on any of the subscales within the IRI. It is important to note that while not statistically significant, younger participants consistently had slightly higher scores across empathy subscales than older participants, which contraindicate findings from previous research suggesting
that empathy increases with age (Davis & Franzoi, 1991). These findings are of clinical value, and support what previous research has found regarding age differences and empathy. There are a variety of possible reasons why younger and older participants did not yield statistically different scores across empathy subscales on the IRI. Some research has found that females’ empathy stabilizes throughout adolescence, whereas males’ empathy decreases throughout adolescence (Endresen & Olweus, 2001; Graaff, Branje, Wied, Hawk, & Lier, 2014). Other research has found that age has only been related to components of cognitive empathy, not affective nor emotional empathy (Schwenck et al., 2014). There have also been mixed findings suggesting that there are only age-related increases in empathy throughout students’ elementary school years (Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2006; Lennon & Eisenberg, 1987). Other research has found age-related increases in empathy across childhood and adolescence (Eisenberg & Fabes, 1998; Eisenberg & Spinrad, 2006). Given the mixed results in previous research on age and empathy, age-related increases in empathy are not a consistent finding and could serve as an explanation for why this study did not detect age differences in empathy.

**Qualitative Discussion**

The present study utilized thematic analysis and constant comparison analysis to inductively and openly code drawings, so that coding and theme development was driven by the content of the data in order to identify patterned meaning across drawings.

**Research Question 1.** The goal of the first qualitative research was to assess how students’ bully/victim status related to empathic content drawn in their DABS measure. Consistent with what previous research has supported regarding bully/victim status and empathy, it was hypothesized that students who identified as “non-bullies” (i.e.,
“victims,” “bystanders,” “uninvolved”) would be more likely to draw bullying situations displaying empathic understanding toward others, compared to “bullies” or “bully-victims.” Overall, data analysis showed that participants who identified as “non-bullies,” “bullies,” and “bully-victims” were equally likely to draw bullying situations focused on the role of the “victim” or “bully” character, and were equally likely to display empathic understanding towards “victim” and “bully” characters. Participants who identified as “bully-victims” and “non-bullies” were more likely to attribute emotion to all characters drawn in the bullying situation than participants who identified as “bullies.” Regarding power imbalance, participants who identified as “bullies” were most likely to indicate elements of size difference, “bully-victims” were most likely to indicate elements of age difference, and “non-bullies” were most likely to indicate elements of gender differences, relative to participants identifying other roles. Regarding bodily-awareness, participants who indicated that they were “bullies” were more likely to recognize body posture differences across characters drawn in the bullying situation. Additionally, participants who indicated that they were “non-bullies” were more likely to recognize large hand size on “bully” characters, whereas participants who indicated that they were “bully-victims” were more likely to draw large hands on all of the characters drawn. Participants who endorsed a “bully-victim” role were most likely to have greater contextual awareness, and make explicit connections between characters’ emotions and the bullying situation, relative to participants who endorsed other roles. Additionally, participants who identified as “bully-victims” were more likely than other participants to utilize emotional and situational cues to describe their understanding of characters’ feelings related to the bullying situation drawn. Therefore, contrary to this hypothesis, all participants
(regardless of their bully/victim role) were able to describe and understand the context and emotions of all character roles drawn within the bullying situations, as well as display empathic understanding towards the characters draw within the bullying situations. There are a variety of reasons why drawings offered participants with differing bully/victim statuses equal opportunity to display empathy in their drawings. Art-based assessments have been shown to offer an uncensored view of children’s thoughts and feelings and a non-intimidating means of assessment in which all children are likely to participate (Peterson & Hardin, 1997; White, Wallace, & Huffman, 2004).

**Research Question 2.** The goal of the second qualitative research was to assess how students’ gender related to empathic content drawn in their DABS measure. It was hypothesized that female participants would be more likely to draw situations that display empathic understanding towards others involved in bullying than male participants. Data analysis revealed that female and male participants were equally likely to draw bullying situations displaying empathic understanding toward others. However, some gender differences emerged. Specifically, male participants were more able to attribute emotion to all characters drawn in the bullying situation than female participants. Regarding power imbalance, male participants appeared to indicate more elements of size and age difference than female participants. Conversely, female participants were more likely to reveal determinants of gender imbalance than male participants. Females and males were equally likely to indicate markers of bodily awareness in their bullying situations. Specifically, females and males were equally likely to recognize a large hand size on the “bully” character, relative to other characters in the bullying situation. Female and male
were also equally likely to recognize body posture differences between the “bully” and “victim” characters drawn.

Both females and males were equally likely to omit characters’ features in their drawings, but tended to omit different features. Specifically, females appeared more likely than males to draw situations where characters were missing eyes or pupils, whereas males appeared more likely to draw situations where characters were missing their hands. Regarding contextual awareness, female and male participants were equally likely to have a sense of contextual elements involved in a bullying situation. Specifically, female and male participants were equally likely to have awareness of both the situation and emotions involved, and were equally likely to display congruence between the situation and emotions experienced by characters drawn in the bullying situation. Female participants were more likely than male participants to make an explicit connection between characters’ emotions and the bullying situation. Conversely, male participants were more likely than female participants to utilize cues, both emotional and situational, to describe their understanding of the characters’ feelings in the bullying situation. Therefore, contrary to this hypothesis, all participants (regardless of gender) were able to describe and understand the context and emotions of all character roles drawn within the bullying situations, and display empathic understanding in their drawings of bullying situations. This may be due to research that has supported the use of art-based assessments because they offer an uncensored view of children’s thoughts and feelings, regardless of gender (Peterson & Hardin, 1997; White, Wallace, & Huffman, 2004). It should be noted that individual differences in fine motor skills have been found. Specifically, research has found that gender differences exist in fine motor skills
(Halpern, 2000), favoring females (Cherney, Seiwert, Dickey, & Flichtbeil, 2006); however, this finding did not appear to impact participants’ abilities to draw their understanding and empathic awareness of bullying situations.

**Research Question 3.** The goal of the third qualitative research question was to assess how students’ age related to empathic content drawn in their DABS measure. It was hypothesized that older students would be more likely to draw situations that display empathic understanding towards others involved in bullying than younger students. It was found that younger and older participants were equally likely to draw bullying situations displaying empathic understanding toward others involved in bullying situations. There were some age-related differences that emerged. Specifically, younger participants appeared to be more likely to attribute emotion to all characters drawn in the bullying situation than older participants. Furthermore, younger participants appeared to indicate more elements of size and age difference than older participants, as it related to power imbalance. Conversely, older participants were more likely to indicate popularity status and gender imbalance than younger participants. Older participants were slightly more able to indicate markers of bodily awareness in their bullying situations than younger participants. Specifically, older participants were more likely to recognize body posture differences between the “bully” and “victim” characters than younger participants. However, younger and older participants were equally likely to recognize a large hand size on the “bully” character, relative to other characters in the bullying situation. Both younger and older participants omitted details of characters involved in the bullying. Specifically, younger participants appeared slightly more likely than older participants to draw situations where characters were missing their hands.
Younger and older participants appeared equally likely to draw situations where characters were missing eyes or pupils. Regarding contextual awareness, younger and older participants were equally likely to have a sense of contextual elements involved in a bullying situation. Specifically, younger and older participants were equally likely to have awareness of both the situation and emotions involved, and were equally likely to display congruence between the situation and emotions experienced by characters drawn in the bullying situation. Older participants were more likely than younger participants to make an explicit connection between characters’ emotions and the bullying situation. Therefore, this hypothesis was not supported, given that all participants (regardless of age) were able to describe and understand the context and emotions of all character roles drawn within the bullying situations, as well as display empathic awareness of characters involved in the bullying. While nuanced differences emerged through analysis of female and male participants’ drawings, all participants tended to equally display empathic understanding. Research has suggested that drawing is a natural mode of expression for children age five to 11 (Cummings, 1986). Additionally, research has found that art-based assessments tend to offer students a nonverbal method of assessment for children who may still be developing language skills or who are unwilling to verbalize their feelings and emotions (Arrington, 2001; White, Wallace, & Huffman, 2004). This likely accounted for all participants, regardless of their age, having the opportunity to display their understanding and empathic awareness of others involved in bullying situations.

**Research Question 4.** The goal of the fourth qualitative research question was to assess how students’ multiple intelligence type related to empathic content drawn in their DABS-measure. It was hypothesized that students who possessed dominant intelligence
types other than verbal/linguistic would display more empathic understanding towards others involved in a bullying situation than students who possess dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence. Data analysis indicated that participants possessing dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence were equally likely to display empathic understanding and recognize varying facial expressions of the characters involved the drawn bullying situations, compared to participants possessing dominance in other intelligence types. Specifically, participants endorsing verbal/linguistic intelligence were just as able to attribute emotions to “victim” and “bully” characters drawn in a bullying situation as other participants. However, differences emerged among participants based on their intelligence type.

Regarding power imbalance, participants possessing dominance in verbal/linguistic intelligence did not reveal any determinants of power imbalance in their drawings, whereas participants of other intelligence types did. Specifically, participants with dominance in either verbal bodily/kinesthetic or math/logic intelligence were more likely to reveal elements of size and age difference as a determinant of power imbalance, as compared to participants with dominance in most other intelligence types. Similarly, participants possessing dominance in interpersonal intelligence were also likely to reveal elements of age difference as a marker of power imbalance. Regarding bodily awareness, participants identifying with either dominance in interpersonal intelligence or spatial intelligence were most likely to recognize a large hand size on the “bully” character, relative to participants possessing other intelligence types. Participants with dominance in bodily/kinesthetic intelligence or spatial intelligence were most likely to recognize body posture differences between the “bully” and “victim” characters. Data analysis found that
participants possessing dominance in bodily/kinesthetic or musical intelligence were most likely to omit details in their drawings (i.e., hands, eyes), relative to participants presenting with other intelligence types. Participants possessing dominance in verbal intelligence were most likely to recognize large hands on the “victim” character only, in the bullying situation. Regarding contextual awareness, participants possessing dominance in interpersonal, logical, or spatial intelligence were most likely to have a sense of contextual elements involved in a bullying situation, relative to participants with dominance in other intelligences. However, all participants were equally likely to understand the bullying situation and the emotions experienced by characters. Participants presenting with dominance in verbal intelligence appeared least able to make explicit connections between the bullying situation and emotions experienced by the characters involved in the bullying situation.

