PERCEPTIONS OF BULLYING: A COMPARISON OF

PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TEACHERS

By

LISA A. CURB

Bachelor of Arts/English
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1983

Master of Education/Reading Specialist
University of Oklahoma
Norman, Oklahoma
1987

Master of Science/Psychology
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
2011

Submitted to the Faculty of the
Graduate College of the
Oklahoma State University
in partial fulfillment of
the requirements for
the Degree of
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY
July, 2014

PERCEPTIONS OF BULLYING: A COMPARISON OF

PRE-SERVICE AND IN-SERVICE TEACHERS

Dissertation Approved:

Dr. Shelia M. Kennison
_____
Dissertation Adviser

Dr. James W. Grice
_____

Dr. Charles I. Abramson
_____

Dr. Amanda Morris
_____

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Name: LISA A. CURB

Date of Degree: JULY, 2014

Title of Study: PERCEPTIONS OF BULLYING: A COMPARISON OF PRE-SERVICE

AND IN-SERVICE TEACHERS

Major Field: PSYCHOLOGY

Abstract: Bullying continues to exist in schools and students want teachers to take an active role in prevention and intervention. Prior research has explored why teachers do not intervene in bullying, but a gap exists in the research in regard to how the personal characteristics of teachers are related to their approach to bullying. This research addresses this. Studies on the perspectives and characteristics of pre-service and in-service teachers were conducted. The research tested the hypothesis that certain characteristics of teachers will be related to teachers being more willing to intervene in bullying situations and be related to teachers' attitudes about bullying. It was determined that pre-service and in-service teachers differed in their attitudes and approaches to bullying. Pre-service teachers perceived bullying as more serious. Pre-service teachers tended to also rate themselves as more feminine than in-service teachers. Pre-service teachers also indicated that they were not prepared to handle bullying incidents, as they lacked confidence. Pre-service also had views that differed from in-service in regard to the school climate and environment and how bullying would be handled. There were some differences in thinking styles that predicted preferred interventions. Both types of teachers viewed physical bullying as more serious than relational aggression. Some differences existed in recognizing bullying in scenarios containing a student with a disability compared to a student without a disability. The results suggest that the ideal training for teachers in how to handle bullying may be training that is tailored specifically for the type of teacher (i.e. pre-service versus in-service).

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Bullying was formally recognized as a problem by the American Medical

Association in 2001. A large national study of over 15,000 students in grades 6 through

10 was published in the *Journal of the American Medical Association* (*JAMA, 2001*).

This study showed that about 30% of students had moderate or frequent bullying

involvement (Nansel et al., 2001). Bullying is still a problem. A different study of over

15,000 students in grades 4 through 12 was conducted within one school district. Results

(2007) indicated 49% of students were victims of bullying. More than 30% of students

had bullied someone in the past month (Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O'Brennan, 2007).

Research indicates students think teachers should be proactive in dealing with

bullying (Cunningham, Cunningham, Ratcliff, & Vaillancourt, 2010). For many reasons,

teachers do not intervene in bullying. The National Education Association (NEA) study

in 2013 stressed the importance of bullying prevention and that teachers want more

training (Bradshaw, Waasdorp, & O'Brennan). This research, exploratory in nature, will

determine if teachers' individual thinking styles could be a factor in how they approach

dealing with student bullying. Bullying is referred to as a "potentially intense stressor for

teachers" indicating the most stress for teachers is caused by time constraints, followed

by the attitudes and behaviors of students (Byrne, 1991; Kahn et al., 2012). The students expect the teachers to intervene and teachers' lack of training is just one of the reasons they do not intervene in bullying.

<div align="center">Significance of the Present Study</div>

The purpose of the present research was to investigate whether teachers' characteristics are related to their willingness to address student bullying situations. Among the characteristics examined is thinking style. This is the first known study to investigate teachers' perspectives on bullying and thinking style. Other personal characteristics include personality, femininity/masculinity, empathy, and sympathy. In-service and pre-service teachers were asked about their perceptions of bullying situations, their ideas for addressing bullying, and their willingness to intervene. Another aspect of research examined the preferred type of interventions to aid students with versus without a disability that were bullied. The attitude toward bullying intervention training is also examined.

CHAPTER II

LITERATURE REVIEW

Bullying is defined by the pioneer researcher Olweus as an anti-social behavior pattern that consists of (1) intentional negative behavior that is (2) typically repeated and (3) targeted at someone who has trouble defending himself or herself (Olweus, 2011, 1983, 1996, 1991). However, the definition used in studies may vary in the United States and what constitutes bullying may also vary somewhat in other countries as well (Nansel, Craig, Overpeck, Saluja, & Ruan, 2004). Direct bullying includes physical bullying and verbal bullying. Indirect bullying includes exclusion and relational aggression. In physical bullying, the emphasis is on contact which includes fighting or damaging personal property or depantsing (Crick, Grotpeter, & Bigbee, 2002). Verbal bullying consists of using language inappropriately through name-calling, mocking, humiliating, or abusing (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). This language may be abusive, intimidating or racist (Rose, Monda-Amaya, & Espelage, 2011). Indirect bullying consists of activities meant to damage or destroy a relationship. Behaviors of this nature include intentionally spreading rumors, telling lies about others, or ignoring/isolating peers or giving dirty looks (Doll & Swearer, 2006; Marini, Dane, & Bosaski, 2006; Sullivan, Cleary, & Sullivan, 2004; Walker, Colvin, & Ramsey, 2005; Rose, Monda-Amaya, & Espelage, 2011; Archer & Coyne, 2005).

Bullying has become widely recognized as a problem in schools (Dake, Price, Telljohann, & Funk, 2003; Beran & Tutty, 2002; Robers, Zhang, Truman, & Snyder, 2011; Unnerver & Cornell, 2004; Nansel et al., 2001; Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O'Brennan, 2007). Recently, a global initiative was undertaken in 30 countries, including the United States. This first nationally representative research on bullying was funded by the National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (NICHD) which is a branch of the National Institute of Health. Thirty countries participated in this project coordinated by the World Health Organization. Data were obtained from 15,686 students surveyed in public and private schools in grades 6 through 10. As mentioned, results were published in the April 25, 2001 issue of the *Journal of the American Medical Association (JAMA).* It showed that about 30% of the students had moderate or frequent bullying involvement, 10.6% were victims, and 6.3% were both bullies and victims (Nansel et al., 2001). Throughout the year, bullying incidents are publicized. Recently, CNN reported a story of a girl that was bullied. She explained on video how it made her feel. Her mom interviewed her and she became emotional and cried as she talked about the bullying that was happening to her. The video went viral. According to the parent's recount, the girl was called into the principal's office and made to feel that it was her fault, and that she should not have gone to that extreme. The bullying had been occurring for five and one-half months. Wallace (CNN, 2014) wrote the parent said (when talking about how the school advised her child), " 'she's been told to ignore it. She's been told to disregard it. Basically, she's been told to stuff her emotions and get on with life' " (p. 1). Studies of students' experiences with bullying have suggested that despite the fact that teachers can play a key role in stopping bullying, teachers do not always intervene

4

(Pepler, Smith, & Rigby, 2004; Rigby & Bagshaw, 2003). The purpose of the present research is to investigate how the personal characteristics of pre-service (education majors) and in-service (experienced) teachers are related to their approach to bullying.

There are many reasons teachers may not intervene in bullying. Teachers may reside in districts whose administrators instruct them not to become involved in bullying issues. Perhaps administrators do not want to take a stand on this issue and focus negative attention on their school by admitting there is a problem. They, too, may choose to ignore the situation. According to Latane and Darley's bystander theory, people's reactions to an event are the same as others around them. The responsibility does not rest on one individual as it does when he or she is alone; it is shared as there is diffusion of any potential blame, and the result may be that nobody becomes involved and helps (Darley & Latane, 1968). If they bring the attention into focus, they may be worried that administrators may think they have "ineffective classroom management skills" (Marshall, Vargas, Meyers, Graybill, & Skoczylas, 2009, p. 139).

Further, some teachers do not perceive bullying is a problem that is occurring in their schools. In Mishna's study of four large public schools in the United States, about one half of the parents and teachers did not know the child/student had been bullied (Mishna, Pepler & Wiener, 2006). In addition, teachers may not perceive bullying is as widespread as students indicate. In a survey of more than 800 eighth graders and teachers/staff to determine the percentage of students who were bullied at school, teachers/staff said 16% were bullied compared to students' response of about 59% that were bullied (Barone, 1995).

Teachers may not intervene in that they do not perceive it their responsibility as policies are in place to deal with bullying, or they limit their responsibility to academic concerns or distracting behavior. One policy in place is that set forth by the United Nations. Although the term bullying is not used, there is a mandate from the United Nations. The requirement to take care of the child's welfare is identified in Article 19 of the United Nations Convention on Rights of the Child and includes such phrases as "parties shall take all appropriate legislative, administrative, social and educational measures to protect the child from all forms of physical or mental violence, injury, or abuse, neglect or negligent treatment, maltreatment or exploitation…" (Article 19, United Nations, 1989). A public school policy is the Zero Tolerance policy. The school policies in place deal with physical aggression, but no guidelines exist to deter nonphysical bullying (Mishna et al., 2006). Some teachers do not perceive disciplining students in areas outside of their classroom such as the halls and cafeteria as one of their responsibilities. In one study, 42% of the teachers supervising boys' bathrooms and 34% of those in charge of the girls' bathrooms noticed bullying and lack of supervision (Cooper, Abousally, Austin, Boyt, & Hawtrey, 2003). Bliding, Holm, and Hagglund (2002) state that a lot of bullying also occurs in corridors and near the lockers as well as in the library and recess area.

Teachers may not intervene because they think that bullying is a part of growing up (Barone, 1995) or they view bullying as a student's individual problem that he or she needs to work through without intervention (Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003). Further, teachers may equate bullying with tattling. For instance, one study showed that 8% of students believed they would be told to stop lying if they told about bullying and

about 13% believe that teachers are not interested, according to a study of 25 schools (Glover, Gough, & Johnson with Cartwright, 2000). Some teachers may not be aware that the long-term, non-physical bullying is the type of bullying experienced most (Byrne, 1999; Corsaro & Eder, 1993; Rigby, 1996, and Smith, Madsen, & Moody, 1999). To illustrate, in a study in Turkey, it was uncommon for teachers to think of bullying as causing emotional hurt (Sahin, 2010). Further, teachers may not have considered bullying from children's perspectives. There are few studies conducted using young children (Gillies-Rezo & Bosacki, 2003), and even so, there is little research from the children's point of view (Cullingford & Morrison, 1995). Teachers may have trouble distinguishing between teasing and bullying, so they may not seek to clarify the event that is happening (McKinley, 2004). Further, teachers may not intervene because they have trouble identifying the bullies. A study found that teachers could more accurately identify bullies in elementary school than middle school (Leff, Kupersmidt, Patterson, & Power, 1999).

