Youth Perceptions of Bullying: Thinking Outside the Box

Kelly L. Wester, Ph.D.
University of North Carolina at Greensboro
Heather C. Trepal, Ph.D.
University of Texas at San Antonio

Abstract: *Bullying, aggression, and intimidation are common phenomena in U.S. schools and can lead to a decline in academic functioning, isolation, distress, and other symptoms of trauma. Although a plethora of research has been conducted on the types, rates, and effects of bullying, none asks students their perceptions of bullying behaviors. In this study Q methodology and interviews with fifth through eighth grade students found differing descriptions of the behaviors they perceive as "bullying." Q factor analysis revealed eight distinct perceptions of bullying behaviors including direct and indirect behaviors. Additionally, some of the youths in the sample did not identify with any of the factors, indicating that there probably are other perceptions of bullying behaviors as well. Probably there are more ways of viewing bullying behaviors, since some of the students did not identify with any of the initial perceptions. Recommendations are given for professionals who work with youths.*

In recent years, violence and aggressive behaviors among school children have been topics of interest in many countries. Bullying behaviors in particular have received a large amount of attention. Researchers have found various ranges of prevalence from 3% to 90% in bullying behaviors among school children (Hoover and Juul 1993; Flannery et al. 2003; Hazler 1996; Hoover and Oliver 1996; Kaltiala-Heino et al. 2000; Oliver, Young, and LaSalle 1994; Olweus 1994; Perry et al. 1988; Rigby and Slee 1991; Slee and Rigby 1993). These depended on (a) how bullying was defined, (b) whether the survey questions used the word "bullying" or described specific behaviors, (c) demographics of the youths questioned, and (d) whether researchers asked about the role of the participant youth as bully, victim, or observer. Regardless of prevalence, bullying is serious because of its effects on the academic success, mental health, and self-esteem of youths (Educational Resource Information Center 1998; Flannery 1997; Flannery, Wester, and Singer *(2004)*; Hazler 1996; Hoover and Oliver 1996; Olweus 2003; Reardon 1997; Singer, Anglin, Song, and Lunghofer 1995).

Authors' Addresses: Wester: Assistant Professor, University of North Carolina at Greensboro, PO Box 26170, Greensboro, NC 27402, e-mail: klwester@uncg.edu; Trepal: Assistant Professor, University of Texas at San Antonio.

Operant Subjectivity, 2004 (January), 27 (2), 68-83.

Because implications for bullies, victims, and bystanders can be serious, great quantities of time, energy, and money have been expended on prevention and intervention in bullying situations. The majority of data has been collected through various self- or teacher-report questionnaires about student experiences of this phenomenon. Typically participants are presented with definitions of bullying developed by researchers with little or no exploration of what behaviors the youths involved perceive as "bullying." To effectively ward off or minimize the negative consequences of bullying, it is essential to acquire a more comprehensive understanding of bullying behaviors as youths with experience define them.

Definitions of Bullying

Although researchers have examined bullying and other aggressive behaviors differently, definitions of bullying have been widely agreed upon in the literature (Farrington 1993; Nansel et al. 2001; Olweus 1978). Nansel and colleagues (2001) summarized these definitions of bullying as a specific type of aggression in which (a) the behavior is intended to harm or disturb, (b) the behavior occurs repeatedly over time, and (c) there is an imbalance of power, with a more powerful person or group attacking a less powerful one.

A few researchers have taken the above criteria in the definitions and asked students their opinions and perceptions of bullying (Guerin and Hennessy 2002; Madsen 1996). Guerin and Hennessy (2002) asked primary school students in Ireland their opinions; and students did not necessarily agree with researchers' definitions. They found that students focused more on the effect of the behavior on the victim than on the actual incident. Guerin and Hennessy also found students believed that bullying need not have the intention to harm another, but may be done because the bully thought it was "funny." Madsen (1996) also found this to be the case, with only 5% of students reporting *intention* as central to the definition of bullying.

The criteria Nansel et al. used are inadequate to express the range of behaviors considered as bullying. Farrington (1993) broadly categorized forms of bullying as: *physical*, *verbal*, or *psychological*. Simmons (2002) added a fourth category – *relational*. Such categories, however, do not address differences between direct and indirect forms of bullying. Previous researchers have not asked young people who have been impacted by direct and indirect aggressive acts what they believe constitutes bullying. The resultant lack of understanding, may explain why adults who work with young people are often unable to intervene effectively in those instances when they recognize that a problem exists. Boulton and Hawker (1997) and Gropper and Froschl (2000) found that adults failed to intervene in bullying situations because either they did not recognize the behavior as bullying or harmful, or they reported not knowing what behaviors were considered to be bullying. Arnold (1994) suggested that although there is a strong consensus

that physical aggression constitutes bullying, there is less agreement on indirect behaviors, such as teasing, social isolation, and spreading rumors. Most individuals are unsure if they view teasing as bullying; however, many youths have reported that they have been teased or verbally harassed (Boutlon and Hawker 1997). Although students and school personnel are unsure whether to categorize teasing and verbal harassment as bullying, Boulton and Hawker (1997) suggested that it can result in many harmful consequences – the worst being suicide. Ireland and Ireland (2003) suggested that an adequate definition to represent the continuum of bullying should include the whole range of direct and indirect aggressive behaviors.