Ultimately, this hypothesis was not supported, given that all participants (regardless of intelligence type) were able to describe and understand the context and emotions of all character roles drawn within the bullying situations, and display empathic understanding of the characters drawn in the bullying situation. Research has supported that drawing is a non-verbal language and means of communication (Cummings, 1986). Art-based assessments tend to offer students a nonverbal method of assessment for children who may be unwilling or unable to verbalize their feelings and emotions (Arrington, 2001; White, Wallace, & Huffman, 2004). This could have accounted for all participants, regardless of their intelligence type, having the opportunity to display their understanding and empathic awareness of characters involved in their drawings of bullying situations.
Mixed Methods Discussion

The present study utilized a triangulation protocol to integrate quantitative and qualitative findings to look for meta-themes, as well as for convergent, complementary, and divergent patterns in order to support, clarify, and expand on the findings from both phases of research.

Research Question 1. The goal of the first research question was to determine how participants’ bully/victim status related to their scores on the IRI, in conjunction with their empathy-based drawings and multiple intelligence type, to contribute to a more comprehensive and nuanced understanding of empathy. It was hypothesized that participants who identify as “bully-victims” and “bullies” would display more empathic understanding of others when their IRI scores were considered in conjunction with the empathy shown in their drawings, then when their IRI scores were considered independently, particularly for students who have intelligence types that support the application of a non-verbal, projective assessment. Data analysis discovered two meta-themes: cognitive and affective empathy. Cognitive empathy was found across measures utilized; it was found in both the IRI and the DABS. Specifically, consistent with previous research, the two subscales that measured cognitive empathy within the IRI were Perspective Taking and Fantasy. Within the DABS, cognitive empathy was found through themes of contextual awareness (e.g., understanding of the bullying situation, depictions of power imbalance, depictions of cause-and-effect outcomes), as well as emotional awareness (e.g., understanding of the emotions experienced by characters in the bullying situation). Affective empathy was found across measures utilized; it was found in both the IRI and the DABS. Specifically, consistent with previous research, the
two subscales that measured affective empathy within the IRI were *Empathic Concern* and *Personal Distress*. Within the DABS, affective empathy was found if participants took on the role of one of the characters drawn in the bullying situation. It was determined that a participant’s projection of the emotions onto the character drawn was congruent with his or her own actual emotions, given that the participant overtly identified with that character.

Data analysis found that most participants’ responses on the IRI were congruent with their responses on the DABS; specifically, if participants endorsed moderate or high cognitive and/or affective empathy scores on the IRI, then they were also likely to display cognitive and/or affective empathy in their drawings. Thus, convergence between these modalities of measuring empathy was found. Data analysis also showed that students’ drawings tended to clarify participants’ responses on the IRI, particularly for “bully-victims” and their affective empathy scores. It was found that participants identifying as “bully-victims” endorsed higher affective empathy scores than participants identifying as “bullies” or “non-bullies.” Through analysis of these participants’ drawings, it was found that “bully-victims” tended to display affective empathy towards “victim” characters drawn in bullying situations. Specifically, these participants tended to align with the emotions experienced by the “victim” role in the drawing. This particular finding would not have been yielded with just utilizing one modality of assessing empathy over the other. Results from the IRI indicated that “bully-victims” had higher affective empathy scores than other participants, and results from the drawings shed light on participants’ patterns of affective empathy; these findings therefore complement each other. Data analysis also revealed an important divergent finding. Specifically, it was found that
several participants’ empathy scores were incongruent with their drawings. Furthermore, there were several participants who had low cognitive or affective empathy scores on the IRI who tended to reveal more empathy in their drawings. Of these participants, several identified as “bullies” or “bully-victims,” and possessed dominance in an intelligence type other than verbal/linguistic. Therefore, the IRI was attributing lower empathy to “bullies” and “bully-victims” when their drawings actually indicated cognitive and affective empathic markers. The hypothesis that drawings, in conjunction with IRI scores would allow “bully-victims” and “bullies” possessing dominance in non-verbal intelligence types to display more empathic understanding of others was supported.

Implications for Bullying Research, Clinical Applicability, and Intervention Efforts

Bullying research. The overall findings from this study indicate that the utilization of an alternative modality of assessing empathy can reveal valuable information regarding empathic traits of school-aged children involved in bullying situations. Furthermore, the results of this study show that it is possible to generate convergence in findings, related to cognitive and affective empathy across quantitative and qualitative measures, thus supporting the application of both measures. Findings also demonstrated that strict reliance on a quantitative, self-report measure of empathy has the potential to mask important nuances between bullying roles and empathy. Specifically, previous research has consistently shown that children who bully lack empathy (Bullock, 2002; Gini et al., 2007); this study revealed findings that contraindicated previous literature on bullying and empathy. While this study was an exploratory mixed methods design, results suggest that it is possible to refine and expand what is already known about bullying and empathy through supplementing quantitative methodology with
Additionally, the results of this study indicated that students possess dominance across different intelligence types. Students who possessed bodily/kinesthetic and spatial intelligence were more likely to express their understanding of bullying and empathy when presented with a qualitative, non-verbal measure as opposed to a quantitative, verbal measure. Researchers should recognize that students possess a broader range of talents and skills that could be overlooked if too much emphasis is placed on the use of verbal intelligence (Brualdi, 1996). Utilization of alternative assessments can potentially help students demonstrate a deeper understanding (Brualdi, 1996) and connection with the information they are presented.

It is recommended that researchers studying bullying and/or empathy attempt to integrate alternative, non-verbal assessments (i.e., projectives) to supplement quantitative measures to help inform and expand their understanding of various constructs. The current study utilized drawings as an alternative, non-quantitative mechanism, to assess students’ thoughts and feelings related to bullying and empathy. In addition to the utilization of drawings, behavioral assessments (i.e., interviews, observations) may also serve as useful modalities for assessing bullying and empathy. These assessment procedures have been found to be useful in assessing students with suspected emotional or behavioral problems (Cheramie, Griffin, & Morgan, 2000; Eckert, Hintze, & Shapiro, 1997). Alternatively, projective techniques have also been found to reflect students’ unconscious drives or feelings, as well as offer opportunities for students to “project” their own problems, motives, and wishes onto ambiguous tasks (Butcher, Mineka, & Hooley, 2007). In considering multiple intelligences, researchers should also consider how the utilization of alternative measures may help accommodate students’ varying
learning styles and strengths, thus allowing students to perform or respond to assessments most effectively. Researchers have suggested that consideration of multiple intelligences in assessment can help provide more authentic assessment, in that students can demonstrate the depth of their understanding, make connections to real-life experiences, and apply their knowledge to new situations (Brualdi, 1996). Despite there being potential barriers of practicality or feasibility in administering multiple assessments in order to collect data, information gleaned from utilizing these methods may generate invaluable information that could expand or even shift beliefs and understanding about affective and cognitive constructs underlying bullying that have been well-established.

**Clinical applicability.** Children’s drawings can serve as a useful modality to assess children’s thoughts, feelings, as well as their empathic traits towards others involved in bullying situations. Specifically, drawings can allow children to identify factors that are important or emotionally significant to them (Thomas & Silk, 1990), and may allow children to experience strong emotions (Kramer; 1973; Naumburg, 1973). Art and drawings are considered to be a natural way to engage children in creative self-expression and conflict exploration (Kramer, 1979), and it allows for children to exercise control over their perceived realities (Kramer, 1979; Naumburg, 1973). Additionally, art is considered to be a safe means of allowing children to explore, making decisions, solve problems, and express their “inner world” without having to rely on words (Allan, 1987; Gil, 2006). Additionally, drawings have been found to be helpful when working with children who have difficulty communicating, either because of cultural barriers or who may be uncomfortable talking about personal experiences (Cochran, 1996; Gil & Drewes,
It is possible that children who possess dominance in intelligence types other than verbal/linguistic also benefit from drawing-based assessments for these same reasons.

Interpretations of children’s drawings can offer insight into children’s emotions, internalized experiences, and perceptions (Gil, 2006; Kaplan, 2003). Therefore, clinicians, researchers, and educators should consider the value, depth, and meaning that interpretations of children’s drawings can provide on children’s emotions and perceptions. Specifically, in this study children revealed several markers of contextual and emotional awareness. Interpretation of their drawings helps to reveal even further information, related to their perceptions of bullying and empathic experiences. Regarding facial features, many participants drew smiles or frowns on the faces of the characters; research has found that this is likely indicative of happiness or sadness (Klepsch & Logie, 1982). Several participants drew faces with missing pupils. Research has suggested that when figures’ eyes are drawn with no pupils, it could be indicative that the person has difficulty socializing with others (Klepsch & Logie, 1982).

There were several participants who indicated bodily-awareness, and drew characters reaching towards the “victim” character. Koppitz (1968) suggested that long or reaching arms could indicate that a person wants to control others, and desires strength or power. Conversely, smaller arms or arms that are close to the body often indicate that a child has rigid inner controls. It can also indicate that a child has difficulty reaching out towards others and has poor personal relationships. There were participants who drew “victim” characters with “closed” body language, relative to the “bully” character. Several participants drew larger hands on the “bully” character than other characters in a bullying situation. Big hands can indicate aggressiveness (Koppitz, 1968; Di Leo, 1973).
Children who are aggressive often draw fingers that appear “claw-like.” Several participants drew characters with “claw-like” hands. Regarding bodily awareness, smaller figures drawn could be indicative of shyness, insecurity, or withdrawn feelings (Di Leo, 1983); conversely, larger drawn figure tend to indicate aggression, with poor inner controls (Di Leo, 1983).