In addition, teachers may not intervene if they did not see the bullying occurring because it was of a more subtle nature or in areas outside of the classroom. In fact, teachers are not likely to witness very many instances of bullying. Pepler, Craig, and Connolly (1997) found that teachers witness one of every 25 bullying incidents. Perhaps the teachers miss some bullying because of their preconceived notions in their minds of what a bully is. Teachers may be aware of physical bullying, but tend to overlook more subtle types not as easily seen such as name-calling, rumor spreading, and excluding others (Doll, Song, & Siemers, 2004; Griffin & Gross, 2004; Hazler, Miller, Carney, & Green, 2001). Further, when it is done in an indirect form and carried out by a third

party, teachers do not perceive it as bullying (Boulton, 1997; Yoon & Kerber, 2003). A study of 1,302 students ages 12 to 16-years-old and teachers and staff in four urban schools showed that teachers were less likely to state indirect bullying behaviors such as social exclusion, hateful emails, text messages, and rumors as bullying, but if they did, they were not viewed as serious of an offense as direct bullying behaviors (Maunder, Harrop, & Tattersall, 2010).

Teachers may just tolerate the bullying (Williams & Cornell, 2006). One of three teachers did not think they were capable of stopping bullying, according to a study by Harris and Willoughby (2003). Further, a study found that sometimes teachers' interventions did not work. In a study of 18/29 times (62%) when teachers intervened in bullying, only 3/18 of the time (17%) was the intervention successful in that bullying did not occur again by that student (Berguno, Leroux, McAinsh, & Shaikh, 2004). Further, some teachers know that their directive will not have lasting effect, because according to research by Viding, McCrory, Blakemore, and Frederickson (2011), about one half of the children who are bullies have callous-unemotional traits and do not show empathy toward others. Further, some teachers do not intervene because they are afraid their actions will make the situation worse. They ignore bullying. Craig, Henderson, and Murphy (2000) cite the research of Stephenson and Smith (1989) in which they found out that although 91% of teachers know that bullying occurs in class, 25% think it is helpful to ignore it. Mishna related that students said telling an adult may make the situation worse. "One boy claimed, 'they think that if I go to the principal's office and tell on him they won't do it anymore, but they'll do it more because you told on them' " (Mishna, 2004, p. 239).

As evidenced by this comment, seeking help in situations involving indirect bullying can "backfire" and lead to an increase in bullying (Newman & Murray, 2005).

Instead of ignoring the situation, some teachers side with the bully to make their job easier, and may express no concern with the bullying that goes on because they themselves bully students. Yoneyana and Naito (2003) found that teachers either bully or side with the bully because if they align themselves with the powerful students, they have better classroom management. According to Olweus (1999), in one half of the classes surveyed, 10% of elementary teachers had bullied students. James and others (2008) found that almost 31% of the students said teachers bullied them. The most common forms of bullying were being called names and being ignored.

Research indicates students think teachers should be proactive in dealing with school bullying (Cunningham, Cunningham, Ratcliffe, & Vaillancourt, 2010). Findings indicate students want teachers to more precisely define bullying, promote activities at recess so students do not create mischief when they have nothing to do, and space apart and supervise less visible areas. Further, students stated that teachers should take an active role in regrouping students to help eliminate cliques and teach social skills. If the goal is to get teachers involved in implementing bullying prevention and intervention, they must become invested in the task. Perhaps the extent to which teachers understand bullying and are invested is determined by their thinking styles, as will be explored by this study.

The purpose of the present research was to test the hypothesis that personal characteristics of teachers will be related to how they approach bullying. The research will focus on characteristics that have been studied previously in the literature (e. g.

9

thinking styles) as well as characteristics familiar in individual differences research (e. g. empathy, personality, and masculinity-femininity). The thinking styles of teachers have received some attention in prior research. Sternberg's theory of mental self-government (1988, 1990, 1994, 1997) describes thinking styles. Sternberg explains that people have preferences for solving problems in regard to their organization and approach and use one or more of 13 thinking styles. These thinking styles are listed in five dimensions: (1) functions (legislative, executive, and judicial), (2) forms (hierarchical, monarchic, oligarchic, and anarchic), (3) levels (global and local), (4) scopes (internal and external) and (5) values (liberal and conservative) (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005). Table 1 shows the 13 thinking styles and subdivisions in a Threefold Model of Intellectual Styles (Zhang & Sternberg, 2005) as displayed in Ponce-Garcia, 2011.

Zhang, Sternberg, and Rayner (2012) explain in more detail about the three main types of thinking styles in the subsequent discussion. The Type I thinking style is characterized by a "low degree of structure" and "cognitive complexity" (Zhang et al., 2012, p. 240). Those having a Type I thinking style are high achievers on analysis, solving problems, and essays (Fan & Zhang, 2009). Type I had high self-esteem (Zhang 2002; Zhang & Postiglione, 2001) and could handle emotional stress (Zhang, 2008, 2009). The Type I thinking styles can be subdivided as follows (Zhang, Sternberg, & Fan, 2013). Legislative thinking is making each decision by oneself. Judicial thinking is like that of an evaluator. Liberal thinking focuses on thinking creatively about new ideas. Global thinking takes in the whole picture. Hierarchical thinking has emphasis on prioritizing different task. The Type II thinking style is characterized as having a "high degree of structure" and "cognitive simplicity" (Zhang et al., 2012, p 240). These Type

II thinkers did best on multiple choice and closed tests (Fan & Zhang, 2009). Zhang and others (2013) explain these subdivisions. Executive thinking implements tasks within a framework or guidelines, whereas conservative thinking focuses on thinking like in the traditional past. Local thinking is paying attention to concrete details, and monarchic thinking is giving attention to one matter at a time. The Type III thinking style is characterized by several boundaries. These include internal which is working by one's self, external which is working with others, oligarchic which is dividing attention and giving some to everything without prioritizing, and anarchic which is giving attention to the pressing task of the moment, as explained by Zhang et al., 2013.

Thinking styles have been studied in teachers. As stated, legislative are more likely to be independent thinkers and due to their analysis may have more creative ideas. Research indicates elementary teachers are more likely to have legislative thinking styles (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1995) characterized by enjoying "being engaged in tasks that require self-instruction and self-direction" (Zhang & Sternberg, 2002, p. 5). Life experiences help determine the thinking styles of teachers. Teachers with more work and travel experience are more likely to be legislative. Their work experience has given them opportunity to solve novel and ambiguous situations in which they have to think creatively (Zhang & Sternberg, 2002). However, a study by Bishop and Foster (2011) of teachers in an education program found that of the five most popular thinking styles, executive rather than legislative, appeared in three out of five of the combinations of styles. It is commonly accepted that secondary teachers are more likely to have an executive thinking style (Sternberg & Grigorenko, 1995). These teachers prefer to have a set of clear instructions to use for doing tasks (Zhang & Sternberg, 2002). Females are

11

more likely to have executive thinking styles compared to males (Bishop & Foster, 2011) yet Bishop and Foster contend that those up to age 30 are more executive. This all comes into focus in relation to bullying. As indicated in research, traditional teaching may strongly reward the executive type thinker student who does what he or she is told, whereas the student who is the bully is viewed as a nuisance because, in his legislative style of thinking, he "likes to decide what to do and how to do it, rather than be told" (Sternberg & Zhang, 2005, p. 247; Sternberg, Grigorenko, & Zhang, 2008). It is possible that the students who bully are more likely to have legislative thinking styles while their middle school teachers have executive thinking styles, so this is not a good match. Recall, also, that the majority of teachers are females, and females are more likely to have an executive style of thinking. Further, these executive teachers like clear instructions laid out for them so they are likely to use the textbook as their main teaching tool rather than deviate and design their own lesson plans. Research indicates that some teachers do not know how to intervene in bullying, so with these teachers having only a limited number of priorities they know they can accomplish and no clear cut steps to follow, it is unlikely they will intervene in bullying situations.

Some research exists in regard to academic achievement. Fan and Zhang (2009) found those who had thinking styles of executive, conservative, monarchic, and local did worse on analysis and problem solving tests. There is a gap in the research in looking at the thinking styles of teachers in relation to bullying. This research aims to determine if teachers prefer to use approaches to bullying that are compatible with their thinking styles. The research will begin with teachers being able to identify the bullying behavior. If teachers have inability to identify bullying and lack training in dealing with bullies,

they are not going to be very effective in helping students. Several studies indicate

teachers do not think their college courses prepared them for dealing with classroom

management, and especially not in dealing with bullying issues (Merrett & Wheldall,

1993; Craig, Bell, & Leschied, 2011). Experienced in-service teachers, according to

another study, lack confidence to deal with bullies regardless of the number of years

taught. Further, 87 percent of teachers want more training (Boulton, 1997). Based on

this lack of training, it is expected that teachers do not know developmentally appropriate

interventions for dealing with bullying. Research found that "a lack of understanding

about the specific tools for promoting developmentally appropriate environments remains

the challenge for teacher education programs," according to Ricard, Brown, and Sanders

(2002, p. 1). Students have noticed a deficit in their developmental training as well,

according to research by Lord and McFarland (2010). Based on past research, teachers

do not know interventions that would be appropriate for dealing with bullying at different

ages. Curb (2010) explains there are interventions that are appropriate at different ages

based on Piaget's and Vygotsky's ideas (Miller, 1996).

Exploratory research will determine if it is important to match the thinking styles

of teachers with a job that matches their thinking styles in implementing/preventing

bullying among students. This is based on research by Zhang, Sternberg, and Rayner,

(2012) who state, "thinking styles might be used to characterize how one prefers to think

about material as one is learning or after one already knows it" (p. 5). Further, "if an

individual's intellectual style matches the information-processing requirements of his or

her job role or task, it is more likely that the individual will perform effectively" (p. 279)

according to Zhang, Sternberg, and Rayner (2012) who reference the research of Hayes

and Allison (1994). Support for this is evidenced by Rigby (2002) who affirms that the process of developing a program may be as important as the content.

Further, this research will investigate to determine whether or not teachers' thinking style will influence their ability to recognize and intervene in bullying situations in similar ways for students with versus without a disability. According to Whitney, Smith, and Thompson (1994), students with cognitive disabilities were 2 to 3 times more likely to be bullied; if they had a physical disability, they were 2 to 4 times more likely to be bullied. Self-reports of teachers and students indicate that more bullying is done to students with disabilities than those who are non-disabled. According to a literature review on bullying regarding children with disabilities, "very few studies address intervention strategies for individual subgroups of students. This gap in the literature may translate to the implementation of inadequate practices or support for students with disabilities who are subjected to bullying" (Rose, Monda-Amaya, & Espelage, 2011, p. 125).

The present research will also investigate whether other personal characteristics (besides thinking styles) will be related to teachers' approach to bullying. These characteristics include empathy and Big 5 personality traits. Having empathy is a desirable trait for the teacher. Empathy allows one to tune in to what someone is feeling or thinking. "Empathy allows us to understand the intentions of others, predict their behavior, and experience an emotion triggered by their emotion" (Baron-Cohen, & Wheelwright, 2004, p. 163). Empathy is viewed as having affective and cognitive components that co-occur. The affective approach states empathy is "an observer's emotional response to the affective state of another" (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright,

2004, p. 164). The cognitive approach stresses "understanding the others' feelings" (Baron-Cohen, & Wheelwright, 2004, p. 164).

Masculinity and femininity are related to bullying perception. It is expected that teachers' gender role characteristics will impact their ability to identify the serious nature of various types of bullying. Siann, Callaghan, Lockhart, & Rawson (1993) found that females were more likely to identify behavior as bullying than males; further, females rated both direct and indirect bullying as more serious than males, but males rated physical bullying as more serious than females. Our study will not consider gender, but will measure the degree of masculine or feminine traits and percentage in relation to type of thinking style, according to the *Bem Sex Role Inventory* (Bem, 1974).