Although indirect forms of bullying can have consequences as severe, or even more severe than direct bullying, indirect forms tend not to be included in research programs. For example, the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (1989) describes bullying behaviors to participants as "...when a student is hit, kicked, threatened, locked inside a room, and things like that" (p. 3). Hoover and colleagues (1992) defined bullying in their study as including "any activity from teasing to physical attacks where one or a group of youngsters pesters a victim...over a long period of time" (p. 8). Clearly, these studies did not include indirect forms of aggression, such as stealing, defacing property, gossiping, or social isolation. It is unknown if youths view this type of behavior as bullying, or simply as negative behavior.

Youth Perceptions of Bullying

Victims of bullying, despite the type of behavior, have a fear of school, and can suffer from depression, low self-esteem, anxiety, dissociation, stress, and academic problems. Simmons (2002) suggested that verbal and nonphysical aggression rarely have been the object of research and may tend to be "invisible because the behavior resists typical displays that we normally associate with bullying" (p. 44).

Although a lot of discussion has taken place around the definitions of bullying and what constitutes bullying behaviors, these discussions have been directed toward studying the prevalence and impact of bullying behaviors. Very little research has been conducted to examine youths' opinions and perceptions of bullying behavior (see Guerin and Hennessy 2002; Ireland and Ireland 2003; Madsen 1996 for exceptions). These studies have found that youths perceive bullying across a broad range of behaviors that include the verbal, physical, and psychological categories set by researchers (Guerin and Hennessy 2002; Madsen 1996). However, these studies did not attempt to determine their perceptions and beliefs of young people about indirect forms of bullying. This inclusion is important, since research has found that younger children are more likely to bully in physical or direct verbal behaviors, with indirect or relational forms of bullying increasing in later childhood (Owens 1996; Rivers and Smith 1994).

One study that dealt with direct and indirect bullying focused on how a sample of currently imprisoned male offenders (juveniles and adult males, 14 years of age through adulthood) defined bullying in terms of intention, repetition, and behavior (Ireland and Ireland 2003). *The individuals in this sample tended to rank direct, overt behaviors (physical, theft-related, direct verbal) as more serious than indirect activities.* The researchers specifically noted, however, that definitions obtained from a prison population differ from those expected from a school or community population.

It is important to note that none of the studies examining perceptions of bullying was conducted within the United States. This poses a problem since bullying has been found to be more severe and occur at higher rates in schools in the U.S. than in any other country (Hoover and Juul 1993; Hoover and Oliver 1996). It has been suggested that recent school tragedies and episodes of school violence within the U.S. involved issues of bullying and revenge (Spivak and Prothrow-Stith 2001). Another shortcoming of the Guerin and Hennessy (2002) and Madsen (1996) studies is that indirect forms of bullying were not examined. Although Ireland and Ireland's (2003) study did examine indirect forms of bullying, they focused on a sample of older adolescents and adults who currently were incarcerated. The research reported here attempted to remedy the perceived shortcomings of prior examples by examining the perceptions of young people (fifth through eighth grade) within the United States regarding behaviors that they felt constitute direct and indirect forms of bullying.

Building a Catalog

The current study is designed to answer the following research questions: (1) What behaviors do youths, between fifth and eighth grade, consider to constitute bullying? (2) How do they explain their choices? We hypothesized (a) that there would be multiple perceptions of bullying behaviors; and based on previous research, (b) that younger students could be expected to consider overt, direct forms of behavior as more characteristic of "bullying" than indirect behaviors.

Methods

Q methodology was selected as the research design to gather students' perceptions of bullying behaviors, because of its usefulness in organizing and measuring subjective perceptions of participants regarding significant personal experiences (Stephenson 1953; Brown 1986; McKeown and Thomas 1988).

Procedure

The first step is to identify a concourse of items encompassing the range of subjective viewpoints, opinions, and beliefs regarding the topic within the target population. The concourse can be derived from the literature,

interviews with representatives of the target population, or any other accessible relevant sources. The concourse is then pared down to manageable size by removing repetition, polar opposites, and obvious consensus items while leaving a comprehensive sample of items (the Q sample) to be sorted by the study participants (Hurd 1999).

Participants are asked to sort the Q sample by ranking items according to a specified condition of instruction. The statements are distributed in an approximation of the normal distribution. Individual interviews are usually conducted with participants after the sorts are completed to ensure that they were able to sufficiently represent their opinions with the items available. The Q sorts are correlated and factor analyzed to facilitate the identification of groups of individuals (factors) whose opinions and viewpoints are similar and distinctive from those of other groups.