Several participants displayed power imbalance in their drawings of bullying situations, particularly via size differences of characters. When children draw some people disproportionately larger than others, it can indicate that the larger drawn person is important to the child or that the person is aggressive (Di Leo, 1983). Lastly, several participants omitted components in their drawings (i.e., facial features, hands). Omissions in drawings can indicate something is missing from the person’s life (Furth, 2002). The omission of a mouth may reveal problems with relating to others and could also be a sign of anxiety (Klepsch & Logie, 1982). Children who omit eyes have been found to be nonaggressive (Klepsch & Logie, 1982). Omitting hands implies insecurity and problems in dealing with others at school or at home (Klepsch & Logie).

**Intervention efforts.** The results of this study indicate that school programs that seek to promote empathy among students should ensure that both cognitive and affective components of empathy are being addressed. While the results of this study highlight the importance of both components of empathy, it also highlights the importance of individual differences in possessing each component of empathy. Specifically, this study also recognized several students whose empathic abilities were incongruent within a specific measure, as well as across measures. Notably, there were some students who displayed incongruent responding on their drawings (i.e., drawing facial expressions that
did not align with a described emotion). Additionally, there were students who displayed “low” empathy on a quantitative assessment of empathy, but displayed several markers of empathy in their drawings. If school counselors, educators, or other adults involved in a student’s life are aware of his or her empathic strengths and difficulties, intervention efforts can be tailored to address a student’s individualized needs in order to promote needed empathic skills.

At the individual level, cognitive-behavioral therapy that focuses on improving a student’s ability to become emotionally and cognitively attuned to others could help increase a student’s empathy (Stallard, 2005). Specifically, practitioners have recommended that students learn to recognize and label emotions, as well as facial recognition and expression of those emotions (Beck, 2011; Martin, 2010; Stallard, 2005). Additionally, practitioners have encouraged that students learn how to read and comprehend emotional situations, and then apply their understanding into relevant settings (Martin, 2010). Cognitive-behavioral therapy also provides students with the opportunity to challenge thinking errors or cognitive distortions that may be interfering with their ability to perceive situations and other people (Beck, 2011). Research has found that when students’ individualized needs are addressed, they are more likely to develop a stronger sense of empathy for others (Barnett, 1987).

At the classroom- and school-wide levels, interventions that target moral education that promote empathy as a teachable skill have been shown to be effective (Good, Fox, & Coffen, 2011; Ruiz & Vallejos, 1999) at increasing empathy and decreasing bullying behaviors (Good, Fox, & Coffen, 2011). Specifically, researchers have recommended that students receive affective training through observational learning
(i.e., modeling; Pizarro & Salovey, 2002), and that training be focused on socio-affective experiences and social- and moral-skill development (Good, Fox, & Coffen, 2011). Perspective taking activities can help enable students to gain insight into how others feel, as well as develop a sense of responsibility towards others (Dunn et al., 2001; Rolheiser & Wallace, 2005). Researchers have found that helping students become connected with others, through finding commonalities can encourage empathic responding (Smith, 1988). The results of this study indicated that students possess varying levels of cognitive and affective empathy for others involved in bullying situations. Therefore, it is possible that classroom- and school-based intervention efforts that focus on these specific strategies and factors of empathy will likely experience in promoting empathy among students.

**Strengths of the Current Study**

There are several strengths in this study. First, and perhaps one of the biggest strengths was that corroboration was found in the mixed methods data analysis through the process of triangulation. Specifically, the results of the IRI supported and were supported by the DABS. Furthermore, coding and interpretive themes were also triangulated with an outside, unbiased graduate student researcher in the Empowerment Initiative Lab, during the qualitative phase of the study.

Second, the current study utilized a unique, non-quantitative modality to assess the relationship among bullying, empathy, and multiple intelligences. Previous research examining bullying and empathy has predominantly relied on the use of self-report, quantitative data, which can be limiting particularly for participants who possess dominance in intelligence other than verbal/linguistic (Armstrong, 2009). Results of this study found that drawings can serve as a useful assessment of bullying and empathy, and
it was determined that this methodology was particularly accommodating for participants possessing dominance in bodily/kinesthetic and visual/spatial intelligence (two non-verbal types of intelligence).

Third, this study improves upon previous research that has attempted to utilize drawing-based measures to examine bullying or empathy. Specifically, researchers have not yet integrated participants’ drawings with their narrative description of their perceptions of content drawn (Andreou & Bonoti, 2011). This study not only examined the graphical content drawn in participants’ depictions of bullying situations, but it also accounted for their narrative descriptions revealed in the supplemental DABS protocol. Thus, this study offered insight into participants’ internalized and externalized perceptions (Kosslyn, Heldmeyer, & Locklear, 1977; Malchiodi, 1998; Skybo, Ryan-Wenger, & Su, 2007) of bullying and empathy.

Lastly, this study yielded important information regarding nuanced differences between quantitative and qualitative methods of assessing bullying and empathy. Specifically, drawings revealed specific factors related to cognitive (e.g., contextual awareness, power imbalance, bodily awareness, emotional awareness) and affective empathy (e.g., alignment of emotions to a particular bullying role). These nuanced findings were not revealed when analyzing the quantitative data alone. Additionally, these specific findings were often overlooked, thus classifying certain participants as having “lower” empathy on their quantitative measure than they did in their drawings. Furthermore, these striking differences tended to be most apparent for participants who identified as being a “bully-victim” and for participants who tended to have dominance in an intelligence type other than verbal/linguistic. Therefore, this study found that using an
alternative measure, more accommodating for certain participants’ strengths, allowed participants to demonstrate their understanding and empathy of bullying situations.

**Limitations**

Despite the strengths of the current study, there are several important limitations to note, and the results should be interpreted with these limitations in consideration. These are discussed in detail below. Recommendations for future research are also provided.

**Sample size and external validity.** This study primarily utilized a homogeneous, convenience sample of students who participated in a bullying intervention program. Specifically, there was an overrepresentation of White participants from several Midwestern elementary and middle schools, and a high school within the same school district. There was a lack of racial and ethnic diversity, as well as an underrepresentation of high school students. This is problematic, given that the social-ecological model of bullying (Swearer & Doll, 2001) indicates that attitudes and involvement in bullying are heavily influenced by a localized school- and community-based culture. It is possible that participants of different race and geography would respond differently to the measures utilized in the study. Additionally, the sample size was small ($n = 38$), and was limited by the number of students who were referred to participate in the bullying intervention program during the 2015-2016 and 2016-2017 academic years. Given that the number of participants was so small, generalizability of the results to the wider population cannot be made. Furthermore, external validity is of concern given that students in the study were only referred to participate in the bullying intervention program due to displaying frequent or severe bullying behaviors (to warrant an office referral), as compared to other
students who may have been displaying more covert forms of bullying. This also significantly impacted the distribution of “roles” that participants identified with, causing participants identifying as “bully-victim” to “outnumber” participants identifying as either “bullies” or “non-bullies.” Furthermore, there were too few students who identified as “victims” or “bystanders” and therefore, those specific roles were unable to be analyzed independently; they had to be grouped together as “non-bullies.” Future studies should include a larger and more diverse sample (i.e., race, age, geographical location) of participants. A larger sample may allow for participants across all roles, including the role of “victim” and “bystander” to be included. Future studies should also utilize a more representative sample of students who bully, as opposed to relying on students who display more severe bullying behaviors.

**Social desirability.** Due to social desirability, it is possible that participants tended to rate their empathic experiences, on the quantitative measure used in the study as being higher than their “actual” empathy had participants been presented with real bullying situations. Research has found that the self-report nature of the scales on the IRI have made it susceptible to social desirability and self-perception biases, particularly for the Empathic Concern and Perspective Taking subscales (Watson & Morris, 1991). Conversely, drawings and other projective-based assessment techniques have been found to be less susceptible to social desirability and self-perception bias because they tend to reflect students’ unconscious drives or feelings (Butcher, Mineka, & Hooley, 2007). Additionally, these modalities of assessment have provided students with opportunities to project their own problems, motives, and wishes onto ambiguous tasks or stimuli (Butcher, Mineka, & Hooley, 2007). There is little research to support that children’s
drawings are at risk for social desirability; therefore, it is felt that participants’ drawings were not impacted by social desirability. However, it is possible that their role identification in their drawings, as well as their role identification on the Bully Survey was impacted by social desirability, thus making it unclear what participants’ actual role in bullying was. Mixed methods analysis helped to corroborate findings between the IRI and drawings, thus reducing the impact of social desirability. Future research should strive to utilize multiple assessments of a given construct, to help support findings across measures to reduce the likelihood of social desirability impacting responses.

**Heightened awareness of bullying and/or empathy.** Participants of this study all came from a school district that utilizes Positive Behavior Interventions and Support (PBIS; http://www.pbis.org/). This refers to a school-wide systemic use of supports that include proactive strategies for defining, teaching, and supporting appropriate student behaviors to create positive school environments. It is possible that through these school-wide supports, participants have received exposure to various anti-bullying (Sugai, Horner, & Algozzine, 2011) and social-emotional curricula (Horner, 2012), thus positively impacting their awareness or expression of bullying and/or empathy. Furthermore, one of the critical components of PBIS is the use of data-based decision making. Specifically, it is felt that decisions are more likely to be effective and efficient when they are based on data because the data can help identify problems and generate solutions (http://www.pbis.org/). Even if schools within the same district were to implement PBIS differently, data-based decision making would allow schools to consistently determine the impact of programming on students’ behaviors and emotions. For elementary schools integrating PBIS programming, it is important to consider the
impact on students’ behaviors and emotions throughout their development. This could have significantly impacted responses from participants in middle school, particularly if they had significant exposure to PBIS programming during their early childhood and elementary school years. Thus, it is unclear whether the findings found in this study represented participants’ actual perceptions of bullying and empathy, or their learned perceptions of bullying and empathy due to PBIS programming. Future research should seek participants from schools that may not yet have had exposure to PBIS programming, and compare those findings related to bullying and empathy with schools that have had this exposure to programming.