With respect to the Big 5 personality traits, it is expected that those teachers who score highest on the intellect/openness category will more likely be Type I thinkers and have more comprehensive bullying intervention strategies than teachers that score highest in the other four personality categories.

CHAPTER III

Method

Participants

The research design consisted of two sample populations: pre-service teachers, those in elementary or secondary education programs who plan to teach, and in-service teachers, those who are currently teaching. There were 91 pre-service teachers and 63 in-service teachers that participated in the survey for a total of 154 teachers. Of these, 50 pre-service teachers and 40 in-service teachers completed all of the surveys. For the *TSI-R2*, for pre-service, there were originally the following number of participants: Type 1 = 37, Type II = 42, and Type III = 12 for a total of 91. For in-service, there were the following number of participants: Type I = 33, Type II = 16, and Type III = 13 for a total of 62. One in-service participant gave too many answers that were the same, so that participant was deleted. There were 27 participants that did not have one dominant Type I, II, or III thinking style, so instead of counting them twice, they were excluded from the data. The demographics of self-identity by ethnicity, age, and grade/subject desired or taught are tabulated (See Table 2).

Recruitment and Procedure

Pre-service teacher participants were education majors at Oklahoma State University in Stillwater and the University of Central Oklahoma in Edmond. Participants

16

were recruited by faculty members and email. In-service teachers were recruited via an online newsletter emailed to all teachers in Oklahoma by the Oklahoma State Department of Education. In addition, a sample of teachers whose emails were listed in the directory of Oklahoma school districts received an invitation to participate in the study. Teachers accessed the online survey by an email link to *Survey Monkey*. After giving consent to participate and being informed that the survey would require about 65 minutes to complete, participants began the surveys. First, it was expected that teachers would be interested in the topic of student bullying that has been publicized frequently in the past few years. Second, it was expected that teachers would take the time required to complete the entire online survey, especially since a prompt was given to alert them of the estimated time needed. After completing the survey, pre-service teachers and in-service teachers were eligible to enter a drawing for a gift card packet consisting of a $100 gift card to a mall, a $50 gift card to a restaurant, and a $50 gift card to a candy store. Participants could enter the drawing by using an email of choice that was not linked to their responses to the survey.

Materials

A statement of informed consent was obtained before the participants began the study. To assess overall differences in pre-service and in-service teachers, the teachers took the *Survey for Assessing Teachers' Perceptions about Bullying (Curb, & Kennison, 2012) (*Appendices A and B*)*. After responding to demographic statements, teachers read such descriptors as "I feel confident in dealing with bullies" and "Dealing with bullying will not be one of my responsibilities as a teacher." Most of the statements were coded on a 5-point Likert-type scale ranging from *strongly agree* to *strongly disagree*. Some of

the statements, especially those referring to their personal experiences, were also coded on a 5-point Likert-type scale but the indicators were adjusted to range from *very much* to *not at all.* An example of such a statement is "I experienced verbal bullying in the form of any one or more of the following: being called names, mocked, being humiliated or intimidated out-loud, or hearing racist comments when I was in school."

To determine thinking style, which is one's cognitive style, the *Thinking Styles Inventory, Revised II (TSI-R2)* (Sternberg, Wagner, & Zhang, 2007) (Appendix C) was used. This self-report test consists of subdivisions of legislative, executive, judicial, global, local, liberal, conservative, hierarchical, monarchic, oligarchic, anarchic, internal, and external. There are five questions for each subdivision. There are groupings of conservative versus liberal, levels of global versus local, functions of legislative, executive, and judicial, and styles of monarchic, hierarchical, oligarchic, and anarchic, and internal versus external. Responses to the questions are selected by using a 7-point Likert-type scale which ranges from *not at all well* to *extremely well.* Reliability for the inventory is conservative .83, liberal .86, global .68, local .63, legislative .77, executive .84, judicial .71, monarchic .51, hierarchic .84, oligarchic .66, anarchic.54, internal .76, and external .64 (Zhang, 2000). To determine an overall thinking style, the scores for the components that fall under each group were summed and divided by the number of components in that main group. Type 1 includes legislative, judicial, hierarchical, liberal, and global. Type II includes executive, conservative, local, and monarchic. Type III includes oligarchic, anarchic, external, and internal. To interpret the value of the correlation coefficient, Dancey and Reidy's (2004) scale was used. A $0.1 - 0.3 =$ weak; $0.4 - 0.6 =$ moderate; $0.7 - 0.9 =$ strong; $1 =$ perfect.

The *Thinking Styles in Regard to Bullying Inventory (BTSI)* (Kennison & Curb, 2012) is a modified version of the *Thinking Styles Inventory, Revised II (TSI-R2)* (Sternberg, Wagner, & Zhang, 2007) in relation to bullying.   It tests the same preferences as the thinking styles test, but each question is related to some aspect of bullying. A correlation was made between each participant's general thinking style and specific thinking style in regard to bullying on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI.* These items are displayed in Appendix D.

To determine teachers' definitions of what constitutes bullying, the seriousness of the bullying, and their likeliness to intervene, I used a modified version of the *Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire (BAQ)* Part I developed by Craig, Henderson, and Murphy (2000) and later modified by Yoon and Kerber (2003) and Curb and Kennison (2012). The factors included various types of bullying (physical, verbal, and social exclusion) and whether or not the bullying was witnessed or not. This research was expanded, as suggested by O'Haver to look at other types of relational aggression, besides that of social exclusion (2011). I crossed factors of type of bullying (physical, verbal, social exclusion, rumors, smirk/eye roll, and dirty looks) and whether or not the bullying was witnessed or not. Since this was exploratory to look at the students with disabilities population more specifically, one half of the scenarios in each of the survey focused on the regular population and one half of the scenarios focused on the students with disabilities population. Care was taken to follow the same format as authors Craig, Henderson, and Murphy (2000) to include the components of a negative action (one that caused some type of pain), and an imbalance of power (in which a student picks on another without being provoked). I have made slight changes in the wording to make it

appropriate for teachers of students of kindergarten through 12th grade. In the original

version, some scenarios indicate only an elementary student, yet research indicates

bullying is most likely to peak in middle school (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2001) and

indirect bullying increases with age (Cairns, Cairns, Neckerman, Ferguson, & Gariepy,

1989), and is used more by older than younger students (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, &

Kaukiainen, 1992; Cairns et al., 1989). To make the scenarios appropriate for all grades

k through 12, a few changes, noted below were made. As students become older, they

are not likely to have *tears* in most of the situations, but will likely be *very upset*. I made

changes in the vignettes to reflect this. As for the specific changes I made for Scenarios

#4 and #10, words used to convey the idea of crying were omitted and replaced with the

words *very upset*. A copy of the questionnaire used in the present research is displayed in

Appendix F.

After reading each scenario, or rather as some refer to it as a vignette, a question

was added of "Is this bullying?" to which the participant was asked to respond *yes* or *no*.

The reader responded to questions that followed about the seriousness of the conflict and

likeliness to intervene, rating their response on a 5-point Liker-type scale for each. The

question of "If you would intervene in this situation, what would you do with the

perpetrator?" was changed so the response was analyzed not only in terms of highest

level of involvement, but comprehensiveness in types of responses. It was replaced with

"Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do."

Another question of "If you are not likely to intervene, why not?" was added. The

scoring described by Yoon and Kerber (2003) was used for the level of involvement

question. The open ended responses were coded on a six-point scale to indicate the level

of involvement in dealing with the perpetrator. A higher score indicated more involvement. The following are stated in Yoon and Kerber (2003) for scoring and examples.

1. No intervention – ignoring

2. Peer resolution – have students talk about their problems

3. Discuss rules with the whole class – class discussion

4. Indication of intolerable behaviors – have a discussion with the student, indicating that bullying behavior is not acceptable

5. Discipline students who have bullying behaviors – privileges are immediately removed; time out is used

6. Report of incident to higher authority—parents are informed and perhaps called; student sent to office

Further, the following additional questions were added: "Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

To assess respondent personality, the *Mini-Markers* survey (Saucier, 1994) (See Appendix G) was used. It is a brief survey containing 40 adjectives related to the Big Five personality factors (i. e. extraversion, conscientiousness, agreeableness, openness, and neuroticism). There is a 9-point *Likert-type* scale ranging from *extremely inaccurate* to *extremely accurate*.

To assess respondent empathy, the *Empathy Quotient* (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright (2004) (See Appendix H) was used. This survey consists of 60 questions. Of those, 40 assess empathy and the other 20 are intended to distract the participant from

the intense empathy focus. If the participant selects *definitely agree or definitely disagree*, he or she receives two points; likewise, if the participant responds *slightly agree* or *slightly disagree*, he or she receives one point. This survey was determined to have construct and external validity. It has a high alpha coefficient and is correlated with independent measures. The Empathy Quotient had a test-retest reliability of $r = 0.97$ (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004).

To determine the teacher's level of masculinity and femininity gender role traits, the *Bem Sex Role Inventory (BSRI)* (Bem, 1974) (See Appendix E) was used. This self-report test consists of 60 items. There are three subdivisions of feminine (affectionate, gentle), masculine (independent, forceful), or neutral (adaptable, jealous). Responses to the questions are selected by using a 7-point Likert scale which ranges from *never* or *almost never true* to *always* or *almost always true*. Examples of words or phrases to which one gives a self-rating include *conscientious* as well as *has leadership abilities* and *tactful.* The *BSRI* was found to have high internal consistency and test-retest reliability. Coefficient alphas computed for masculinity and femininity" were "masculinity alpha = .86 and femininity alpha = .82" and "re-test reliability were masculinity $r = .90$; femininity $r = .90$; androgyny $r = .93$" (Holt & Ellis, 1998, p. 930).

The *Short Form Preference survey* (See Appendix I) was included on the survey. Participants read two scenarios of someone attending a bullying workshop and selected their preference. The first scenario describes a person who likes freedom to come up with ideas and look at the whole picture and evaluate. The second scenario describes someone at the bullying workshop that receives a clear set of guidelines and instructions to follow for each type of bullying incident. The person completes one task at a time.

The participants selected a preference for Scenario 1 or Scenario 2. The participant was

not told, but the first scenario represents a Type I thinking style preference and the

second scenario a Type II thinking style preference. This was compared to the person's

Type I or Type II thinking style and a percentage of match per thinking style was

determined. Appendix I displays these scenarios.

To assess attitude toward bullying intervention training, pre-service teachers were

asked to complete the *Assessing Pre-service Teachers' Perception of Training* (See

Appendix J) and in-service teachers were asked to complete the *Assessing In-service*

Teachers' Perceptions of Job Satisfaction Survey (See Appendix K). This survey asks in-

service teachers if they think those who are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to

intervene in bullying situations.

Analysis Plan

An analysis plan is provided (See Figure 1) and is discussed below for the three

parts of this research: pre-service vs. in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, and in-

service teachers.

Pre-service vs. In-service Teachers

To determine if new teachers compared to current teachers have different

perspectives, the purpose of the initial *Survey for Assessing Teachers' Perceptions about*

Bullying (Curb, & Kennison, 2012) was threefold. First, the survey assessed teachers'

perspectives on variables related to student bullying and teacher responsibility. These

included the responses of teachers' perceptions of the seriousness of bullying, their

readiness and expectations for intervening, and their confidence in doing so. Second, it

assessed the school environment. Factors include school policies, environment, and

empathy as intervention in bullying. Third, it assessed teachers' previous experiences with bullying when they were students in school and the number of courses in child development. A series of t-tests was used to determine any differences in perspectives. The descriptive statistics include percentages as well as mean ratings.