This study used a concourse of words derived from relevant literature and interviews with youths from another study (Gregory et al. 2001). The responses combined to provide a concourse of behaviors that included physical, verbal, relational, and psychological forms of bullying. Various professionals (i.e., counselors, professors, police officers, school personnel and adolescents) were consulted to identify duplicates or items that did not make sense as a single word or statement. A reading specialist checked that the words were readable at a fifth grade level. A representative Q sample was structured from 16 items (words or statements), typed onto index cards, and numbered randomly The sample is presented in Table 1 (Appendix).

Sample

A convenience sample of volunteer participants included 45 youths from a fifth grade elementary school class and one middle school (grades 6 through 8) from a middle-class, suburban community in the Midwest. Consent was received from parents and students prior to the sorting and interviews. The sample included 23 boys (51%) and 22 girls (49%) aged 8-15 years (mean=11.64, SD=1.5). Twenty three (51%) were in fifth grade, 8 (18%) in sixth grade, 5 (11%) in seventh grade, and 9 (20%) in eighth grade. The majority (64%) were Caucasian, with 27% African American, 7% Native American, and 2% describing their ethnicity as "other."

After receiving a description of the project and instructions on how to sort their Q sample, the students were asked to rank-order the statements according to the following condition of instruction: "Sort the cards according to whether you believe the behavior is *most like bullying* or *least like bullying*." The rank-ordered array had 7 columns valued from -3 (least like bullying) to +3 (most likely bullying). After each Q sort, the researchers conducted individual semi-structured interviews with students that included questions about how their ranking of the statements related to their opinions and experiences regarding bullying. Middle school students, grades 6-8,

were seen individually by one of the researchers to receive the *condition of instruction*, perform the Q sort, and have a confidential interview. Two students refused the opportunity for a private interview. On average, their sorts and interviews took 20 minutes to complete.

For fifth graders, the project was presented in a classroom setting, though, each sort was completed individually. In a class discussion format researchers explained the project and read each statement or word from the Q sample, asking the students to define the words and give brief examples or descriptions of each statement. Only definitions of the words were discussed in order to ensure that each fifth grader understood each word. Descriptions of what was considered to be bullying, or what was more serious behaviors, were not discussed within the classroom setting. Then the Q sorts were completed by pasting the words onto the response sheet without talking to their classmates. This took approximately 30 minutes. The class discussed bullying, but researchers were not able to interview individuals, thus that data is not included with the fifth grade Q sorts.

Results

The Q sorts were analyzed using PQMethod (Schmolck, 2002a). Principal components factor analysis, unrotated, was employed to analyze the correlations among the Q sorts of all participants in the current study. Eight factors emerged with eigenvalues greater than 1.0, explaining 84% of the variance, the maximum number of factors that PQMethod can handle (Schmolck, 2002b).

Factor 1 accounted for the largest amount of variance (17%) compared to other factors. Factors 2, 3, 4, and 6 each accounted for 10-11% of the variance. The remaining factors each accounted for less than 10%. Table 3 presents all the factor loadings.

Factor loadings of 0.645 and above where considered significant. Seventy-five percent of the youths loaded on one of the eight factors, with 11 youths not loading significantly on any factor. Table 1 displays the demographics of each factor, while Table 2 presents factor scores.

Factors

Factor 1: Physical Bullying

Factor 1 (10 participants; 17% variance explained) is characterized by feelings that bullying is physical that it can result in bodily harm. Loaders on this factor included youths of both genders across all grades and racial groups in the study.

Youths on Factor 1 sorted as "most like bullying," the statements (a) kicking, (b) hitting and punching, and (c) fighting. They reported that "most bullies tend to beat people up," and mentioned that "if someone doesn't like someone, they'll hurt them." Loaders on this factor also reported that

bullying behaviors can "start things and lead to really bad things" and can "really hurt if you kick somebody, [it] hurts a lot." Yet they reported that they did not consider nonphysical behaviors to be bullying — such as prank phone calls, making fun of other people, and isolating or ignoring others. One student mentioned that "a lot of students engage in these [non-physical] behaviors" and a person can "not make you do anything." Another said that these behaviors were "not like bullying, it is not physical. [You] might as well tell someone if you are being threatened." Another youth on this factor reported that he "didn't think it's [*non-physical behavior*] a big problem, maybe for little kids it is a big problem;" a person can "ignore it, it is not like bullying. Some people do it for fun."