**Intervention administration differences.** Several trained graduate students served as interventionists and administered the T-BIP for the current study. Utilizing multiple interventionists was intended to help reduce interviewer bias, which is any systematic difference between how information is solicited, recorded, or interpreted (Pannucci & Wilkins, 2010). To ensure that there was consistency across interventions and interventionists, a standardized protocol was followed. It is possible that there were slight nuances across interactions between participants and their interventionists. Specifically, for the DABS measure, it is possible that certain interventionists asked more follow-up questions, beyond the scope of the DABS protocol, whereas other interventionists asked few or no follow-up questions. While unlikely, this could have impacted the information available for qualitative analysis, and may have subsequently provided an under- or over-estimate of participants’ actual empathic responses on the DABS. Future research involving interventions with an interview component should ensure that all interventionists and researchers be provided with specific training on
“how” and “when” to ask follow-up questions. In addition to possible interviewer bias, question-order bias also possibly impacted participants. During the intervention, quantitative measures (i.e., Bully Survey, IRI) were randomized; however, the qualitative (i.e., DABS) measure was always administered after the quantitative measures. While specific questions and randomization of the quantitative measures likely did not influence participants’ drawings, it is still possible that certain words and ideas presented in questions could have impacted their thoughts, feelings, and attitudes which may have carried over into their drawings (Schuman & Ludwig, 1983). Future research examining bullying and empathy, utilizing both quantitative and qualitative measures should randomize the order of all assessments used in the study.

**Credibility of qualitative themes.** Creswell and Miller (2000) proposed that there are several strategies that can be used in qualitative research to validate findings. Creswell (2003) recommends that at least two strategies be utilized to maximize the likelihood of validating the results of qualitative research. This study relied on the usage of two validation strategies; triangulation and peer review. Specifically, triangulation involves the utilization of multiple and different sources to provide corroborating evidence (Creswell, 2003; Erlandson et al., 1993; Merriam, 1988). This study utilized triangulation of multiple data sources (i.e., Bully Survey, IRI, MI Cubed, DABS drawing and protocol) to examine and corroborate the relationships among bullying, empathy, and multiple intelligences. Given that similar themes emerged across data sources, it was determined that each measure utilized served as a valid modality of assessing the constructs of interest. Additionally, peer review provides an unbiased, “external check” of the research process, as well as the meaning and interpretation of the data (Creswell,
The peer review process evaluates the consistency with which multiple individuals apply similar criteria to make decisions about data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), and is similar to interrater reliability. This study utilized peer review during the coding phase of students’ drawings. Specifically, a percentage of drawings were collaboratively and independently reviewed, and then themes were discussed. Agreement of coding and themes was found on 96% of the drawings, thus supporting validity of the coding system and interpretation of themes. Despite this study’s attempt to validate findings, the credibility and transferability of the qualitative themes remains unknown.

Creswell (2003) encourages researchers to utilize the member checking strategy, as a way to establish credibility of the findings and interpretations of a study. Member checking involves researchers soliciting participants’ views of the credibility of the findings and interpretations (Ely et al., 1991; Glesne & Peshkin, 1992; Merriam, 1988). Specifically, this strategy involves taking the data, analyses, interpretations, and conclusions back to participants so that they can judge the accuracy, believability, and credibility of the findings (Creswell, 2003). This study did not utilize member checking, and therefore, the credibility of the findings cannot be assumed despite the study’s validity. This is particularly relevant for the theme of affective empathy found in participants’ drawings; assumptions were made regarding the interpretation of participants’ own emotions and the alignment of emotions projected onto various characters in the bullying situation that they identified. It is unknown if this was the true experience for the participants. Future research examining the impacts of using drawing-
based (or other non-quantitative) measures should seek to utilize member checking to establish credibility of the findings and interpretations.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

Based on the limitations in the current study, further research in the area of understanding empathy and bullying is warranted. Specifically, future studies should attempt to obtain a larger and more diverse sample. This will likely help strengthen the generalizability of the findings related to empathy and bullying. It is also recommended that future research supplement self-report assessments with alternative, projective measures. Not only does this help corroborate and validate findings across measures, but it also helps reduce the likelihood of social desirability impacting the results of research. It is recommended that future studies assess for competing bullying interventions or participants’ exposure to anti-bullying and empathy curricula in schools. Such exposure could impact participants’ thoughts and perceptions regarding bullying behaviors and their empathy experienced towards peers involved in bullying. Future studies could examine the specific impacts of such exposure to these curricula, by comparing participants’ bullying behaviors and empathy (for those exposed to PBIS curricula) to a control group, in order to more accurately weigh the impacts of such curricula on perceptions of bullying and empathy.

Given the potential utility of drawings on offering insight into participants’ perceptions of bullying and their feelings of empathy towards others involved in bullying situations, future studies should continue to examine the outcomes generated by children’s drawings to determine if drawings can serve as a reliable and valid measurement of empathy. Future qualitative research should attempt to integrate
“member checking” as a way to obtain credibility regarding the themes and interpretations of participants’ drawings of bullying situations. Researchers should continue to utilize mixed methods (quantitative and qualitative) for future studies, to corroborate findings or reveal nuances across measures that could help expand the literature on bullying and empathy. Lastly, future studies should explore the use of other types of qualitative assessments intended to measure empathy of participants involved in bullying. While drawings serve as a useful modality to assess children’s cognitive and affective empathy towards others, it is possible that other qualitative measures (i.e., projectives) could accommodate students who possess dominance in a variety of intelligence types.

Conclusion

Bullying is a prevalent problem that negatively impacts all students involved. Research has examined various factors believed to contribute to the occurrence of bullying behaviors; studies have found that one factor is a lack of empathy. The current study utilized an exploratory mixed methods design to analyze the relationships among bullying, empathy, and multiple intelligences. Moreover, the purpose of this dissertation study was to examine the relationship between bully/victim status and empathy through the evaluation of participants’ drawings of a bullying situation, as well as their self-reported empathy. Given that the research on bullying and empathy suggests that children who bully have low empathy (Caravita, Di Blasio, & Salmivalli, 2008; Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007), this study aimed to explore whether or not participants who identified as “bullies” may actually possess more empathy than what is currently understood in the literature, when they are given an alternative modality, possibly
accommodating their multiple intelligence strengths, to reveal empathy. It was found that participants’ drawings can serve as a useful modality to assess children’s thoughts, feelings, as well as their empathic traits towards others involved in bullying situations. Results suggest that a drawing-based assessment was less reliant on participants’ verbal skills and may have accommodated participants who had strengths or dominance in intelligence types that were non-verbal in nature.

Although the study did not find significant results for the quantitative analyses and failed to support the qualitative hypotheses, important information was still found that should change the way that bullying and empathy are conceptualized. Specifically, it was found that drawings allowed participants, regardless of their bully/victim status, gender, age, and multiple intelligence type to demonstrate their understanding of cognitive and affective empathy towards others involved in bullying situations. Drawings appeared to be more sensitive to participants’ differing intelligence types, and also appeared to be more sensitive so that nuanced information on bullying and empathy were found.

More importantly, this current study is one of the first to utilize a mixed methods approach to evaluate the relationships among bullying, empathy, and multiple intelligences. Additionally, this is one of the first studies to utilize drawings as a modality for evaluating the connection between bullying and empathy. The results from this study corroborated that participants did in fact possess cognitive and affective empathy across multiple assessments. However, the results of this study also revealed a critical divergent finding across measures. Specifically, it was found that participants (particularly those who identified as “bullies” and “bully-victims”) who displayed low empathy on the IRI,
revealed empathic elements in their drawings. Given the limitations of the study, even though these results do not necessarily indicate that participants who identify as “bullies” or “bully-victims” have more empathy than once believed, it does highlight the utility and sensitivity of a drawing-based assessment tool to detect nuanced information being missed on a quantitative measure of empathy. Additional studies are needed to further investigate the relationship between bullying and empathy, particularly using multiple modalities (i.e., drawings, self-report) that accommodate multiple intelligence differences among participants. Future research should seek to strengthen the ability of drawings to detect affective empathy, given that this was a possible shortcoming of the current study.

The results from this study have several important implications for bullying research, clinical applicability, and bullying prevention efforts. Notably, the assessment of empathy should utilizing alternative assessment (i.e., drawings, qualitative) in order to provide more information regarding nuanced details of empathy that would otherwise be missed by quantitative measurement. In conclusion, the current study explored and examined the relationship between bully/victim status and empathy through the evaluation of participants’ drawings of a bullying situation, as well as their self-reported empathy and multiple intelligences. Perhaps the greatest strength of the study is the use of mixed methodology, in that findings across quantitative and qualitative measures both corroborated and contradicted previous research. This study represents an important contribution to the field of bullying research, given that findings both enhanced and expanded what was previously known about the relationship between bullying and empathy. Given that bullying and empathy are dynamic experiences between two or more people, utilization of dynamic assessment tools (i.e., drawings) seems warranted to
attempt to more accurately capture this complex phenomenon. Therefore, the utilization of drawings or alternative, non-quantitative assessments to supplement quantitative assessments is encouraged in research, clinical practice, or bullying intervention programs in order to give students an opportunity to more accurately demonstrate their thoughts, feelings, and perceptions regarding the bullying dynamic.
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### Mean Differences of Interpersonal Reactivity Subscale Scores across Bully/Victim Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>IRI Perspective Taking Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Fantasy Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Empathic Concern Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Personal Distress Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14.40 (4.452)</td>
<td>14.50 (5.126)</td>
<td>15.90 (5.801)</td>
<td>*10.10 (5.486)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully-Victim</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14.17 (3.222)</td>
<td>14.00 (5.336)</td>
<td>19.67 (2.657)</td>
<td>*15.33 (5.269)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bully</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17.30 (4.715)</td>
<td>13.30 (7.072)</td>
<td>17.10 (4.954)</td>
<td>13.70 (4.523)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Higher mean scores indicate greater empathy

*Denotes a significant difference at the p<.05 level
Table 2

*Mean Differences of Interpersonal Reactivity Subscale Scores across Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>IRI Perspective Taking Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Fantasy Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Empathic Concern Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Personal Distress Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>*13.61 (3.534)</td>
<td>13.50 (4.668)</td>
<td>18.00 (4.602)</td>
<td>14.89 (5.759)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>*16.35 (4.234)</td>
<td>14.35 (6.491)</td>
<td>18.00 (4.507)</td>
<td>12.30 (5.006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Higher mean scores indicate greater empathy  
*Denotes a significant difference at the p<.05 level*
Table 3