To determine the seriousness of bullying, a t-test was used to compare the summed average rating of the seriousness of student bullying by teacher type across all 12 scenarios of the *Bullying Attitude Questionnaire (BAQ)* developed by Craig, Henderson and Murphy (2000) and later modified by Yoon and Kerber (2005) and Curb and Kennison (2012) for Hypothesis 1. The same procedure was used to determine the intent to intervene for Hypothesis 2. Following, seriousness was also examined in regard to the seriousness of bullying to students without disabilities and students with disabilities. For the six scenarios involving a student without disabilities being bullied, a series of t-tests was conducted to determine whether pre-service and in-service teachers perceived the seriousness of any of the six bullying scenarios differently. Descriptive statistics were used to determine the percentages for Hypothesis 3. The same procedure was followed for the six scenarios involving a students with a disability for Hypothesis 4. A secondary analysis was conducted to determine whether teachers thought the situations involving students without disabilities and students contained bullying. Descriptive statistics were used to determine whether the percentage of in-service and pre-service teachers perceived bullying in each scenario.

A new measure *Thinking Styles in Regard to Bullying (BTSI)* (Kennison & Curb, 2012) was tested. It was created from the *Thinking Styles Inventory –Revised II (TSI-R2)* (Sternberg, Wagner, & Zhang, 2007). Each question from the *TSI-R2* was modified to

include a reference to handling bullying.   For analysis of the *TSI-R2*, the summed averages of pre-service teachers' scores for each of the 13 thinking styles were compared to the summed averages for in-service teachers' scores. T-tests were used to determine if there were significant differences in their scores on the *TSI-R2* thinking styles test. For the *BTSI*, the same procedure was followed to determine if there were significant differences in teachers' scores on this bullying thinking styles test.

Pre-Service Teachers

Pre-service teachers' dominant thinking styles were determined according to the *TSI-R2* thinking styles test. Those participants who had a Type I or Type II thinking style had their responses to bullying scenarios analyzed to determine any differences on variables related to their perspectives on student bullying. The six variables that were analyzed are as follows with their respective Hypothesis number: (1) seriousness of the bullying, (2) intent to intervene, (3) comprehensiveness of ideas, (4) sympathy toward victim, (5) level of involvement, and (6) empathy. For each of these hypotheses, a t-test was used to compare the summed average rating of the variable given by each teacher across all scenarios. A series of t-tests was performed.

To test the prediction that a type of thinker (as determined by the *TSI-R2*) other than executive would have more comprehensive ideas for dealing with bullying, the number of interventions per scenario was averaged and the number compared for each of the thirteen thinking styles for Hypothesis 7.

To determine if one type of personality is likely to have more comprehensive intervention strategies than others, the personality of each in-service teacher was determined. Using the *Mini Markers: A brief version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five*

Markers (Saucier, 1994), two calculations were performed. The first was the average

number of scenarios participants in each personality type responded to. The second was

the average number of interventions participants in each personality type responded to.

This was the basis for Hypothesis 8.

Pre-service teachers were asked if they were more likely to intervene in bullying

situations if they received training. Using descriptive statistics, a percentage was

computed for Hypothesis 9.

To check for correlation of the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI*, pre-service teachers took

both the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI*. To test the hypothesis that the responses from the two

tests correlate for Thinking Style I, the results of pre-service teachers that fall into the

Type I were examined. A series of correlations was conducted separately for each of the

five thinking style subcategories of legislative, judicial, hierarchical, global, and liberal

for Hypothesis 10. Next, pre-service teachers took both the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI*. To test

the hypothesis that the responses from the two tests correlate, the results of pre-service

teachers that fall into the Type II were examined. A series of correlations was conducted

separately for each of the four thinking style subcategories of executive, monarchic,

local, and conservative for Hypothesis 11. Following, pre-service teachers took both the

TSI-R2 and the *BTSI*. To test the hypothesis that the responses from the two tests

correlate, the results of pre-service teachers that fall into the Type III were examined. A

series of correlations was conducted separately for each of the four thinking style

subcategories of oligarchic, anarchic, internal, and external for Hypothesis 12. To

interpret the value of the correlation coefficient, Dancey and Reidy's (2004) scale was

used. A $0.1 - 0.3$ = weak; $0.4 - 0.6$ = moderate; $0.7 - 0.9$ = strong; 1 = perfect.

Another exploratory measure was used to determine thinking style, the *Short Form Preference survey*. After reading two scenarios describing someone attending a workshop on bullying, each pre-service and in-service teacher responded by selecting their preference of which description they would prefer if they were at the workshop. Although they were not told this, the first description was that of a Type I thinking style participant, and the second description was that of a Type II thinking style participant. Each participant's thinking style was determined previously by the *TSI-R2*. For those teachers that had a Type I or Type II thinking style, the number of matches to the responses on the survey was determined. The percentage of matches was reported.

The results of the *Bem Sex Role Inventory* (Bem, 1974) was examined for the variables of masculinity and femininity according to Type I and Type II thinking styles. To determine percentages in each thinking style, descriptive statistics were used.

In-service Teachers

In-service teachers' dominant thinking style was determined according to the *TSI-R2* thinking styles test. Those participants that have a Type I or Type II thinking style had their responses to bullying scenarios analyzed. The six variables that were analyzed are as follows with their respective hypothesis number: (1) seriousness of the bullying, (2) intent to intervene, (3) comprehensiveness of ideas, (4) sympathy toward victim, (5) level of involvement, and (6) empathy. For each of these hypotheses, a t-test compared the summed average rating of the variable given by each teacher across all scenarios. The prediction was that Type I would have a higher average than Type II. However, a series of t-tests was also performed and any significant differences between thinking styles were reported.

It was of interest to compare responses of teachers toward bullied students without disabilities and students with disabilities in regard to number of ideas for intervention and the various types of ideas for intervention, according to Thinking Style I and Thinking Style II teachers. At the end of each scenario that depicted bullying, participants were asked to list up to 10 interventions they would likely use. Instead of calculating it by the method in the above hypothesis which assigned values of 1 through 6 for particular interventions, a 7 for two or more, and an 8 for three or more (which previously was coded as 1 for one intervention, 2 for two interventions, and a 3 for three or more interventions), this time a chart was made to see which two types of responses made up the 7 or which three types of responses made up the 8, according to the scoring method proposed by Nicolaides, Toda, & Smith (2002). The purpose of this was to determine if in-service Type I thinking style teachers would have more than one idea for intervention for at least one of the students without disabilities to which they responded more often than in-service Type II thinking style teachers for Hypothesis 7. The same procedure was used for Hypothesis 8, but in regard to the bullied students with disabilities. A secondary analysis of the type of responses given in the students without disabilities and students with disabilities scenarios was conducted. This analysis used descriptive statistics to determine the types of responses that were most common and least common. Comparisons using percentages were made between Type I and Type II in-service teachers regarding the specific types of interventions for students with disabilities and students without disabilities scenarios.

To determine if one type of personality is likely to have more comprehensive intervention strategies than others, the personality of each in-service teacher was

determined. Two calculations were performed. The first was the average number of scenarios participants in each personality type responded to. The second was the average number of interventions participants in each personality type responded to. This is listed in a table for Hypothesis 9.

It was hypothesized that in-service teachers that are satisfied with their jobs are more likely to intervene in bullying. To test this, descriptive statistics were used and percentages were reported for Hypothesis 10.

To check for correlation of the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI*, in-service teachers took both the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI*. The results of in-service teachers that fall into the Type I Thinking Style were examined. A series of correlations was conducted separately for each of the five thinking style subcategories of legislative, judicial, hierarchical, global, and liberal for Hypothesis 11. The same procedure was followed for the Type II Thinking Style. A series of correlations was conducted separately for each of the four thinking style subcategories of executive, monarchic, local, and conservative for Hypothesis 12. The same procedure was followed for the Type III Thinking Style. A series of correlations was conducted separately for each of the four thinking style subcategories of oligarchic, anarchic, internal, and external for Hypothesis 13. Another exploratory measure was used to determine thinking style, the *Short Form Preference survey*. After reading two scenarios describing someone attending a workshop on bullying, each pre-service and in-service teacher responded by selecting their preference of description. Although they were not told this, the first description was that of a Type I thinking style and the second description was that of a Type II thinking

style participant. Their choice was paired with those that rated as a Type I or Type II

thinking style as determined by the *TSI-R2*. The percentage of matches was reported.

The results of the *BEM* were examined for the variables of masculinity and

femininity according to Type I and Type II thinking styles. To determine percentages in

each thinking style, descriptive statistics were used.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The results section will be divided into three sections: pre-service versus in-service teachers, pre-service teachers, and then in-service teachers to explain teachers' thinking styles and other issues related to bullying. An overview of the results is provided in Figure 1.

Pre-service Versus In-service Teachers

In exploratory fashion, to assess overall perspectives about student bullying, a new survey was designed for this study. The *Teacher Survey for Assessing Teachers' Perceptions about Bullying* (Curb & Kennison, 2012) was completed online by 50 pre-service teachers and 40 in-service teachers. The results are displayed in two tables. The first table shows variables related to student bullying and teacher responsibility (See Table 3). Using t-tests to assess the differences, there was one significant difference (at the .05 level) between pre-service teachers ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 1.18$), and in-service teachers ($M = 2.25$, $SD = .95$), $t(88) = 2.62$, $p = .010$ on their confidence level in dealing with bullying. A large number of pre-service teachers indicated they were not confident in dealing with bullies. Other results of this exploratory survey are displayed in a second table that shows variables related to school environment and empathy in regard to student

bullying (See Table 4). Descriptive statistics indicate there were three other significant

results at the p < .05 level. There was a significant difference in perception of school

climate of pre-service teachers (M = 2.56, SD = 1.25), compared to in-service teachers (M

= 1.82, SD = .87), t(87) = 3.28, p = .002. More pre-service than in-service teachers do

not think the school climate will be one that disapproves of bullying. There was a

significant difference in views of classroom management for pre-service teachers (M =

3.46, SD = 1.15) and in-service teachers (M = 4.05, SD = 1.13), t(88) = -2.44, p = .017.

Fewer pre-service than in-service teachers disagree that the administration will think they

cannot manage the bullies if the teachers send them to the office. Further, there was a

significant difference between pre-service teachers (M = 2.18, SD = 1.00 and in-service

teachers (M = 2.82, SD = 1.03), t(88) = -2.99, p = .004, in regard to the efforts of the

school to avoid releasing bullying incidents to the media. More pre-service than in-

service teachers thought the school would try to keep the media from finding out about

the bullying that happens on campus. Several other significant or nearly significant

results at the p < .05 were noted, although these were not displayed in the table. There

was a significant difference between pre-service teachers (M = 3.00, SD = 1.34) and in-

service teachers (M = 2.35, SD = 1.19), t(88) = 2.40, p = .018 on the amount of verbal

bullying experienced as students in school. Pre-service teachers experienced much less

verbal bullying than in-service teachers. There was a nearly significant difference in the

amount of physical bullying that pre-service teachers (M = 3.98, SD = 1.36), and in-

service teachers (M = 3.42, SD = 1.37), t(88) = 1.91, p = .059 experienced as students.