Factor 2: Progressive Bullying

Factor 2 represented the viewpoints of four students, accounting for 10% of the variance. The main idea suggests bullying starts off as something less than physical behavior or violence — often verbal epithets, such as threatening to beat someone up. Soon, however, the threats progress to behaviors that are more serious and physical. Similar to the Physical Bullying Factor, Factor 2 included both males and females, with two of the youths identifying themselves as Caucasian and the other two as African American and Other. All the youths on the Factor 2 were middle school students. Statements such as (a) stalking/following, (b) threatening to beat up, and (c) fighting were scored as "most like bullying behaviors," while less direct forms of bullying behaviors were sorted as "least like bullying behaviors."

A female within this group commented that verbal threats "can lead to other behaviors, physical behaviors." Another reported bullying "can get you in trouble with the police." Some youths on Factor 2 spoke about the bullies, saying they "are always there because they know you don't want them to be there," and "saying [they will] beat you up, threatening to make you feel bad about yourself."

Factor 3: Social Consequence Bullying

The third factor included 5 youths, in fifth through eighth grades, with one female identifying as a Native American, while the others were all Caucasian males. Factor 3 accounted for 11% of the variance. These youths regard bullying as behaviors that an individual could receive a "record" for, such as a school record (i.e., suspension, expulsion) or a police record. Thus, the factor label "Social Consequence Bullying." Their Q sorts indicated that (a) threatening to beat up, (b) stalking and following someone around, and (c) destroying property were the behaviors "most like bullying." They stated that these behaviors bring consequences: one "can get a record, suspension for threatening," "[a] record by police for destroying property and stealing," or "can get a record by the principal for fighting." Interestingly, they did not consider teasing, picking on someone, and prank phone calls to be bullying

behaviors, because they were not something for which one could get a record, but also because these are "kindergarten type behaviors" and one "can't make someone do anything."

Factor 4: Verbal Bullying.

Factor 4 characterized bullying as comments that are verbal in nature, including threats, teasing, and making fun of others. This factor explaining 10% of the variance. The three students loaded on Factor 4 included both genders and all grades and racial groups.

Factor 4 sorted the statements (a) threatening/saying to beat up someone after school, (b) intimidation, and (c) making fun of someone/teasing as "most like bullying." Believing that bullying was verbal in nature, one youth stated that "threatening needs to be taken seriously." Another reported that "fighting is a result of bullying," since bullying behaviors are more verbal in nature, suggesting that bullying tends to be verbal harassment that ultimately escalates to fighting and aggression. One male mentioned that "bullying is mostly about telling people you are going to do something, not necessarily action." They were adamant that these behaviors needed to be taken seriously.

Factor 5: Intrusive Bullying

The fifth factor defined by three Caucasian female students, one each in grades 5, 6, and 8, accounted for 9% of the variance. No interviews were conducted with these definers, because the sixth and eighth grade students refused to be interviewed, and no individual interviews were conducted with the fifth grade students. Most of the high scoring behaviors intruded on an individual's safety, personal space, or belongings, or were about pressuring an individual to do something they might not normally do. The statements that these youths sorted as "most like bullying" were (a) making someone do something, (b) stalking or following someone, and (c) destroying property.

Factor 6: Power Differential Bullying

Factor 6 accounted for 11% of the explained variance and was comprised of five youths, three African Americans and two Caucasians, one each from grades 5 and 7, and three from grade 8. The salient statements given by the youths suggested that the bully was stronger than the victim, either verbally or physically. This power differential was what they saw as most characteristic of bullying. Their highly scored statements included (a) picking on someone, (b) kicking, and (c) pushing. One youth reported that a bully tends to "pick on people, particularly pick on [some particular individual]. Really hurt people, [and] physically harm [them]." Another indicated that bullying does not necessarily have to be a physical power differential, but can consist of other types of behavior. He stated "usually people say it is a bigger person – height, bulk, size – that bullies a little person because they think they have a better advantage, but [that is] not true, a smaller person may

bully too." These participants agreed that bullying tends to be mostly physical, and not mental; yet it usually emerges from some type of power difference (e.g., physical, popularity, intelligence) between bully and victim.

Factor 7: Psychological Bullying

Factor 7 included three Caucasian females, one each in grades 5, 6, and 7. As with Factor 3 (Intrusive Bullying), this factor saw bullying as characterized by psychological or mental acts. The statements scored "most like bullying behaviors" included (a) stalking and following someone around, (b) making fun of or teasing, and (c) threatening to beat someone up. One female commented that bullying is "scary, having someone watch your every move," indicating that no matter the form of bullying, it tends to be psychologically frightening. Another reported that bullying is "more likely [to consist of] things that will hurt [victims] feelings, make them cry. Most [bullies] are insecure, and try to make others feel smaller. Intimidation makes them feel bigger." Factor 7 students believe that incidents or situations which intimidate another person or frighten them psychologically are bullying behaviors, yet more direct behaviors such as prank phone calls, and more physical forms of behavior, such as fighting and pushing were "least like bullying." Bully behaviors can "sometimes be in a play way, kind of get upset but doesn't really matter" and that "phone calls don't really matter to people."