*Mean Differences of Interpersonal Reactivity Subscale Scores across Age*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>IRI Perspective Taking Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Fantasy Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Empathic Concern Mean (SD)</th>
<th>IRI Personal Distress Mean (SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>15.20 (4.618)</td>
<td>14.55 (5.286)</td>
<td>18.55 (3.620)</td>
<td>13.65 (5.994)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Higher mean scores indicate greater empathy*
Table 4

Summary of Qualitative Themes and Subthemes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Core Themes</th>
<th>Miscellaneous Theme</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contextual Awareness</td>
<td>Emotional Awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type of Bullying</td>
<td>Emotional Attribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding of Bullying Situation</td>
<td>Understanding of Emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Power Imbalance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bodily Awareness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cause-and-Effect</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes of Bullying</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5

Percentages of Students Adopting Alternative Bully/Victim Roles in their Drawings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status (on Bully Survey)</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percentage Maintaining Same Role (in Drawings)</th>
<th>Percentage Endorsing Different Role (in Drawings)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bully</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bully-Victim</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Bully</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Of the participants identifying as a “bully” on the Bully Survey who endorsed a different role in their drawings, 40% of the participants endorsed a “victim” role and 40% of the participants denied any involvement. Of the participants identifying as a “bully-victim” on the Bully Survey who endorsed a different role in their drawings, 22% of the participants endorsed a “bully” role and 72% of the participants endorsed a “non-bully” role.
Figure 1. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Ace, who self-identified as an 8-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Ace’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation depicted an age-related power imbalance. Ace displayed an understanding of emotions. Larger hands drawn on the “bully” character were observed.
Figure 2. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Alex, who self-identified as a 13-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Alex’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation contained an age- and size-related power imbalance. Alex displayed an understanding of emotions. Arms reaching toward the “victim” character were observed.
Figure 3. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Alice, who self-identified as a 9-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Alice’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation displayed an age-related power imbalance. Alice displayed an understanding of emotions. Large hands on both the “bully” and “victim” characters were observed.
Figure 4. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Bryn, who self-identified as an 11-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Bryn’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation displayed an understanding of intent. Bryn demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Large hands on both the “bully” and “victim” characters were observed.
Figure 5. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Claire, who self-identified as a 10-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Claire’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated an age- and size-related power imbalance. Claire demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Claire indicated her understanding of barriers to intervening.
Figure 6. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Clark, who self-identified as a 10-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Clark’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated an age- and size-related power imbalance. Clark demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Clark identified a resolution and personal connection to the bullying situation.
Figure 7. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Cleo, who self-identified as a 9-year old female. She also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Cleo’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated an age-, size-, and gender-related power imbalance. Cleo demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Cleo specified that this bullying situation was “pretend.”
Figure 8. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Clyde, who self-identified as an 8-year old male. He also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Clyde’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated a size-related power imbalance. Clyde demonstrated an understanding of emotions. “Claw-like” hands were observed on “bully” and “victim” characters. Clyde identified a resolution to the bullying situation.
Figure 9. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Curtis, who self-identified as a 7-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Curtis’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated an age- and size-related power imbalance. Curtis demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Large hands on the “bully” character were observed. Additionally, Curtis indicated closed body posture on the “victim” character.
Figure 10. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Dennis, who self-identified as an 8-year old male. He also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Dennis’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated a size-related power imbalance. Dennis demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Dennis displayed open, falling body posture on the “victim” character, given that the character was pushed by the “bully.”
Figure 11. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Dora, who self-identified as an 11-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Dora’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation occurred at school, and included a personal connection. Dora demonstrated an understanding of emotions.
Figure 12. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Eliza, who self-identified as a 12-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Eliza’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated an age- and size-related power imbalance. Eliza demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Eliza omitted details on the “victim” character (i.e., eyes, hands), and drew “claw-like” hands on the “bully” character.
Figure 13. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Fabian, who self-identified as a 13-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Fabian’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated an age- and size-related power imbalance. Fabian demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Fabian drew arms reaching outward toward the “victim” character.
Figure 14. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Felicia, who self-identified as a 14-year old female. She also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Felicia’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated themes of repetition and intent. Felicia demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that larger hands were drawn on the “bully” character, and other details were omitted (i.e., eyes).
Figure 15. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Grant, who self-identified as a 16-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Grant’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated popularity status as a form of power imbalance. Grant demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Grant drew larger hands on the “bully” character, and utilized closed body posture on the “victim” character.
Figure 16. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Gus, who self-identified as a 9-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Gus’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated an age- and size-related power imbalance. Gus demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Gus omitted details (i.e., hands) on characters drawn in the bullying situation.
Figure 17. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Gwen, who self-identified as a 13-year old female. He also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Gwen’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated size-related power imbalance. Gwen demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Gwen omitted several details (i.e., facial features, hands).
Figure 18. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Hailey, who self-identified as a 12-year old female. She also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Hailey’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated age- and size-related power imbalance. Hailey demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Hailey displayed a supine body posture on the “victim” character, given that the character was pushed by the “bully.” No hands were drawn.
Figure 19. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Kai, who self-identified as a 12-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Kai’s drawing and DABS protocol, this was a verbal bullying situation that occurred between the “bully” and “victim” characters. Kai demonstrated an understanding of emotions.
Figure 20. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Kayla, who self-identified as a 13-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Kayla’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated a gender-related power imbalance. Kayla demonstrated an understanding of emotions for the “victim” character, but was unable to attribute emotions to the “bully” character.
Figure 21. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Ken, who self-identified as a 9-year old male. He also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Ken’s drawing and DABS protocol, this relational bullying situation indicated a group-size related power imbalance. Ken demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Ken omitted several details (i.e., hands) on the characters drawn.
Figure 22. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Lee, who self-identified as a 15-year-old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Lee’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated an age-related power imbalance. Lee demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Lee drew large hands on both the “victim” and “bully” characters.
Figure 23. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Mae, who self-identified as an 11-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Mae’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated an age- and size-related power imbalance. Mae demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Mae drew large hands on both the “victim” and “bully” characters.
Figure 24. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Manny, who self-identified as a 13-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Manny’s drawing and DABS protocol, this is physical bullying situation between the “bully” and “victim” characters. Manny demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Manny drew large hands on both the “bully” and the “victim” characters. Manny indicated that the bullying occurred at school.
Figure 25. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Miley, who self-identified as a 9-year old female. She also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Miley’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated an age-, size-, gender-, and intellectual-related power imbalance. Miley demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Miley drew larger hands on the “bully” character.
Figure 26. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Mya, who self-identified as an 11-year old female. She also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Mya’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated a gender-related power imbalance. Mya demonstrated an understanding of emotions.
Figure 27. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Otto, who self-identified as a 10-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Otto’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated an age-related power imbalance. Otto demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It can be observed that Otto drew certain characters (i.e., bystander) without hands.
Figure 28 Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Paige, who self-identified as an 11-year old female. She also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Paige’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated an age-related power imbalance. Paige demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Paige drew larger hands on the “bully” character, and no hands on the “victim” character.
Figure 29. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Pedro, who self-identified as a 12-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Pedro’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated a size, age-, and gender-related power imbalance. Pedro demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Pedro drew larger hands on the “bully” character, than on the “victim” character.
Figure 30. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Penny, who self-identified as a 14-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Penny’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated an age-related and group-size difference power imbalance. Penny demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Penny displayed an understanding of intent, repetition, and barriers to intervening.
Figure 31. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Phillip, who self-identified as a 10-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Phillip’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated age- and size-related power imbalance. Phillip demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Phillip did not draw hands on the “bully” character.
Figure 32. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Phoebe, who self-identified as a 10-year old female. He also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Phoebe drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated a size-related power imbalance. Phoebe demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Phoebe displayed open, falling body posture on the “victim” character, given that the character was pushed by the “bully.”
Figure 33. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Rex, who self-identified as an 11-year old male. He also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Dennis’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated age- and size-related power imbalance. Rex demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Rex provided a resolution to the bullying situation, indicated that the situation occurred at recess, and described a personal connection.
Figure 34. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Rita, who self-identified as an 11-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Rita’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated a popularity-status power imbalance. Rita demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Rita described the “bully” character’s intent.
Figure 35. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Serena, who self-identified as a 10-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Serena’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated a size-related power imbalance. Serena demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Serena provided a resolution to the bullying situation.
Figure 36. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Theo, who self-identified as a 9-year old male. He also self-identified as a “bully.” Based on Theo’s drawing and DABS protocol, this physical bullying situation indicated an age-related power imbalance. Theo demonstrated an understanding of emotions. It was observed that Theo omitted details (i.e., pupils, hands) on the “bully” and “victim” characters.
Figure 37. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Wynter, who self-identified as a 13-year old female. She also self-identified as a “non-bully.” Based on Wynter’s drawing and DABS protocol, this verbal bullying situation indicated a size-related power imbalance. Wynter demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Wynter did not include pupils on the eyes of any characters drawn in her picture.
Figure 38. Draw a Bullying Situation completed by Zoe, who self-identified as a 13-year old female. She also self-identified as a “bully-victim.” Based on Zoe’s drawing and DABS protocol, this was a physical bullying. Zoe demonstrated an understanding of emotions. Zoe displayed large hands on the “victim” character.
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Parental/Guardian Consent

Parent/Guardian Consent Form

Target Bullying Intervention Program (T-BIP)

Dear Parent or Guardian:

You are invited to allow your child to participate in an intervention and research study: Target Bullying Intervention. Your child has been asked to participate because he/she has been referred for bullying behaviors. The following information is provided in order to help you make an informed decision about whether or not to allow your, your child’s, and your child’s teacher’s information to be used for research purposes. If you have any questions please do not hesitate to ask. You are being asked for your consent because your child is less than 19 years of age. Additionally, we are asking for permission to access your child’s school records to record office referral data in order to evaluate the effectiveness of the intervention. The office referral data includes such things as number of office referrals, reason for office referral, place of referral, number of suspensions, and other school documentation (e.g., notes, contacts). This will be used to compare students who did not participate in the bullying intervention with students who did participate in the bullying intervention.