Pre-service said they experienced physical bullying less than in-service teachers. The

number of courses taken in child development was of interest. There was a significant

difference between pre-service teachers ($M = 2.46$, $SD = 1.54$) and in-service teachers ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.88$), $t(75) = -3.02$, $p = .003$, on the number of child development courses completed in college. Only 7/50 (14%) of pre-service teachers had taken five or more courses in child development, compared to 13/40 (32.5%) of in-service teachers.

This research expected to find a difference between pre-service and in-service teachers ratings of *seriousness* across a total of 12 scenarios and a difference in regard to teachers' intent to *intervene* in that situation. Hypothesis #1 was that in-service teachers would view bullying as less serious than pre-service teachers. A t-test compared the summed average rating of seriousness given by each teacher across all scenarios. There was a significant difference in scores for in-service teachers ($M = 3.25$, $SD = .61$) compared to pre-service teachers ($M = 3.51$, $SD = .64$), $t(110) = 2.12$, $p = .036$. As predicted, in-service teachers perceived bullying to be less serious than pre-service teachers. The hypothesis was supported. Hypothesis #2 was that in-service teachers will express a lower level of intent to intervene in bullying than pre-service teachers. A t-test compared the summed average ratings of level of intent to intervene by teacher type across all scenarios. There was not a significant difference in scores for in-service teachers ($M = 3.71$, $SD = .65$) compared to pre-service teachers ($M = 3.83$, $SD = .66$, $t(110) = .94$, $p = .347$. The hypothesis was not supported.

Our research was also interested in looking at the ratings of *seriousness* for each of the scenarios separately by type of teacher and type of student as well. This research determined the *seriousness* ratings of responses to six scenarios depicting bullying of students without disabilities, and six depicting bullying of students with disabilities, according to type of teacher. Hypothesis #3 stated that pre-service teachers will perceive

33

bullying as more serious than in-service teachers for each of the six students without disabilities scenarios, and a series of t-tests was conducted. There was one significant result in Scenario #1 (Hit Someone). There was a significant difference between pre-service ($M = 3.68$, $SD = .89$) and in-service teachers' perceptions ($M = 3.32$, $SD = .83$), $t(110) = 2.14$, $p = .035$. Descriptive statistics showed that 48.5% of pre-service teachers said the situation was *serious* or *very serious* compared to 36.4% of in-service teachers. The hypothesis was supported for this scenario. The hypothesis was not supported for the following five scenarios: #4(Stupid), #6 (Rumors), #7 (Baseball Exclusion), #10 (Dirty Looks) or #12 (Eye Roll). Hypothesis #4 stated that pre-service teachers will perceive bullying as more serious than in-service teachers for the six students with disabilities scenarios, and a series of t-tests was conducted. There was one significant result in Scenario # 11 (ADHD). There was a significant difference between pre-service teachers' perception of the seriousness of this situation of an ADHD student being bullied ($M = 2.77$, $SD = .76$) and the perceptions of in-service teachers ($M = 2.39$; $SD = .74$), $t(91) = 2.42$, $p = .017$. Descriptive statistics showed that 15.4% of pre-service teachers said this situation was *serious* or *very serious* compared to 4.8% of in-service teachers. The hypothesis was supported for this scenario. The hypothesis was not supported for the other five handicap scenarios regarding teachers' perception of the seriousness of bullying.

  Secondary analysis. This analysis was conducted to determine whether scenarios depicting bullying will be perceived as bullying when it occurs in students without disabilities and students with disabilities, according to teacher type of pre-service or in-service. Even though most of the results were not significant, descriptive statistics were

reported to show a trend in the percentage of teachers that thought a situation involved

bullying. Pre-service teachers were more likely than in-service teachers to state that each

of the 12 scenarios contained bullying (See Table 5). Results indicate a larger percent of

both pre-service and in-service teachers were more reluctant to call situations involving

more indirect inappropriate behaviors (#6 Rumors, #7 Excluded, #12 Eye Roll, and #10

Dirty Looks) as bullying compared to situations involving physical bullying (#1 Hit

Someone) or verbal bullying (#4 Stupid) in the students without disabilities scenarios.

Next, both types of teachers' responses were examined in the scenarios involving

students with disabilities. Results indicate a larger percent of pre-service and in-service

teachers were more reluctant to call situations involving more indirect inappropriate

behaviors (#9 Dyslexic – eye roll), (#5 Tourette's – exclusion), and (#11 ADHD – dirty

looks) as bullying compared to situations involving (#3 Cerebral Palsy – physical

bullying) and (#2 Downs syndrome – verbal bullying) and (#8 Legally Blind – verbal

bullying).

Distinctions on *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* Using T-Tests, According to Teacher Type of Pre-service or In-service

A series of t-tests for independent samples was conducted to determine if there

were distinctions on the scores of pre-service and in-service teachers on the *Thinking*

Styles Inventory – Revised II (*TSI-R2*) (Sternberg, Wagner, & Zhang, 2007) and the

Thinking Styles in Regard to Bullying (*BTSI*) (Kennison & Curb, 2012). Since this study

is the first attempted other than a small pilot study and was exploratory in nature, two-

tailed tests were used. The results of the *TSI-R2* will be discussed first, followed by those

of the *BTSI*.

TSI-R2. On the *TSI-R2*, there were differences in the scores of pre-service and in-service teachers on three of the four categories of the Type II grouping. There was a significant difference in the scores for pre-service ($M = 5.00$, $SD = 1.08$) and in-service teachers ($M = 4.59$, $SD = 1.09$) for the executive thinking style, $t(123) = 2.05$, $p = .042$. A significant difference was found in the scores for pre-service ($M = 4.84$, $SD =. 94$) and in-service teachers ($M = 4.37$, $SD = .99$) on the conservative thinking style, $t(123) = 2.70$, $p = .008$. A significant difference was also found in the scores for pre-service ($M = 4.62$, $SD = 1.12$) and in-service teachers ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.00$) on the monarchic thinking style, $t(123) = 3.86$, $p < 0.01$. There was a nearly significant difference in the oligarchic thinking style, one of the Type III groupings, for pre-service ($M = 4.48$, $SD = .96$) and in-service ($M = 4.14$, $SD = .88$), $t(123) = 1.96$, $p = .053$ Further, on the *TSI-R2*, there were no significant differences among pre-service and in-service teachers on the responses to questions on the individual styles of legislative, judicial, hierarchical, liberal or global which fall under the Type 1 grouping, the local in the Type II grouping, or the internal, external, or anarchic of the Type III grouping.

BTSI. There were the same number of significant differences on the *BTSI* which assessed thinking styles in relation to bullying as there were on the *TSI-R2* which assessed thinking styles in general among the pre-service and in-service teachers who took both tests. On the *BTSI*, there were no nearly significant result differences. There was one statistically significant difference in one thinking style in each of the Type I, Type II, and Type III groupings. In Type I, there was a significant difference in the scores for pre-service ($M = 4.64$, $SD = 1.22$) and in-service teachers ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.20$), $t(123) = 3.00$, $p = .003$, on the judicial thinking style for the *BTSI*. In Type II,

there was a significant difference in the scores for pre-service ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.09$) and in-service ($M = 3.48$, $SD = .78$), $t(123) = 3.08$, $p = 0.003$ on the monarchic thinking style on the *BTSI*. In Type III, there was a significant difference in the scores for pre-service ($M = 4.95$, $SD = 1.03$) and in-service ($M = 4.26$, $SD = .97$), $t(123) = 3.74$, $p < 0.01$ on anarchic thinking style questions on the *BTSI*. Further, on the *BTSI*, there were no significant differences among pre-service and in-service teachers on the responses to questions that assessed the legislative, hierarchical, liberal, or global of the Type I grouping. There were no significant differences between pre-service and in-service teachers on the executive, conservative, and local of the Type II grouping. In addition, there were no significant differences between the two groups on the oligarchic, internal, or external of Type III grouping.

Pre-Service Teachers

The results of pre-service Thinking Style I teachers and thinking Style II teachers' responses to 12 scenarios on variables depicting bullying were analyzed. These variables were seriousness, intent to intervene, comprehensiveness, sympathy, involvement, and empathy (See Table 6). Hypothesis #1 predicted that pre-service teachers with a Type I thinking style will rate bullying as more serious than pre-service teachers with a Type II thinking style. The prediction was not supported. Inferential statistics showed there was not a significant difference in the scores for pre-service Type I thinkers ($M = 3.57$, $SD = .66$) and pre-service Type II thinkers ($M = 3.48$, $SD = .63$), $t(56) = .578$, $p = .565$, on their ratings of seriousness of bullying in the scenarios. Hypothesis #2 predicted that pre-service teachers with a Type I thinking style will be more likely to intervene in bullying than pre-service teachers with a Type II thinking style. The prediction was not supported.

A t-test indicated there was not a significant difference in the scores for Type I thinkers (M = 3.98, SD = .59) and Type II thinkers (M =3.70, SD = .71), $t(56)$ = 1.58, p = .119, on likeliness to intervene in the bullying scenarios. Hypothesis #3 predicted that pre-service teachers with a Type I thinking style will be more likely to have more comprehensive strategies for intervening in bullying than pre-service teachers with a Type II thinking style. The prediction was not supported. There was not a significance difference in the scores for pre-service Type I thinkers (M = 1.13, SD = .19) and pre-service Type II thinkers (M = 1.10, SD = .31), $t(42)$ = .30, p = .77, on the comprehensive number of strategies. Hypothesis #4 predicted that pre-service teachers with a Type I thinking style will be more sympathetic toward victims of bullying than pre-service teachers with a Type II thinking style. The prediction was not supported. There was not a significant difference in the scores for pre-service Type I thinkers (M = 4.24, SD = .51) and pre-service Type II thinkers (M = 4.10, SD = .57), $t(56)$ = 1.01, p = .317, on sympathy. Hypothesis #5 predicted that pre-service teachers with a Type I thinking style will be show higher levels of involvement in bullying than pre-service teachers with a Type II thinking style as the prediction was not supported. There was not a significant difference in the scores for pre-service Type I thinkers (M = 3.60, SD = 1.03) and pre-service Type II thinkers (M = 3.32, SD = 1.11), $t(56)$ = .98, p = .332, on level of involvement. Hypothesis #6 predicted that pre-service teachers with a Type I thinking style will be more empathetic toward victims of bullying than the pre-service teachers with a Type II thinking style. Pre-service teachers with a Type I Thinking Style had slightly higher levels of empathy than those with a Type II Thinking Style. The prediction was not supported. There was not a significant difference in the scores for Type I thinking style

($M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.20$) and Type II Thinking Style ($M = 2.21$, $SD = .93$), $t(41) = 1.14$, $p = .263$, on empathy.

Further exploration into the 13 individual thinking styles that fall into one of the three main groupings of Thinking Style I, II, or III were examined. Hypothesis #7 predicted that a type of pre-service teacher who is a thinker other than executive will have more comprehensive ideas for dealing with bullies. This hypothesis was supported. There were no participants from the judicial, global, local, or oligarchic thinking styles that participated in this part of the survey. The following is the average number of interventions per person per thinking style: anarchic (1.33), legislative (1.29), external (1.18), hierarchical (1.15), monarchic (1.15), and liberal (1.05). The number of average interventions per person per thinking style that were tied were conservative (1), internal (1) and executive (1).