Factor 8: Personal Experiences with Bullying

And, finally, included here as a unique factor are the emblematic experiences of one fifth grade African American male. Throughout the class discussion, he mentioned personal experiences such as those he sorted as "most like bullying:" (a) prank phone calls, (b) threatening to beat someone up, and (c) stealing.

Discussion

The purpose of this research was to catalog the perceptions and expectations of young American students about bullying behaviors. Researchers and professionals typically use definitions and examples of bullying behaviors in four general categories: physical, verbal, psychological, and relational (Farrington 1993; Simmons 2002). Although some student views of bullying fit into these categories (specifically Factors: 1 Physical, 4 Verbal, and 7 Psychological), the results of this study also reveal that other perceptions exist.

Our results suggest that some youths perceive bullying only as behaviors that can bring trouble upon the bully or results in the form of a record of sanctions from some authority (Factor 3 Social Consequence Bullying). We also found evidence that some young people perceive bullying as a continuum of behaviors and consequences, perhaps starting out as verbal threats and intimidation and leading to more physically aggressive behaviors

(Factor 2 Progressive Bullying). A few participants narrowed their perceptions to behaviors that are damaging and intrusive (Factor 5 Intrusive Bullying).

Research definitions of bullying typically have included a difference in power — whether physical, verbal, social, or some other form of power. Youths on Factor 6, Power Differential Bullying — mentioned their belief that power differences are characteristic of bullying, reporting that bullies tend to be individuals, whether large or small, who "have a better advantage."

Although eight factors are reported, eleven participants did not load on any factor, suggesting the existence of other perceptions. It is important that professionals who work with youths become familiar with the various possible perceptions, including those behaviors outside conventional thinking in order to intervene effectively.

As Arnold (1994) mentions, professionals tend to agree that physical aggression is a form of bullying. However, youths hold broader opinions including verbal, psychological, and relational bullying. Some researchers claim that indirect forms of bullying are rites of passage (Olweus 1993), and thus are not truly to be considered (Gropper and Froschl 2000; Hazler et al. 2001; Olweus 1994; Simmons 2002). However, youths not only claim that such indirect forms of behaviors exist, but that they produce serious consequences. They specifically named: increased depression, anxiety, and anger; decreased academic achievement; avoidance of school; aggressive behavior; and suicide.

Reading definitions of terms with the group of fifth grade students apparently did not provoke any tailoring of their Q sort responses to fit what they may have perceived as being socially desired behaviors signaled by veiled nuances in the terms. Had this occurred, student factor loadings would have been very similar, expressing the perceived socially desirable view. Responses by the fifth graders instead loaded across 7 of the 8 factors. Thus, it is not believed that this method had any biasing impact on the actual sorting behaviors.

Indirect forms of bullying may not always be recognized (Boulton and Hawker 1997; Hazler, Miller, Carney, and Green 2001), because physical forms of bullying more easily and reliably identified. Hazler and colleagues (2001) found that both teachers and school counselors rated scenarios and vignettes with physical harm or the threat of physical harm as extreme problems, while they scored verbal, social, and emotional scenarios as less severe. Similarly, school personnel may be unsure about whether teasing is a form of bullying; however, many students reported being teased or verbally harassed as bullying behavior (Boulton and Hawker 1997). Youths have personal perceptions of bullying behavior, and this Q factor analysis reveals more perceptions and opinions than are usually mentioned by researchers.

Teachers, counselors, parents, and others who work with youths can increase their effectiveness if they "think outside the box" and consider the multiple perceptions of bullying that exist among young people.

Some youths in this study suggested that verbal bullying is part of a continuum, and can be followed by more physical, violent behaviors. Thus, by the time a teacher, counselor, or other adult intervenes in a physical altercation, bullying behaviors may have already occurred over an extended period, and the psychological harm may have already been done. Sometimes youths also reported that the indirect psychological forms of bullying can be worse than physical forms: bruises and broken bones can heal, while words and mental anguish leave lasting impressions and hidden mental scars.

Olweus (1994) has suggested that adult attitudes about bullying and harassment play major roles in determining the extent to which bullying occurs and might be tolerated within a setting. Gropper and Froschl (2000) found that although adults were present during 227 incidents of bullying and teasing, they failed to intervene in 71% of the incidents. Youths may interpret the passive tolerance of adults who do not intervene as tacitly condoning the behavior (Simmons 2002). Because psychological, relational, and verbal forms of bullying (Groppers and Froshl 2000; Simmons 2002) are not always recognized immediately, professionals may be unaware of the amount of bullying that actually occurs in their classrooms and schools, and throughout the lives of youths. Through intervention and discussion, teachers, counselors, parents, and school administrators can diminish the amount of bullying that takes place in the schools and neighborhoods.