The bullying intervention will take place at your child’s school or at the Counseling and School Psychology Clinic at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. The purpose of this intervention is to help stop bullying behaviors. A secondary purpose of this study is to investigate bullying behavior, social behavior, and school experiences among students involved in bullying.

Your child will be asked to complete several questionnaires concerning his/her experiences at school, as well as questions about his/her thoughts and feelings. A doctoral-level graduate student from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln will work with your child during this intervention. The intervention will take approximately three hours. The graduate students are under the direct supervision of Dr. Susan Swearer, a licensed psychologist. Your child will be shown a PowerPoint presentation about bullying and will talk about the consequences of bullying with the graduate student researcher. The presentation provides information about bullying. It describes which behaviors are bullying, where bullying takes place, characteristics of kids who bully others, things that bullies do, who gets bullied, and reasons why kids bully. It is our hope that via this intensive, individualized program, we can figure out the reasons behind and the reasons that maintain the bullying behavior. We also hope that this experience will be life-changing and will help change your child's bullying behavior. Additionally, a teacher will be asked to fill out a short survey about bullying behaviors. Teachers who will be selected to complete the survey are teachers who either: (1) referred your child, (2) have high contact rates with your child, or (3) who are identified as being familiar with your child by the school counselor or principal. A meeting will be arranged approximately one to two weeks after the intervention during which you will be asked to complete a parent version of the same survey and ask for your opinion about bullying behaviors and about the intervention. Your child will be asked to complete two additional surveys at that time. You will also receive a report with specific recommendations to help your child with his/her specific needs as identified through the bullying intervention.
You will be given a referral list of counselors who are available to talk with your child about his or her experiences at school and with peers. If you should choose to access any of these services, you will be responsible for payment. If your child reports any acts of harm committed to him or herself or others, the principal investigator (Dr. Susan Swearer) will contact you and together we will come up with a plan of action to help your child.

Any information obtained during this intervention which could identify your child will be kept strictly confidential. Every participant will be given a code number so he/she will not be able to be identified by researchers or school personnel. The information obtained in this study may be published in scientific journals or presented at scientific meetings, but your child’s identity will be kept strictly confidential. Study records will be kept for five years in a locked file cabinet in the principal investigator’s research office at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln.

You are free to decide whether not to allow your child to participate in the study and for the primary investigator to use your information for research purposes. Also, you are free to withdraw the use of this information at any time without adversely affecting your child’s relationship with the investigators, the University of Nebraska-Lincoln, or with your school district. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which your child is otherwise entitled.

Your child’s rights as a research participant have been explained to you. If you have any questions about this study, please contact Dr. Susan Swearer at (402) 472-1741. If you have any questions concerning your child’s rights as a research participant that have not been answered by the investigator, or to report any concerns about the study, you may contact the University of Nebraska-Lincoln Institutional Review Board (UNL IRB), telephone (402) 472-6965.

**DOCUMENTATION OF INFORMED CONSENT**

You are voluntarily making a decision whether or not to allow your, your child’s, and your child’s teacher’s information to be used for research purposes. Your signature certifies that you have decided to allow that information to be used having read and understood the information presented. You will be given a copy of this consent form to keep.

___________________________________  _____________
SIGNATURE OF PARENT/GUARDIAN    DATE

___________________________________
PRINT YOUR CHILD’S NAME

___________________________________  _____________
SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR      DATE

**IDENTIFICATION OF PRIMARY INVESTIGATOR**

Susan M. Swearer, Ph.D.    Office: 402-472-1741
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Youth Assent

Youth Assent Form

Target Bullying Intervention Program (T-BIP)

We are inviting you to be in this intervention and research study because you are a student in Nebraska age 9-18 years and you have been referred because of bullying behaviors.

This intervention will take about three hours at your school or the Counseling and School Psychology Clinic at the University of Nebraska-Lincoln. We will ask you questions about how you and other students in your school get along with each other, as well as questions about some of your emotions. You will be shown a presentation about bullying and talk with a graduate student from the University of Nebraska-Lincoln about the consequences of bullying. It is our hope that through this intervention, that we can figure out the reasons behind and the reasons that maintain bullying behavior.

You will be asked several questions which may cause you to feel uncomfortable as they may touch on personal subjects. If you report that you have been physically harmed or that you intend to harm yourself or others, Dr. Susan Swearer will talk with you and your parents about this. Together we will come up with a plan to make sure that you are safe. Being in the study may help you think about some of your feelings and concerns you experience at school. We will provide you with a list of teachers and counselors who may be able to further help you. If you choose to access counselors outside of school, your family will be responsible for paying for that service. We hope the information from this study will help us better understand the struggles and challenges you and other students may experience. We hope to gain an understanding of how to help students feel safer in school. Additionally, a teacher at your school will be asked to complete a survey about bullying behaviors. Teachers who will be selected to complete the survey are teachers who either: (1) referred you for bullying behaviors, (2) have high contact rates with you, or (3) who are identified as being familiar with you by the school counselor or principal. We will ask your parents to complete the same survey about bullying. Finally, you will be asked to complete two additional surveys at the follow-up meeting.

Your responses will be kept strictly confidential (private). The only time in which your information will not be kept private is if you tell us that you are being harmed by an adult or you are harming (or going to harm) someone else. There will be no way for us to know which responses belong to you or someone else after we have coded each questionnaire. Each questionnaire will have a code number that we will use to organize the data.

We may publish a summary of everybody’s responses or present a summary at a scientific meeting, but your identity and your responses will be totally confidential.

We will also ask your parents or guardians for their permission for you to do this study because you are under 19 years of age. You may talk this over with them before you decide whether or not to participate.

_______ Student’s Initials

IRB#___________________________

Target Bullying Intervention Program (T-BIP)
You are free to decide not to participate in this study or to withdraw at any time without negatively affecting your relationship with the investigators, the University of Nebraska, or your school district. Your decision will not result in any loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled.

If you have any questions at any time, please ask one of the researchers, or you may call Dr. Susan Swearer at (402) 472-1741.

If you check “yes”, it means that you have decided to participate and have read everything that is on this form. You and your parents or guardians will be given a copy of this form to keep.

[ ] Yes, I would like to participate in the study.

[ ] No, I do not want to participate in the study.

____________________________
SIGNATURE OF PARTICIPANT
____________________________
DATE

____________________________
PRINT YOUR NAME

____________________________
SIGNATURE OF INVESTIGATOR
____________________________
DATE

INVESTIGATOR

Susan M. Swearer, Ph.D.  Office: 402-472-1741
APPENDIX D

Bully-Survey

Date: __________________________

Swearer Bully Survey - Student Version

Instructions: In this survey you will be asked to respond to questions and statements about bullying.

Bullying happens when someone hurts or scares another person on purpose and the person being bullied has a hard time defending himself or herself. Usually, bullying happens over and over.

- Punching, shoving and other acts that hurt people physically
- Spreading bad rumors about people
- Keeping certain people out of a group
- Teasing people in a mean way
- Getting certain people to “gang up” on others

*******************************************************************************

There are four parts to this survey: (A) When you were bullied by others, (B) When you saw other students getting bullied, (C) When you bullied others, and (D) Your thoughts about bullying.

*******************************************************************************

Copyright © 2001 by Susan M. Swearer, Ph.D. Revised: 09/2014
## The Bully Survey - Part A

**PART A:** In this part, you will be asked about times when *you* were bullied.

**REMEMBER:** Bullying happens when someone hurts or scares another person on purpose and the person being bullied has a hard time defending himself or herself. Usually, bullying happens over and over.

- Punching, shoving and other acts that hurt people physically
- Spreading bad rumors about people
- Keeping certain people out of a group
- Teasing people in a mean way
- Getting certain people to “gang up” on others

### 1a. Have you been bullied this school year?

- [ ] Yes  
- [ ] No

### 1b. If yes, how often have you been bullied? (Check one)

- [ ] one or more times a day
- [ ] one or more times a week
- [ ] one or more times a month

*If you have not been bullied this year, you may move on to Part B on page 6*

### 2a. Where have you been bullied? (Check all that apply)

- [ ] homeroom
- [ ] academic class
- [ ] bus
- [ ] gym
- [ ] locker room
- [ ] hallway
- [ ] bathroom
- [ ] online/texting during school
- [ ] online/texting outside of school
- [ ] cafeteria
- [ ] before school
- [ ] after school
- [ ] dances
- [ ] sporting events
- [ ] telephone

Circle the ONE place you have been bullied the most.