It was of interest to explore the relation between other variables and intervention or likeliness to intervene. One factor was personality and the other was impact of training. Hypothesis #8 was that pre-service teachers who scored highest in the intellect/openness category of the Big Five (*Mini Marker*) will have more comprehensive intervention strategies for dealing with bullies than those in the extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and neurotic categories. There were no teachers in either the pre-service or in-service teacher types that scored in the neurotic category. For pre-service teachers, the hypothesis was not supported as each of the other types of personalities had more comprehensive strategies than those in the openness/intellect category. From most to least number of comprehensive strategies, the personality types were: conscientiousness, extraversion, agreeableness, and openness/intellect (See Table

39

7). Hypothesis #9 predicted that pre-service teachers would indicate that they would be more likely to intervene in bullying situations if they had received prior bullying intervention training. Using descriptive statistics, it was determined that 26/50 (52%) would either *agree* or *strongly agree* to intervene in bullying if they had training. The prediction was supported in that more agreed than disagreed. However, it should be noted that 38% selected *neither agree nor disagree*.

The *TSI-R2* and The *BTSI* were taken by pre-service teachers to determine if there was a correlation between these two thinking styles tests. Using SPSS, a bivariate correlation was conducted to compare the participants' responses for each of the 13 thinking styles individually and then grouped for Thinking Style I, Thinking Style II, and Thinking Style III, which were categories proposed by Zhang (2002). Hypothesis #10 stated that the *BTSI* and *TSI-R2* would correlate on Thinking Style #1. The results of the thinking styles of pre-service teachers that fall into the Type I grouping were examined. A series of correlations was conducted separately for each of the five thinking subcategories of legislative, judicial, hierarchical, global and liberal. The scores on judicial for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .59$, $p < .01$. The scores on hierarchical for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .61$, $p < .01$. The scores on global for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .48$, $p < .01$. The scores on liberal for *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .67$, $p < .01$. The scores on legislative for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were weakly correlated, $r(76) = .37$, $p < .01$. The hypothesis was supported for each the five thinking subcategories of Thinking Style I.

Hypothesis #11 stated that the *BTSI* and the *TSI-R2* would correlate on Thinking Style II. A series of correlations for each of the four thinking styles of executive, monarchic, local, and conservative were conducted. The scores on executive for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .62, p < .01$. The scores on monarchic for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .64, p < .01$. The scores on local for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .56, p < .01$. The scores on conservative for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .65, p < .01$. These correlations offer support for the hypothesis.

Hypothesis #12 stated that the *BTSI* and the *TSI-R2* would correlate on Thinking Style III. The results of the thinking styles that fall into the Type III grouping were examined. A series of correlations for each of the four thinking styles of oligarchic, anarchic, internal, and external were conducted. The scores on oligarchic for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .49, p < .01$. The scores on anarchic for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .42, p < .01$. The scores on internal for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were weakly correlated, $r(76) = .33, p < .01$. The scores on external for pre-service on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(76) = .59, p < .01$. The hypothesis was supported in that the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* were correlated when taken by pre-service teachers. In summary, of the thirteen thinking styles, all moderately correlated on the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* except for two; legislative and internal were weakly correlated.

Another exploratory measure was used to determine thinking style, the *Short Form Preference survey*. Teachers selected their preference for activities for a bullying

workshop (which actually represents a Type I or Type II thinking style, unknown to them). Their preference was matched with their thinking style as determined by the *TSI-R2*. Of the pre-service teachers that were designated as Type I according to the *TSI-R2*, 25/29 (86.2%) of those selected the preference activity for the bullying workshop that was the same as their thinking style. However, only 16/29 (55.2%) of those with a designated Type II thinking style selected a preference activity that matched their thinking style.

The relationships between type of thinking style and the *BEM* scale scores (masculinity and femininity traits) were explored. Pre-service teachers with a Type I or Type II thinking styles scored higher on femininity than masculinity. For Type I, 18/29 (62.06%) scored as having feminine traits, and for Type II, 22/29 (75.86%) scored as having feminine traits.

In-service Teachers

The results of in-service Thinking Style I teachers and Thinking Style II teachers' responses to 12 scenarios on variables depicting bullying were analyzed (See Table 8). These variables were seriousness, intent to intervene, comprehensiveness, sympathy, involvement, and empathy. Hypothesis #1 predicted that in-service Type I thinking style teachers would rate bullying as more serious than in-service Type II thinking style teachers. For in-service teachers, there was not a significant difference in the scores for Type 1 thinking style teachers ($M = 3.23$, $SD = .56$) and Type II thinking style teachers ($M = 3.33$, $SD = .58$), $t(34) = -.50$, $p = .621$, on their ratings of seriousness of bullying in the scenarios. The prediction was not supported. Hypothesis #2 predicted that in-service Type I thinking style teachers would score higher on likeliness to intervene in bullying

than in-service Type II thinking style teachers. This prediction was not supported.

However, there was not a significant difference in the scores for Type I thinkers ($M =$

3.74, $SD = .65$) and Type II thinkers ($M = 3.73$, $SD = .61$), $t(34) = .07$, $p = .945$ on

likeliness to intervene in the bullying scenarios. Hypothesis #3 predicted that in-service

Type I thinking style teachers would have more comprehensive strategies for intervening

in bullying than in-service Type II thinking style teachers. This prediction was not

supported. There was not a significance difference in the scores for Type I thinkers ($M =$

1.19, $SD =.31$) and Type II thinkers ($M = 1.07$, $SD = .37$), $t(32) = .97$, $p = .337$ on the

comprehensive number of strategies. Hypothesis #4 predicted that in-service Type I

thinking style teachers would have more sympathy for the victims of bullying than in-

service Type II thinking style teachers. The prediction was not supported. There was not

a significant difference in scores for Type I thinking style ($M = 3.97$, $SD = .57$) and Type

II thinking style ($M = 4.10$, $SD = .31$), $t(34) = -.75$, $p = .459$, on sympathy. Hypothesis

#5 predicted that in-service Type I thinking style teachers would have a higher level of

involvement in bullying issues than in-service Type II thinking style teachers. This

prediction was not supported. There was not a significant difference on level of

involvement for Type I teachers ($M = 3.34$, $SD = .58$) and Type II teachers ($M = 3.46$, SD

$= .92$), $t(18) = -.40$, $p = .691$. Hypothesis #6 predicted that in-service Type I thinking

style teachers will have a higher level of empathy toward the victim of bullying than in-

service Type II thinking style teachers. The prediction was not supported. There was not

a significant difference in scores for in-service Type I Thinking Style ($M = 2.50$, $SD =$

.86) compared to Type II Thinking Style ($M = 2.08$, $SD = .49$), $t(33) = 1.85$, $p = .073$, on

empathy (See Table 6).

It was of interest to compare responses of in-service teachers toward bullied students without disabilities and students with disabilities in regard to number of ideas for intervention and the various types of ideas for intervention, according to Thinking Style I and Thinking Style II teachers. At the end of each scenario that depicted bullying, participants were asked to list up to 10 interventions they could possibly take. Instead of calculating it by the method in the above hypothesis which assigned values of 1 through 6 for particular interventions, and a 7 for two or more, and an 8 for three or more (which had to be coded as 1 for one intervention, 2 for two interventions, and a 3 for three or more interventions), a chart was made to examine which two types of responses made up the 7 or 8. Hypothesis #7 predicted that in-service Type I thinking style teachers would have more than one idea for at least one of the scenarios involving a student without disability more often than in-service Type II thinking style teachers. Of the 12 in-service Thinking Style I teachers that responded to student without disability scenarios, 8/12 (66.67%) offered more than one idea of intervention at least once, compared to the 5 in-service Thinking Style II teachers in which none (0.00%) offered more than one idea. The prediction was supported. The same process then followed for students with disabilities. Hypothesis #8 predicted that in-service Type I thinking style teachers would have more than one idea for at least one of the scenarios involving a student with a disability to which they responded more often than in-service Type II thinking style teachers. Of the 12 in-service Thinking Style I teachers that responded to the students with disabilities scenarios, 8/12 (66.67%) offered more than one response to the scenarios they responded to, compared to 5/5 (100%) of the in-service Thinking Style II teachers

who offered more than one response on the students with disabilities scenarios. The prediction was not supported.

Secondary analysis of the type of responses given in the students without disabilities and students with disabilities scenarios. The most common response for in-service teachers of both types of thinking styles was to talk to the student. This was evidenced in both the students without disabilities and students with disabilities scenarios. The least common response was writing a note to parents. None of the in-service teachers of either Type I or Type II thinking style chose to have the student perpetrator write a note to parents explaining his or her behavior. Only 1/12 (8.33%) of the in-service Thinking Style I teachers required a student who bullied a student without disability to apologize for his/her inappropriate behavior. In regard to students with disabilities scenarios, the same number, 1/12 (8.33%) of the Thinking Style I teachers (a different teacher) required the student to apologize. There were 0/5 (0.00%) of Thinking Style II teachers who required a student perpetrator to apologize for inappropriate actions in either the students without disabilities or students with disabilities scenarios. Something else of interest was the number of teachers who involved role play for the perpetrator. Of the 12 participants of Thinking Style 1 in regard to the students without disabilities scenarios, 5/12 (41.67%) said they would use role play, compared to 0/5 (0.00%) of the 5 participants in Thinking Style II. For the scenarios involving students with disabilities, of the 12 participants of Thinking Style I, 4/12 (33.33%) said they would use role play, compared to 2/5 (40%) of those in the Thinking Style II. Further, it was of interest to see how many teachers used research to tell the victim that the bully has problems and not to internalize what happened to them. This conversation was planned

45

more often for the student without disability victim. Of the Type I thinking style teachers, 1/12 (8.33%) would do this for the student without disability victim, compared to 2/5 (40%) of the Type II thinking style teachers. Regarding the student with disability victim, of the Type I thinking style teachers, only 1/12 (8.33%) agreed to use research and tell the student not to internalize what happened, compared to 0/5 (0.00%) of the Type II thinking style teachers. In one final analysis, in looking at all of the responses given by both types of teachers to students in both students without disabilities and students with disabilities situations, only 4/34 (11.76%) of the total responses of Type II thinking style teachers were those other than *talk to student* or *rewrite or retell how the situation should have evolved,* compared to 22/91 (24.18%) of the total responses for Type I thinking style teachers.

It was of interest to explore the relation between other variables and intervention or likeliness to intervene. One factor was personality and the other was impact of job satisfaction. It was of interest to analyze the Big Five personality traits in regard to the comprehensive intervention strategies used by in-service teachers. Hypothesis #9 was that teachers whose personality was that of the openness/intellect type would have the most comprehensive strategies for dealing with bullies. Responses for each scenario were tallied and averaged across the number of scenarios. For in-service teachers, the hypothesis was partly supported. The teachers who had the most comprehensive intervention strategies for dealing with bullies were those of the conscientious personality type, followed by those of the openness/intellect personality. From most to least, in the average number of scenarios participants responded to were the following: conscientiousness, openness/intellect, agreeableness, and extraversion. It was not

surprising the same pattern was evidenced in the number of scenarios out of 12 that each

personality type chose to give feedback for because it was an indication of being willing

to intervene as well. From most to least in the average number of scenarios participants

responded to were conscientiousness, openness/intellect, agreeableness, and extraversion

(See Table 7). Hypothesis #10 was that in-service teachers who are satisfied with their

jobs are more likely to intervene in bullying. Descriptive statistics indicated that 17/40

(42.5%) of in-service teachers responded *strongly agree* or *agree*. However, 13/40

(32.5%) responded *strongly disagree* or *disagree* that they would be more likely to

intervene in bullying if they were satisfied with their jobs. The hypothesis was supported

in that there were more participants who said if they were satisfied with their jobs, they

would be more likely to intervene.