There are some limitations in this study. No individual interviews were held with the fifth graders, and undoubtedly they would have provided richer data and more information about the viewpoints of younger students Also, perceptions of older adolescents in high school were not available for the current study. There was no intention to generalize the findings of this study to all youths, but to gain an understanding of the diverse opinions and perceptions of youths about the views of behaviors that illustrate bullying as they occurred in our participant group.

Suggestions for Future Work

Future research should examine the perceptions of bullying behaviors among older students. Previous research has found that active participation in bullying behaviors decrease among adolescents when examining self-reported data (Olweus 1991; Salmivalli 2002; Smith, Madsen and Moody 1999; Whitney and Smith 1993), thus it would be interesting to use Q sorts to gauge adolescent perspectives about behaviors they characterize as bullying.

The limitations of prior research in the area of youths' perceptions of bullying, leaves many opportunities for future endeavors. Similar questions should be asked of other students, including those in older and younger age

groups. Information should be gathered from different samples to determine whether there is overlap on the factors found in the current study and what additional perceptions might exist. Future researchers should examine whether perceptions of bullying by youths who bully others differ from those of individuals who have been victims or bystanders. This may help individuals who work with youth understand whether universal perceptions of bullying exist across all groups of youths or if perceptions are based on personal experiences.

References

Arnold, F. 1994. Bullying: A tale of everyday life: Reflections on insider research. *Education Action Research* 2:183-93.

Boulton, M. and Hawker, D. 1997. Verbal bullying – the myth of 'sticks and stones.' In *Bullying: Home, school and community*, ed. D. Tattum and G. Herbert, 53-63. London: David Fulton Publishers.

Brown, S.R. 1986. Q technique and method: Principles and procedures. In *New tools for social scientists*, ed. W.D. Berry and M.S. Lewis-Beck, 57-76. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

———. 1993. A primer on Q-methodology. *Operant Subjectivity* 16(2):91-138.

Edwards, C.H. 2001. Student violence and the moral dimension of education. *Psychology in the Schools* 38:249-57.

Educational Resource Information Center. 1998. *What should parents and teachers know about bullying* [brochure]. Washington, DC: Office of Educational Research Improvement.

Farrington, D.P. 1993. Understanding and preventing bullying. In *Crime and justice: An annual review of research, Volume* 17, ed. M. Tonry and N. Morris, 381-458. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Flannery, D. 1997. *School violence: Risk, preventive intervention, and policy*. Urban Diversity Series, No. 109. New York, NY: Educational Resource Information Center, Clearinghouse on Urban Education.

Flannery, D.J., Wester, K.L., and Singer, M.I. 2004. Impact of exposure to violence in school on child mental health and behavior. *Journal of Community Psychology* 32: 559-73.

Gregory, Carol K., Erez, Edna, and Wester, Kelly L. 2001. Bullying in the schools: The reciprocity of people and places. Paper read at the International Conference of the American Society of Criminology, 6-10 November, at University of California, Irvine, California.

Gropper, N., and Froschl, M. 2000. The role of gender in young children's teasing and bullying behaviors. *Equity and Excellence in Education* 33:48-56.

Guerin, S. and Hennessy, E. 2002. Pupils' definitions of bullying. *European Journal of Psychology of Education* 17:249-62.

Hazler, R.J. 1996. Breaking *the cycle of violence: Interventions for bullying and victimization.* Washington, DC: Accelerated Development.

Hazler, R.J., Miller, D.L., Carney, J.V., and Green, S. 2001. Adult recognition of school bullying situations. *Education Research* 43:133-46.

Hoover, J.H. and Juul, K. 1993. Bullying in Europe and the United States. Reclaiming children and youth. *Journal of Emotional Behavior Problems* 2:25-9.

Hoover, J.H., Oliver, R., and Hazler, R.J. 1992. Bullying: Perceptions of adolescent victims in the Midwestern USA. *School Psychology International* 13:5-16.

Hoover, J.H. and Oliver, R. 1996. *The bullying prevention handbook: A guide for principals, teachers and counselors.* Bloomington, IN: National Educational Services.

Hurd, R.C. 1999. Adults view their childhood bereavement experiences. *Death Studies.* 23:17-41.

Ireland, J.L, and Ireland, C.A. 2003. How do offenders define bullying? A study of adult, young, and juvenile male offenders. *Legal Criminal Psychology* 8:159-73.

Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelae, M., Rantanen, P., and Rimpelae, A. 2000. Bullying at school: An indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence* 23:661-74.

McKeown, B. and Thomas, D. 1988. Q Methodology. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Madsen, K.C. 1996. Differing perceptions of bullying and their practical implications. *Educational and Child Psychology* 13:14-22.

Nansel, T.R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R.S., Ruan, W.J., Simons-Morton, B., and Scheidt, P. 2001. Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 25:2094-100.