### 2b. If you checked online/texting, please explain. (Check all that apply)

- [ ] Facebook
- [ ] Instagram
- [ ] Twitter
- [ ] Online Gaming
- [ ] IMing
- [ ] Email
- [ ] Texting
- [ ] Other social media (please describe): ____________
3. How did you get bullied?  (Check how often these things happened)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never Happened</th>
<th>Rarely Happened</th>
<th>Sometimes Happened</th>
<th>Often Happened</th>
<th>Always Happened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Called me names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Made fun of me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Said they will do bad things to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Played jokes on me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Wouldn’t let me be a part of their group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Broke my things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Attacked me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Nobody would talk to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Wrote bad things about me (i.e., on paper)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Said mean things behind my back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Pushed or shoved me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Wrote mean things or made things up online about me (i.e., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Other ways you were bullied:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Who bullied you?  (Check all that apply)

- older boys
- older girls
- younger boys
- younger girls
- boys in the same grade
- girls in the same grade
- someone who is strong
- someone who is weak
- someone who I didn’t know
- someone I was interested in but never went out with
- someone who is powerful
- someone who is not powerful
- someone who has many friends
- someone who doesn’t have many friends
- someone who is popular
- someone who is not popular
- someone who is smart
- someone who is not smart
- someone who is an adult
- my girlfriend/boyfriend
- my brother
- my sister
- someone who is in my group of friends
- Other ____________________
5. How much of a problem was the bullying for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never a Problem</th>
<th>Rarely a Problem</th>
<th>Sometimes a Problem</th>
<th>Often a Problem</th>
<th>Always a Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Made me feel sick</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I couldn’t make friends</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Made me feel bad or sad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Made it difficult to learn at school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I didn’t come to school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I had problems with my family</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other ways this was a problem:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6a. Why do you think you were bullied? (Check all that apply)

Because:

- ☐ they think my face looks funny
- ☐ they think I’m fat
- ☐ they think I’m skinny
- ☐ they think I look too old
- ☐ they think I look too young
- ☐ they think I am a wimp
- ☐ they think my friends are weird
- ☐ I’m sick a lot
- ☐ I’m disabled
- ☐ I get good grades
- ☐ I get bad grades
- ☐ where I live
- ☐ the clothes I wear
- ☐ the color of my skin
- ☐ the country I’m from
- ☐ I am different
- ☐ the church I go to
- ☐ my parents
- ☐ my brother
- ☐ my sister
- ☐ my family is poor
- ☐ my family has a lot of money
- ☐ someone in my family has a disability
- ☐ I am too tall
- ☐ I am too short
- ☐ I am in special education
- ☐ I get angry a lot
- ☐ I cry a lot
- ☐ I can’t get along with other people
- ☐ they say I’m gay
- ☐ the way I talk
- ☐ I act too much like a boy
- ☐ I act too much like a girl
- ☐ other (describe): __________________

6b. Circle the MAIN reason why you were bullied.
7a. Were you able to protect yourself from the bullying?
   - Yes
   - No

7b. If yes, what did you do?
   

8. Did your teachers and school staff know about the bullying that happened to you?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I don’t know

9. How do you think the teachers and school staff take care of the bullying?
   - Very well
   - Okay
   - Bad
   - I don’t know

10. Tell us what the teachers and school staff did to take care of the bullying.

11. Did your parents know about the bullying that happened to you?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I don’t know

12a. Does anyone bully you at home? (Check everyone who has bullied you)
   - no one
   - sister
   - friend
   - father
   - stepfather
   - other relative
   - mother
   - stepmother
   - neighbor
   - brother
   - grandparent
   - other: _____________

12b. Is the bullying at home different from the bullying at school? How?

13. Is bullying a problem in your school?
   - Yes
   - No

14. Do you think that schools should worry about bullying?
   - Yes
   - No
The Bully Survey - Part B

PART B: In this part, you will be asked about other students that have been bullied.

REMEMBER: Bullying happens when someone hurts or scares another person on purpose and the person being bullied has a hard time defending himself or herself. Usually, bullying happens over and over.
- Punching, shoving and other acts that hurt people physically
- Spreading bad rumors about people
- Keeping certain people out of a group
- Teasing people in a mean way
- Getting certain people to “gang up” on others

15a. Did you ever see a student other than yourself who was bullied this school year?
☐ Yes    ☐ No

15b. If yes, how often did you see this student being bullied? (Check one)
☐ one or more times a day
☐ one or more times a week
☐ one or more times a month

If you do not know any students who have been bullied this year, you may move on to Part C on page 9.

16a. Where was the student bullied? (Check all that apply)
☐ homeroom    ☐ cafeteria
☐ academic class    ☐ before school
☐ bus    ☐ after school
☐ gym    ☐ dances
☐ locker room    ☐ sporting events
☐ hallway    ☐ telephone
☐ bathroom    ☐ online/texting outside of school
☐ online/texting during school    ☐ recess

Circle the ONE place you have been bullied the most.

16b. If you checked online/texting, please explain. (Check all that apply)
☐ Facebook
☐ Instagram
☐ Twitter
☐ Online Gaming
☐ IMing
☐ Email
☐ Texting
☐ Other:
17. **How did this student get bullied?** (Check how often these things happened)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never Happened</th>
<th>Rarely Happened</th>
<th>Sometimes Happened</th>
<th>Often Happened</th>
<th>Always Happened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Called him/her names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Made fun of him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Said they will do bad things to him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Played jokes on him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Wouldn't let him/her be a part of their group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Broke his/her things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Attacked him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. Nobody would talk to him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. Wrote bad things about him/her</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. Said mean things behind his/her back</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Got pushed or shoved</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Wrote mean things or made things up online about him/her (i.e., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. Other ways (s)he was bullied:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Who bullied this student? (Check all that apply)

- older boys
- older girls
- younger boys
- younger girls
- boys in the same grade
- girls in the same grade
- someone who is strong
- someone who is weak
- someone who (s)he didn’t know
- someone (s)he was interested in but never went out with
- someone who is powerful
- someone who is not powerful
- someone who has many friends
- someone who doesn’t have many friends
- someone who is popular
- someone who is not popular
- someone who is smart
- someone who is an adult
- his/her girlfriend/boyfriend
- his/her brother
- his/her sister
- someone who is in his/her group of friends
- Other____________________

19. How did seeing the bullying affect you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>a. Made me feel sick</th>
<th>Never a Problem</th>
<th>Rarely a Problem</th>
<th>Sometimes a Problem</th>
<th>Often a Problem</th>
<th>Always a Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>b. I couldn’t make friends</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Made me feel bad or sad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Made it difficult for me to learn</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I didn’t come to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I had problems with my family</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other ways this was a problem:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
20a. Why do you think this student was bullied? (Check all that apply).

Because:
- his/her face looks funny
- (s)he is fat
- (s)he is skinny
- (s)he looks too old
- (s)he looks too young
- (s)he is a wimp
- his/her friends are weird
- (s)he is sick a lot
- (s)he is disabled
- (s)he gets good grades
- (s)he gets bad grades
- where (s)he lives
- the clothes (s)he wears
- the color of his/her skin
- the country (s)he is from
- (s)he is different
- the church (s)he goes to
- his/her parents
- his/her brother
- his/her sister
- his/her family is poor
- his/her family has a lot of money
- someone in his/her family is disabled
- (s)he is too tall
- (s)he is too short
- (s)he is in special education
- (s)he gets angry a lot
- (s)he cries a lot
- (s)he can't get along with other people
- (s)he is gay
- the way (s)he talks
- (s)he acts too much like a boy
- (s)he acts too much like a girl
- other (describe): ____________________

20b. Circle the MAIN reason why this student was bullied.

20c. Was the student able to protect him/herself from the bullying?
- Yes
- No

21. Did the teachers and school staff know about the bullying that you saw?
- Yes
- No
- I don't know

22a. How do you think your teachers and school staff took care of the bullying?
- Very well
- Okay
- Bad
- I don't know

22b. Tell us what the teachers and school staff did to take care of the bullying.

23. Tell us what you did about the bullying.

________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________
The Bully Survey - Part C

PART C: In this part, you will be asked about when you bullied another student.

REMEMBER: Bullying happens when someone hurts or scares another person on purpose and the person being bullied has a hard time defending himself or herself. Usually, bullying happens over and over.
- Punching, shoving and other acts that hurt people physically
- Spreading bad rumors about people
- Keeping certain people out of a “group”
- Teasing people in a mean way
- Getting certain people to “gang up” on others

24a. Did you bully anyone this school year?
   □ Yes □ No

24b. If yes, how often did you bully this person? (Check one)
   □ one or more times a day
   □ one or more times a week
   □ one or more times a month

If you never bullied other students this year, go to Part D on page 12 and answer the rest of the questions.

25a. Where did you bully him or her? (Check all that apply)
   □ homeroom □ cafeteria
   □ academic class □ before school
   □ bus □ after school
   □ gym □ dances
   □ locker room □ sporting events
   □ hallway □ telephone
   □ bathroom □ online/texting outside of school
   □ online/texting during school □ recess

Circle the ONE place you have been bullied the most.

25b. If you checked online/texting, please explain. (Check all that apply)
   □ Facebook □ IMing
   □ Instagram □ Email
   □ Twitter □ Texting
   □ Online Gaming □ Other:
26. How did you bully this person? *(Check how often these things happened)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never Happened</th>
<th>Rarely Happened</th>
<th>Sometimes Happened</th>
<th>Often Happened</th>
<th>Always Happened</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Called him/her names</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>Made fun of him/her</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>Said I will do bad things to him/her</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>Played jokes on him/her</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td>Wouldn’t let him/her be a part of my group</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td>Broke his/her things</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g.</td>
<td>Attacked him/her</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h.</td>
<td>Nobody would talk to him/her</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i.</td>
<td>Wrote bad things about him/her</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j.</td>
<td>Said mean things behind his/her back</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k.</td>
<td>Pushed or shoved him/her</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l.</td>
<td>Wrote mean things or made things up online about him/her <em>(i.e., Facebook, Instagram, Twitter, etc.)</em></td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
<td>□</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m.</td>
<td>Other ways (s)he was bullied: ____________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