The *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were both taken by in-service teachers to determine if there

was a correlation between these two thinking styles tests. As before, a bivariate

correlation was conducted to compare the participants' responses for each of the 13

thinking styles individually and then grouped for Thinking Style I, Thinking Style II, and

Thinking Style III, which were categories proposed by Zhang (2002). Hypothesis #11

was that the *BTSI* and the *TSI-R2* would correlate on the individual thinking styles under

Thinking Style I domain when given to in-service teachers. A series of correlations was

conducted separately for each of the five thinking styles of legislative, judicial,

hierarchical, global and liberal. The scores on judicial for in-service on the *TSI-R2* and

BTSI were strongly correlated, $r(45) = .73$, $p < .01$. The scores on liberal for in-service on

the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were strongly correlated, $r(45) = .74$, $p < .01$. The scores on

legislative for in-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(45) = .56$,

$p < .01$. The scores on hierarchical for in-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were

moderately correlated, $r(45) = .58, p < .01$. The scores on global for in-service on the

TSI-R2 and *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(45) = .46, p < .01$. These correlations

offer support for the hypothesis.

      Hypothesis #12 was that the *BTSI* and the *TSI-R2* would correlate on the

individual thinking styles under the Thinking style II domain when given to in-service

teachers. Following, the results of the thinking styles that fall into the Type II grouping

were examined. A series of correlations for each of the four thinking styles of executive,

monarchic, local, and conservative were conducted. The scores on executive for in-

service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(45) = .58, p < .01$. The

scores on local for in-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(45)$

$= .62, p < .01$. The scores on conservative for in-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were

moderately correlated, $r(45) = .46, p < .01$. The scores on monarchic for in-service on

the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were weakly correlated, $r(45) = .37, p < .05$. The hypothesis was

supported.

      Hypothesis #13 was that the *BTSI* and the *TSI-R2* would correlate on the

individual thinking styles under the Thinking style III domain when given to in-service

teachers. A series of correlations for each of the four thinking styles of oligarchic,

anarchic, internal, and external were conducted. The scores on oligarchic for in-service

on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(45) = .60, p < .01$. The scores on

anarchic for in-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were moderately correlated, $r(45) = .56, p$

$< .01$. The scores on internal for in-service on the *TSI-R2* and *BTSI* were moderately

correlated, $r(45) = .59, p < .01$. The scores on external for in-service on the *TSI-R2* and

BTSI were moderately correlated, $r(45) = .59$, $p < .01$. The hypothesis was supported. Another exploratory measure will be used to determine thinking style, the *Short Form Preference survey*. Their choice of preference for activities for a bullying workshop (which actually represents a Type I or Type II thinking style) was matched with their thinking style as determined by the *TSI-R2*. Of the in-service teachers that were designated as Type I according to the *TSI-R2*, 19/23 (86.2%) selected the workshop style that matched their thinking style. However, only 10/13(76.9%) of those with a Type II thinking style selected a preference activity that matched their thinking style.

The relationships between type of thinking style and *BEM* scale scores (masculinity and femininity traits) were explored. In-service Type I thinking style had more participants with masculinity traits 16/23 (69.57%) than femininity traits 7/23 (30.43%) on *BEM* whereas in-service Type II thinking style had more participants with femininity traits 7/13 (53.85%) than masculinity traits 6/13 (46.15%).

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The study examined the extent to which personal characteristics are related to pre-service and in-service teachers' perceptions of bullying. The research also examined how both types of teachers viewed bullying when the victim was a student with versus without a disability. The first part of the discussion will focus on the differences in pre-service teachers and in-service teachers followed by findings that relate to both types of teachers. Next, review the findings unique to each type of teacher. Finally, consider the results of the secondary analyses.

Pre-Service versus In-service Teachers

Pre-service teachers are entering the teaching profession with views quite different from in-service teachers. Results indicate pre-service teachers perceive bullying as more serious than in-service teachers. This has added to the prior research in that "most studies have focused on the prevalence and frequency of school bullying, but few researchers have focused specifically on the perceived severity of school bullying" (Chen, Liu, Cheng, 2011, p. 178). This is important because teachers' decisions about severity impact whether or not teachers intervene in situations (Chen, Liu, & Cheng, 2011; Mishna, Scarcello, Pepler, & Wiener (2005). Pre-service teachers have

experienced less verbal bullying than in-service teachers, so it is interesting they perceive bullying as more serious than in-service teachers. Perhaps in-service teachers perceive student bullying as less serious because they are desensitized due to more exposure to student bullying incidents in their teaching experience.

The findings indicate pre-service teachers compared to in-service teachers are not prepared to handle bullying. Pre-service teachers lack confidence in dealing with bullies. This is important because if they have self-confidence, they would be expected to have self-efficacy. Past research indicates teachers with higher self-efficacy for dealing with bullying incidents have been more likely to use new educational practices (Evers, Brouwers, & Tomie, 2002: Skinner, Babinski, & Gifford, 2014) and would be expected to respond more favorably to prevention and intervention bullying ideas. The findings also indicated more pre-service teacher than in-service teachers do not think the school climate will disapprove of bullying. The climate is important as past research indicates more students participate in bullying if there is an unhealthy environment that supports bullying as the norm (Wang, Berry, & Swearer, 2013; Unnever & Cornell, 2003). Having an unhealthy climate increases victimization and internalizing problems and makes the students feel less safe (Goldweber, Waasdorp, & Bradshaw, 2013). More pre-service teachers than in-service worry that administration will think they cannot manage the bullies if the teachers send the students to the office, as evidenced in the past research of Marshall, Vargas, Meyers, Graybill, & Skoczylas (2009). More pre-service than in-service teachers think the school will try to keep the media from finding out about the bullying that happens there. Although our research indicates in-service teachers had taken more child development classes, the pre-service teachers may take more classes

before they graduate. In regard to intervening in bullying, more pre-service teachers than

not said they would be likely to intervene in bullying if they receive prior training. In-

service teachers said they would be more likely to intervene in bullying if they were

satisfied with their jobs. Prior research indicates teachers want more bullying prevention

and intervention training (Boulton, 1997; Crothers & Kolbert, 2004; Bradshaw,

Waasdorp, & O-Brennan, 2013).

Pre-service teachers compared to in-service teachers, scored higher on executive,

conservative and monarchic of the *TSI-R2* in keeping with the terms defined by Sternberg

and Zhang (2005). It is not surprising that the pre-service teacher of little teaching

experience would have characteristics of the executive thinking style such as a desire for

structured assignments with guidelines to follow. Being new to the system, pre-service

teachers would have conservative characteristics of wanting to follow established rules

and procedures in place. The pre-service teachers would also demonstrate characteristics

of a monarchic thinking style in that they would not want to take on too much, but focus

on one project at a time. On the *BTSI*, pre-service teachers compared to in-service

teachers, scored higher on the characteristics of monarchic, judicial, and anarchic as

described by Sternberg and Zhang (2005). That the pre-service teacher also scored high

on monarchic on this inventory is appropriate in that the new teacher desires to keep

things simple and work on one thing at a time until completed. The pre-service teacher

has the characteristics of anarchic in trying to find his or her way and is disorganized but

creative in the early attempts at teaching. Perhaps the creativity is fostered in that the

teacher wants to determine the best way to teach students because the judicial

characteristic is manifested as the teacher knows that he or she will be evaluating students' performance.

There were several other exploratory measures of interest. There were more pre-service Type I and Type II teachers who showed femininity than masculinity sex role traits. This characteristic, as defined by the *Bem Sex Role Inventory,* seems to complement their thinking styles in that these teachers show the femininity traits of *yielding* to the task before them and try to be *understanding* of whatever administration asks them to do. However, the in-service Type I teachers compared to the in-service Type II teachers rated higher on masculinity than femininity on *BEM*. These teachers can be expected to put their comprehensiveness of ideas, creativity, and ability to see the whole picture to good use as they become *independent* and *aggressive* as they develop new programs. In response to choice of bullying training, thinking style inventories are promising. In-service teachers of both Type I and I had a greater than 76% match between type of training selected and their thinking style. In regard to the thinking styles tests, all of the *TSI-R2* and the *BTSI* correlated, and most subtests were moderately correlated for both types of teachers.

Both types of teachers were more likely to recognize physical and verbal incidents as bullying than they were indirect bullying. It is important to remember that there are differences in students' and teachers' perceptions of the seriousness of bullying. Chen, Liu, and Cheng (2011) remind us, "Secondary students rated the severity of relational aggression to be greater than that of physical and verbal bullying. This finding provided accumulating evidence to the previous studies which indicate that relational bullying is more harmful than physical or verbal bullying as it might bring victims more depressive

symptoms and emotional stress" (p. 179). This was found in studies by Baldry (2004) and Bauman (2008) as well. However, our research indicated teachers were less likely to even label indirect bullying as bullying, especially in-service teachers compared to pre-service teachers. In all six scenarios containing bullying to a student with disability, pre-service teachers were more likely to label it as bullying than in-service teachers. In the situation containing physical bullying, both pre-service and in-service teachers were more likely to label the incident as bullying if it occurred in a student with disability scenario than if it was a student without disability scenario. In one of two situations containing verbal bullying, both pre-service and in-service teachers were more likely to label a situation as bullying if it involved a student with a disability rather than a student without a disability. However, both pre-service and in-service teachers were less likely to label eye roll and exclusion as bullying in the student with disability than the student without disability scenario. Pre-service teachers were more likely to label a scenario giving dirty looks to a student with a disability and to a student without a disability as bullying than in-service teachers.

Pre-service

The finding that pre-service teachers who have a thinking style other than executive had more comprehensive ideas for dealing with bullying was not surprising based on the characteristics of thinking styles as discussed by Sternberg and Zhang (2005) and the research that the executive thinker likes to have clear cut instructions (Zhang & Sternberg, 2002). The three thinking styles with the most comprehensive ideas are discussed below. The anarchic thinking style teacher has a lot of creativity, so it is not surprising that this thinking style contributed the most ideas. Next in number of ideas

54

of ideas was the legislative thinking style teacher who would be expected to contribute ideas as he or she likes to plan strategies. Following was the external thinking style teacher who would who would prefer working in groups and discussing the ideas at different stages of the project.

In-service

In-service teachers who scored in the conscientious and openness/intellect of the *Mini-Marker* personality test had the most comprehensive ideas for dealing with bullies. Further, these two personality types chose to respond more often to the open-ended questions on the survey. It was expected those in the openness/intellect personality category would contribute a lot of ideas for intervention since Fan and Zhang (2009) describe this type as high achievers on analysis and problem solving. In the exploratory research conducted, the Type II thinker was more willing to take the current research about the problems inherent in a bully and to explain these to a victim and tell the student not to internalize what is happening to them due to the bullying situation. Knowing that bullies are more likely to have two or more co-occurring mental disorders and substance abuse (Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpela, Rantanen, & Rimpela, 2000) might help the victim to realize that it is not their own fault that they are being bullied.