Oliver, R.L., Young, T.A., and LaSalle, S.M. 1994. Early lessons in bullying and victimization: The help and hindrance of children's literature. *School Counselor* 42:137-46.

Olweus, D. 1978. *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys.* Washington, DC: Hemisphere Publishing Corporation.

———. 1986. *The Olweus bully/victim questionnaire.* Bergen, Norway: University of Bergen.

———. 1991. Bully/victim problems among school children: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. In *The development and treatment of childhood aggression*, ed. D. Pepler, and K. Rubin. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

———. 1993. *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do.* Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

———. 1994. Annotation: Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school-based intervention program. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 35:171-90.

———. 2003. Social problems in school. In *An introduction to developmental psychology,* ed. A. Slater and G. Bremner, 434-54. Malden, MA, US: Blackwell Publishers.

Perry, D.G., Jusel, S.J., and Perry, L.C. 1988. Victims of peer aggression. *Developmental Psychology* 24:807-14.

Reardon, B.A. 1997. *Tolerance – the threshold of peace*, 17-22. Paris: UNESCO Publishing.

Rigby, K. and Slee, P.T. 1991. Bullying among Australian school children: Reported behavior and attitudes toward victims. *Journal of Social Psychology* 131:615-27.

Rivers, I. and Smith, P.K. 1994. Types of bullying behaviour and their correlates. *Aggressive Behavior* 20:359-68.

Salmivalli, C. 2002. Is there an age decline in victimization by peers at school? *Education Research* 44:269-77.

Schmolck, P. 2002a. PQMethod (Version 2.11, adapted from mainframe-program Qmethod written by John Atkinson, 1992) [Computer Software]. Neubiberg, University of the Bundeswehr Munich. Available as freeware at:*//www.rz.unibw-muenchen.de/~p41bsmk/qmethod/*.

———. 2002b. *PQMethod Manual.* Downloaded and installed from Schmolck, P. 2002a as: PQManual.htm.

Simmons, R. 2002. *Odd girl out: The hidden culture of aggression in girls.* NY: Harcourt.

Singer, M., Angling, T., Song, L., and Lunghofer, L. 1995. Adolescents' exposure to violence and associated symptoms of psychological trauma. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 273:477-82.

Slee, P.T., and Rigby, K. 1993. Australian school children's self appraisal of interpersonal relations: The bullying experience. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development* 23:273-82.

Smith, P.K., Madsen, K., and Moody, J. 1999. What causes the age decline in reports of being bullied at school? Towards a developmental analysis of risks of being bullied. *Education Research* 41:267-85.

Spivak, H. and Prothrow-Stith, D. 2001. The need to address bullying – an important component of violence prevention. *Journal of the American Medical Association* 285:2131-2.

Whitney, I., and Smith, P.K. 1993. A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Education Research* 35:3-25.

Appendix

Table 1. Demographics

*Factor**	*1*	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*
Gender								
Male	5	2	4	2	0	3	0	1
Female	5	2	1	1	3	2	3	0
Grade								
5	5	0	3	1	3	1	1	1
6	3	1	1	1	0	0	1	0
7	1	2	0	0	0	1	1	0
8	1	1	1	1	0	3	0	0
Ethnicity								
Caucasian	7	2	4	1	3	2	2	0
African Am.	2	1	0	1	0	3	1	1
Native Am.	1	0	1	1	0	0	0	0
Other	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean Age†	11.40 (1.26)†	13.00 (1.15)	11.20 (2.16)	12.33 (1.52)	10.66 (0.57)	12.40 (1.51)	11.66 (1.15)	12.00 (0.00)

** 1 Physical, 2 Progressive, 3 Social Consequence, 4 Verbal, 5 Intrusive, 6 Power Differential, 7 Psychological, 8 Personal Experiences; † (Standard Deviation of Age)*

Table 2. Average rank order of statements by factor

No.	*Statement*	*Factor**							
		1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*
1	Isolation/Ignoring	-2	-1	0	-2	0	-3	0	-2
2	Gossiping/Rumors	1	-2	-1	1	1	-2	-1	0
3	Stalking/Following	-1	3	2	-3	2	-1	3	-2
4	Name Calling	0	0	-1	0	1	0	-1	-3
5	Hitting/Punching	2	1	-1	0	0	1	0	0
6	Destroying Property (e.g., books or locker)	1	-2	2	-2	2	0	1	-1
7	Pushing	0	1	0	1	-1	2	-2	-1
8	Threatening/saying to beat up someone after school	0	2	3	3	1	1	2	2
9	Kicking	2	1	0	0	-2	2	0	0
10	Stealing	1	-3	1	-1	-3	-1	1	2
11	Fighting	3	2	1	1	-1	0	-2	0
12	Making someone do something/peer pressure	0	0	0	0	3	-1	0	1
13	Prank phone calls	-3	-1	-2	-1	-1	-2	-3	3
14	Intimidation	-1	-1	1	2	-2	0	1	1
15	Making fun of someone/teasing	-2	0	-3	2	0	1	2	-1
16	Picking on someone	-1	0	-2	-1	0	3	-1	1