27. Who did you bully? *(Check all that apply)*

- □ older boys
- □ older girls
- □ younger boys
- □ younger girls
- □ boys in the same grade
- □ girls in the same grade
- □ someone who is strong
- □ someone who is weak
- □ someone who I didn’t know
- □ someone I was interested in but never went out with
- □ someone who is powerful
- □ someone who is not powerful
- □ someone who has many friends
- □ someone who doesn’t have many friends
- □ someone who is popular
- □ someone who is not popular
- □ someone who is smart
- □ someone who is not smart
- □ someone who is an adult
- □ my girlfriend/boyfriend
- □ my brother
- □ my sister
- □ someone who is in my group of friends
- □ Other ________________________
28a. How much was this a problem for the student you bullied?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never a Problem</th>
<th>Rarely a Problem</th>
<th>Sometimes a Problem</th>
<th>Often a Problem</th>
<th>Always a Problem</th>
<th>I Don't Know</th>
<th>I Don't Care</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Made him/her feel sick</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. (S)he couldn't make friends</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Made him/her feel bad or sad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Made it difficult for him/her to learn</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. (S)he didn't come to school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. (S)he had problems with his/her family</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other ways this was a problem:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28b. How much was the bullying you did a problem for you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never a Problem</th>
<th>Rarely a Problem</th>
<th>Sometimes a Problem</th>
<th>Often a Problem</th>
<th>Always a Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Made me feel sick</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. I couldn't make friends</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Made me feel bad or sad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Made it difficult for me to learn</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. I didn't come to school</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. I had problems with my family</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. Other ways this was a problem:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29a. Why did you bully this person? (Check all that apply)
Because:
☐ his/her face looks funny  ☐ his/her parents
☐ (s)he is fat  ☐ his/her brother
☐ (s)he is skinny  ☐ his/her sister
☐ (s)he looks too old  ☐ his/her family is poor
☐ (s)he is looks too young  ☐ his/her family has a lot of money
☐ (s)he is a wimp  ☐ someone in his/her family is disabled
☐ his/her friends are weird  ☐ (s)he is too tall
☐ (s)he is sick a lot  ☐ (s)he is too short
☐ (s)he is disabled  ☐ (s)he is in special education
☐ (s)he gets good grades  ☐ (s)he gets angry a lot
☐ (s)he gets bad grades  ☐ (s)he cries a lot
☐ where (s)he lives  ☐ (s)he can't get along with other people
☐ the clothes (s)he wears  ☐ (s)he is gay
☐ the color of his/her skin  ☐ the way (s)he talks
☐ the country he/she is from  ☐ (s)he acts too much like a boy
☐ (s)he is different  ☐ (s)he acts too much like a girl
☐ The church (s)he goes too  ☐ other (describe):______________

29b. Circle the MAIN reason why you bullied this person.

29c. Was the student able to protect him/herself from your bullying?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

30. Did the teachers and school staff know about the bullying that you did?
☐ Yes  ☐ No  ☐ I don't know

31. How do you think the teachers and school staff took care of the bullying?
☐ Very well  ☐ Okay  ☐ Bad  ☐ I don't know

32. Tell us what the teachers and staff did to take care of the bullying.____________

33. Is bullying a problem in your school?
☐ Yes  ☐ No

34. Do you think that schools should worry about bullying?
☐ Yes  ☐ No
PART D: In this part, you will be asked about your thoughts about bullying.

35. How much do you agree with each sentence?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Totally False</th>
<th>Sort of False</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Sort of True</th>
<th>Totally True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Most people who get bullied ask for it</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Bullying is a problem for kids</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. I don’t like bullies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Bullies scare people</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e. Bullying toughens wimpy kids</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f. Bullies hurt kids</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g. It’s okay to be friends with a bully</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h. It’s okay to bully others online</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i. I can understand why someone would bully other kids</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j. I think bullies should be punished</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>k. Bullies don’t mean to hurt anybody</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>l. Bullies make kids feel bad</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>m. I feel sorry for kids who are bullied</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n. Being bullied is no big deal</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>o. It’s okay to bully others if I don’t get caught</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

36. Is bullying a problem in your school?

☐ Yes ☐ No

37. Do you think that schools should worry about bullying?

☐ Yes ☐ No

38. Please write any other ideas you have about bullying and being bullied. ______

__________________________

__________________________
39. What language is spoken in your home? __________________

40. What country is your family from? __________________

41. Gender:
   □ Male          □ Female

42. Age: ______

43. Race:
   □ White/Caucasian   □ Black/African American
   □ Latino/Hispanic  □ Middle Eastern
   □ Native American  □ Asian
   □ Eastern European □ Other: ____________________
   □ Biracial (Please specify): ____________________

44. Circle only your current grade:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

45. How well do you do in your schoolwork? On your last report card, if you think of all of your subjects, what did you get? (Check one)

   □ mostly As       □ As and Bs
   □ mostly Bs      □ Bs and Cs
   □ mostly Cs      □ Cs and Ds
   □ mostly Ds      □ Ds and lower

I am reading this survey carefully    Yes  No
I am telling the truth on this survey  Yes  No

Thank You!
APPENDIX E
Interpersonal Reactivity Index

INTERPERSONAL REACTIVITY INDEX

The following statements inquire about your thoughts and feelings in a variety of situations. For each item, indicate how well it describes you by choosing the appropriate letter on the scale at the top of the page: A, B, C, D, or E. When you have decided on your answer, fill in the letter on the answer sheet next to the item number. READ EACH ITEM CAREFULLY BEFORE RESPONDING. Answer as honestly as you can. Thank you.

**ANSWER SCALE:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I daydream quite a lot about things that might happen to me.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I often feel worried about people that are not as lucky as me and feel sorry for them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. It is sometimes hard for me to see things from another person’s point of view.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Sometimes I don’t feel sorry for other people when they are having a hard time.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. When reading a book, I try to imagine what the people in the story are thinking.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Emergency situations make me feel worried and upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. When I watch a movie, I usually feel neutral and don’t get too into it.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. When I am arguing with my friends about what we are going to do, I think carefully about what they are saying before I decide whose idea is best.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I want to help people who get treated badly.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Sometimes I feel helpless when people around me are upset.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. When I am angry or upset at someone, I usually try to imagine what he or she is thinking or feeling.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I don’t usually get too involved or obsessed over a good book or movie.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>When I see someone get hurt, I tend to remain calm.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I am not usually bothered by other people’s problems.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>If I’m sure I’m right about something, I don’t waste much time listening to other people’s arguments.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>After I watch a play or a movie, I have felt as though I were one of the characters.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>When people around me are nervous or worried, I get a bit scared and worried too.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>When I see someone being treated unfairly, I don’t always feel sorry for them.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I can usually handle emergency situations pretty well.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I often get affected by things I see happen.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I think people can have different opinions about the same thing.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I am quite a soft-hearted person</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>It is easy for me to pretend that I am the star of my favorite movie.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I am likely to lose control during emergencies.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I sometimes try to understand my friends better by pretending I am them.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>When reading a good story, I imagine what it would be like if the story were true.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I get very worried and upset when I see someone who needs help in an emergency.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I try to think about other people’s feelings before I make mean comments about them.</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX F

Draw A Bullying Situation Directions and Protocol

Instructions for: *Draw a Bullying Situation*

1. Hand child the *Draw a Bullying Situation* worksheet

2. Say: “I’d like you to draw a bullying situation. This can be something you’ve seen or experienced or it can be an example of what you think bullying might look like. Include at least two people in your drawing and tell me when you’re finished. Try not to draw stick people, and make the best drawing you can.”

3. Make a copy of the drawing, and provide the student with a short break.

4. Review drawing and refer to DABS protocol.
THINK OF A BULLYING SITUATION. PLEASE DRAW A PICTURE OF IT BELOW.
Draw a Bullying Situation (DABS) Protocol

So tell me about this picture [wait for response]. Who is in the picture? Is this a [girl, boy, teenager, etc.]? Point to each person drawn in the picture. Label the picture with names, if possible.

How old is each person? What grade is each person in? Point to each person drawn in the picture. Label the picture with ages/grades, if possible.

What is happening in the picture? Ask about any details drawn in the picture. What is the role of each person in the drawing? Label roles of characters drawn.

How is each person feeling right now? Why do you think each person feeling that way? Point to each person drawn in the picture. Label the feelings that the participant states, for each person drawn in the picture.

How can you tell that each person is feeling that way? Point to each person drawn in the picture.

What character in the drawing do you identify with the most? Draw an arrow to identified character.

*Ask any other follow-up questions as needed.
APPENDIX G

MI Cubed Questions and Talent Key Pictures

1. "Would it be easier for you to "teach someone a skill" or "work with a number"
2. "Do you prefer "team" or "individual athletic competition"
3. "Would you rather "do a crossword puzzle" or "build a model"
4. "Would you rather "read a magazine" or "take a walk"
5. "Would you rather "play a board game" or "act in a skit"
6. "Is it easier for you to "clap a rhythm pattern" or "read aloud"
7. "Which do you enjoy more "paintings" or "music"
8. "Are you better at "sports" or "crafts"
9. "Would you prefer to "help someone work through a personal problem" or "go to an exhibit"
10. "Is it easier for you to "figure out the answer to a number puzzle" or "identify a musical tone pattern"
11. "Would it be easier for you to learn "a foreign language" or "sign language"
12. "Is it easier for you to work "alone" or "with a group"
13. "When you write a report, do you "prepare an outline first" or "just start writing"
14. "Is it easier for you to "put numbers in order" or "draw a picture"
15. "Are you more likely to "talk over your day" or "exercise"
16. "If you had an hour of free time, would you "go outdoors" or "read a book"
17. "Is it easier for you to pick out "the incorrect item in a number sequence" or "the wrong note in a tune"
18. "Is it easier for you to follow "a picture diagram" or "written instructions"
19. "Would you rather "listen to music" or "sit quietly"
20. "Would you rather "play a board game" or "take part in a team sport"
21. "Are you more likely to attend "a sporting event" or "a concert"
22. "If you are upset, are you more likely to "ponder the problem" or "take up some vigorous activity"
23. "Would you rather spend time "at music festival" or "a wilderness park"
24. "Would you rather "play a number game" or "watch the stars"
25. "Would you rather listen to "a talk show" or "the birds singing"
26. "Would you rather "read the newspaper" or "be a part of a current-events discussion"
27. "Are you more likely to go to a "hobby store" or "a sporting-goods store"
28. "Are you more likely to "doodle" "daydream"

Motivation Questions:

1. Disagree Strongly
2. Disagree a little
3. Neither disagree or agree
4. Agree a little
5. Agree strongly

1. I see myself as someone who has an active imagination
2. I see myself as someone who has few artistic interests
3. I see myself as someone who does a thorough job
4. I see myself as someone who tends to be lazy
5. I see myself as someone who is generally trusting
6. I see myself as someone who tends to find faults with others
7. I see myself as someone who is relaxed and handles stress well
8. I see myself as someone who gets nervous easily
9. I see myself as someone who is outgoing, sociable
10. I see myself as someone who is reserved