** 1 Physical, 2 Progressive, 3 Social Consequence, 4 Verbal, 5 Intrusive, 6 Power Differential, 7 Psychological, 8 Personal Experiences*

Table 3. Factor loadings

Participant	*Factor*							
	1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*
1	-0.13	0.31	0.28	0.23	0.24	**0.71**	0.26	0.19
2	0.15	0.43	0.40	0.31	0.03	0.50	0.35	0.23
3	0.32	0.19	**0.76**	-0.30	0.14	0.01	0.15	-0.10
4	**0.68**	0.11	-0.10	-0.08	-0.35	0.25	-0.23	-0.04
5	0.40	**0.64**	0.22	0.08	-0.02	0.36	0.19	-0.30
6	**0.65**	-0.35	0.37	-0.01	0.36	0.02	0.03	-0.03
7	0.18	0.09	-0.13	0.13	-0.15	**0.90**	-0.03	-0.20
8	-0.12	0.03	-0.30	**0.82**	0.13	0.13	0.17	-0.00
9	**0.72**	0.10	0.11	0.14	-0.03	0.06	0.42	0.38
10	0.42	0.12	-0.21	0.03	0.01	**0.71**	-0.01	0.18
11	-0.09	-0.01	**0.75**	0.38	0.06	0.11	-0.10	-0.11
12	-0.21	-0.16	-0.24	0.05	0.39	0.48	0.55	-0.24
13	0.10	0.14	-0.13	0.04	0.31	-0.24	**0.70**	-0.11
14	0.07	0.57	-0.20	-0.10	0.12	0.39	0.05	0.40
15	0.43	**-0.67**	-0.19	0.22	0.23	-0.17	0.16	-0.10
16	-0.06	-0.07	0.52	-0.18	0.02	0.38	**0.67**	-0.15
17	**0.81**	0.01	0.00	0.36	-0.11	0.19	-0.05	0.21
18	-0.04	**0.73**	0.02	0.37	0.07	0.11	0.15	-0.27
19	**0.71**	-0.15	0.01	0.01	0.54	-0.11	-0.15	0.12
20	0.27	0.33	0.12	0.11	-0.14	**0.74**	0.13	0.09
21	**0.64**	0.29	0.25	-0.09	-0.13	0.30	-0.22	0.37
22	**0.87**	0.20	0.13	-0.10	0.02	0.06	-0.03	-0.25
23	0.02	0.18	0.45	-0.16	0.57	-0.03	-0.16	0.45
24	0.06	0.26	0.10	0.10	**0.80**	0.16	0.36	0.02
25	0.02	0.08	-0.10	-0.10	**0.70**	-0.31	0.11	-0.33
26	0.06	-0.17	0.38	-0.09	0.01	-0.48	0.20	0.46
27	0.42	-0.07	0.11	-0.59	0.30	-0.14	0.45	-0.00
28	**0.65**	0.02	0.09	-0.43	-0.18	0.23	-0.13	-0.00
29	-0.27	0.29	0.15	0.02	-0.10	0.08	**0.67**	-0.05
30	-0.12	0.51	-0.08	0.07	0.18	**-0.59**	0.12	-0.07
31	**0.82**	0.11	0.25	0.18	-0.15	0.08	0.07	0.01
32	-0.13	-0.05	0.46	0.21	0.16	0.07	0.62	0.36
33	-0.14	0.20	0.30	**0.83**	-0.19	0.01	-0.04	0.00
34	0.29	0.05	**0.75**	-0.33	-0.12	-0.21	0.18	0.05
35	**0.87**	-0.15	0.04	-0.12	0.13	0.04	-0.04	-0.05
36	-0.05	0.02	**0.82**	0.01	0.22	-0.08	-0.06	0.37
37	0.36	0.58	0.01	0.21	0.14	-0.18	-0.47	0.02
38	0.32	0.45	-0.13	0.46	-0.07	0.03	0.17	0.42
39	0.27	0.11	-0.09	**0.75**	-0.14	0.27	-0.05	0.06
40	0.46	-0.13	-0.01	0.62	0.21	-0.22	0.05	0.39
41	0.05	-0.15	-0.10	-0.21	0.21	-0.05	0.10	**-0.90**
42	-0.19	0.04	0.17	-0.11	**0.91**	-0.03	-0.01	-0.07
43	0.22	0.11	**0.70**	-0.08	-0.01	-0.01	0.53	0.03
44	0.05	**0.76**	0.14	0.06	0.33	0.26	0.13	-0.12
45	0.41	-0.35	-0.07	-0.10	-0.12	0.21	-0.27	0.44

Note: Shaded bold print indicates participant loaded significantly on this factor ($p<0.01$).