A division of tasks in regard to helping students according to thinking style should be examined more. A concern was noted in the open-ended responses given by both Type I and Type II in-service teachers. The most common response for dealing with bullies was to talk to the student. Only one teacher had the perpetrator apologize to the victim and the least common option was to have the student write a note to parents explaining the behavior. Teachers need to consider other options for preventing and

dealing with bullying because even though the Type I teachers contributed the most ideas, only about one-fourth of them had more than one idea (per scenario) other than *talk to the student* or *retell or rewrite how the situation should have evolved*. Some research on preferences of working with students with a disability or those without a disability was examined in this study and some interesting, but cautious results surfaced, but should be considered carefully due to the small sample size. Research by Raskauskas and Modell (2011) indicates there is a need for modifications for the students with disabilities in bullying intervention and prevention programs.

Limitations

This study had some limitations. First, the study involved self-report measures, so that always leaves a potential for bias. To deal with this, care was taken to provide a separate link for an email of choice for the drawing for the lottery in the hope that teachers would answer the questions honestly, knowing there was no link to their responses. Although the *Bem Sex Role Inventory* was used, it might be of interest to have respondent indicate whether they are male or female so further comparisons can be made. All 13 individual thinking styles were not represented in this study. There was a lack of teachers with a preferred thinking style of judicial, global, local, or oligarchic. Although the initial pool of teachers was adequate for sample size, some chose not to participate in the entire survey, possibly due to the length of the online 65 minute survey. It should be noted that the initial sample size of in-service teachers was one-third smaller than that of the pre-service teachers. It would be desirable to recruit more in-service teachers. Further, to encourage participants to complete the survey, it is suggested to have some landmarks along the way (i.e. reminders of the percentage left to complete). Another

alternative is to interview teachers individually as they might be more likely to complete all questions. Creative ideas for intervention in bullying scenarios were not used very much, but should be implemented and evaluated to determine their effectiveness. Working together, more can be done to help prevent student bullying.

Future Directions

Some groundwork has been laid in making a bullying thinking inventory scale that correlates with Sternberg's more general thinking style survey. A short two-question survey to determine thinking style was also promising for in-service teachers. It will be interesting to explore in future research how thinking style and preference for involvement in bullying prevention and intervention change with the passing of time as there are differences in the views of pre-service and in-service teachers. Zhang and Sternberg (2002) remind us that thinking styles are likely to change due to age and experience.

Pre-service teachers and in-service teachers differ in their attitudes and approaches to bullying. The focus for the future should be separate in-service training for pre-service and in-service teachers to help those new to the career develop more confidence. After giving a thinking styles test, interventions for bullying may need to be tailored for each group, addressing the knowledge and attitudes of each. Explore more options for intervention than are currently being used. Further, determine how teachers' perspectives change over time and how they are related to teacher success in the classroom and retention of teachers.

REFERENCES

Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social

aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, *9*, 212–230.

Baldry, A. C. (2004). The impact of direct and indirect bullying on the mental and

physical health of Italian youngsters. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 343-355.

Barone, F. (1995). Bullying in school: It doesn't have to happen. *NASSP Bulletin,*

79:104.

Baron-Cohen, S., & Wheelwright, S. (2004). The empathy quotient: An investigation of

adults with Asperger Syndrome on high functioning Autism, and normal sex

differences. *Journal of Autism and Developmental Disorder, 34*(2), 163-175).

Bauman, S. (2008). The association between gender, age and acculturation and

depression and overt and relational victimization among Mexican American

elementary students. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, 28, 528-554.

Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Pre-service teachers' responses to bullying scenarios:

Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational

Psychology*, *98*, 213-221.

Bem Sex Role Inventory (Bem, 1974).

Beran, T. N., & Tutty, L. (2002). Children's reports of bullying and safety at school.

Canadian Journal of School Psychology, *17*(2), 1-14.

doi:10.1177/082957350201700201

Berguno, G., Leroux, P., McAinsh, K., & Shaikh, S. (2004). Children's experience of

> loneliness at school and its relation to bullying and the quality of teacher

> interventions. *Qualitative Report*, *9*(3), 483-499.

Bishop, C., & Foster, C. (2011). Thinking styles: Maximizing online supported learning.

> *Journal of Educational Computing Research*, *44*(2), 121-139.

Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and

> boys fight? *Aggressive Behaviour,* 18, 117-127.

Bliding, M., Holm, A.S., & Hägglund, S. (2002). *Offensive actions and informal settings.*

> *Student perspectives on school environments and social climate*. Stockholm:

> Skolverket.

Boulton, M. (1997). Teachers' views on bullying: definitions, attitudes and ability to

> cope. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology, 67*(2), 223-233. Doi:

> 10.1111/j.2044-8279.1997.tb01239.x

Bradshaw, C. P., Sawyer, A. L., & O'Brennan, L. M. (2007). Bullying and peer

> victimization   at school: Perceptual differences between students and school staff.

> *School Psychology Review, 3*6(3), 361-382.

Bradshaw, C. P., Waasdorp, T. E., O'Brennan, L. M. (2013). Teachers' and education

> support professionals' perspectives on bullying and prevention: Findings from a

> National Education Association Study. *School Psychology Review, 42*(3), 280-

> 297.

Bullying Attitude Questionnaire, Modified. Yoon, J. S., and Kerber, K. (2003) Bullying:

> Elementary teachers' attitudes and intervention strategies', *Research in*

> *Education, 69*, 27–35.

Byrne, B. (1999). 'Ireland.' In: Smith, P. K., Morita, Y., Junger-Tas, J., Olweus, D.,

    Catalano, R. and Slee, P. (Eds.), *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national*

    perspective. New York: Routledge.

Byrne, B. M. (1991). Burnout: Investigating the impact of background variables for

    elementary, intermediate, secondary, and university educators. *Teaching and*

    Teacher Education, 7, 197-209. doi: 10.1016/0742-051X(91)90027-M

Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B. D., Neckerman, H. J., Ferguson, L. L., & Gariepy, L. L. (1989).

    Growth and aggression: Childhood to early adolescence. *Developmental*

    Psychology, 25, 320-330.

Chen, L. M., Liu, K. S., & Cheng, Y. Y. (2011). Validation of the perceived school

    bullying severity scale. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of*

    Experimental Educational Psychology, 32(2), 169-182.

Cooper, C. S., Abousally, C. T., Austin, J., Boyt, M. A., & Hawtrey, C. E. (2003). Do

    public schools teach voiding dysfunction? Results of an elementary school

    teacher survey. *Journal of Urology*, *170*(3), 956-958.

Correlations: Direction and Strength. Retrieved from

    http://www.strath.ac.uk/aer/materials/4dataanalysisineducationalresearch/unit4/co

    rrelationsdirectionandstrength/

Corsaro, W. A., & Eder, D. (1993). Children's peer cultures. *Annual Review of Sociology*,

    16, 197-220.

Craig, K., Bell, D., & Leschied, A. (2011). Pre-service teachers' knowledge and attitudes

    regarding school-based bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education*, *34*(2), 21-33.

Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International*, 21, 5-21.

Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development, 66*(3), 710-722.

Crick, N. R., Grotpeter, J. K., & Bigbee, M. A. (2002). Relationally and physically aggressive children's intent attributions and feelings of distress for relational and instrumental peer provocation. *Child Development, 73*(4), 1134-1142.

Crothers, L. M., & Levinson, E. M. (2004). Assessment of bullying: A review of methods and instruments. *Journal of Counseling & Development, 82*, 496-503.

Cullingford, C., & Morrison, J. (1995). Bullying as a formative influence: The relationship between the experience of school and criminality. *British Educational Research Journal* 2(5), 547.

Cunningham, C. E., Cunningham, L. J., Ratcliffe, J., & Vaillancourt, T. (2010). A qualitative analysis of the bullying prevention and intervention recommendations of students in grades 5 to 8. *Journal of School Violence*, *9*(4), 321-338. doi:10.1080/15388220.2010.507146

Curb, L. A. (2010). Empowering teachers to help students use cognitive strategies to deal with bullies. paper, Oklahoma State University.

Curb, L. A. (2012). Teacher perception and bullying. *Comprehensive Exam*, Oklahoma State University.

Curb, L. A., & Kennison, S. (2012). *Survey for Assessing Teachers' Perceptions about Bullying*.

Dake, J. A., Price, J. H., Telljohann, S. K., & Funk, J. B. (2003). Teacher perceptions and

    practices regarding school bullying prevention. *Journal of School Health, 73*(9),

    347-349.

Darley, J. M., & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies:Diffusion of

    responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology 8*(4), 377-383.

    doi:10.1037/h0025589

Doll, B., Song, S., & Siemers, E. (2004). Classroom ecologies that support or discourage

    bullying. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), B*ullying in America schools:*

    A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention (pp. 161-183).

    Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associate.

Doll, B., & Swearer, S. (2006). Cognitive-behavioral interventions for participants in

    bullying and coercion. In R. Mennuti, A. Freeman, & R. Christner

    (Eds.), *Cognitive behavioral interventions in educational settings: A handbook for*

    practice (pp. 183-201). New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Evers, W. J. G., Brouwers, A. & Tomie, W. (2002). Burnout and self-efficacy: A study of

    teachers' beliefs when implementing an innovative education system in the

    Netherlands. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*, 227-243.

Fan, W. Q., & Zhang, L. F. (2009). Thinking styles and achievement motivations.

    Thinking Learning and Individual Differences, 19, 299-303.

Gillies-Rezo, S., & Bosacki, S. (2003). Invisible bruises: Kindergartners' perceptions on

    bullying. *International Journal of Children's Spirituality 8*, 163-77.

Glover, D., Gough, G., & Johnson, M. with Cartwright, N. (2000). Bullying in 25

secondary schools: Incidence, impact and intervention. *Educational Research, 42*(2), 141-156.

Goldweber, A., Wassdorp, T. E., & Bradshaw, C. P. (2013). Examining the link between forms of bullying behaviors and perceptions of safety and belonging among secondary school students. *Journal of School Psychology, 51*(4), 469-485.

Griffin, R. S., & Gross, A. M. (2004). Childhood bullying: Current empirical findings and future directions for research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 9*(4), 379-400. doi:10.1016/S1359-1789(03)00033-8

Harris, S., & Willoughby, W. (2003). Teacher perceptions of student bullying behavior. *ERS Spectrum, 2*(13), 4-11.

Hazler, R., Miller, D., Carney, J., & Green, S. (2001). Adult recognition of school bullying situations. *Educational Research, 43*(2), 133-146.

Holt, C. L., & Ellis, J. B. (1998). Assessing the current validity of the Bem Sex-Role Inventory. *Sex Roles, 39*(11/12), 929-941.

James, D. J., Lawlor, M., Courtney, P., Flynn, A., Henry, B., & Murphy, N. (2008). Bullying behavior in secondary schools: What roles do teachers play? *Child Abuse Review*, *17*(3), 160-163. doi: 10.1002/car.1025

Juvonen, I., Graham, S., & Schuster, M. A. (2003). Bullying among young adolescents: The strong, the weak, and the troubled. *Pediatrics, 112*(6), 1231-1237.

Kahn, J. H., Jones, J. L., & Wieland, A. L. (2012). Preservice teachers' coping styles and their responses to bullying. *Psychology in the Schools 49*(8), 784-794.

Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpela, M., Rantanen, P., & Rimpela, A. (2000). Bullying at

school—an indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of*

Adolescence, *23*(6), 661- 674.

Kennison, S. & Curb, L. A. (2012). *Thinking Style in Regard to Bullying Inventory*

(BTSI).

Leff, S. S., Kupersmidt, J. B., Patterson, C. J., & Power, T. J. (1999). Factors influencing

teacher identification of peer bullies and victims. *School Psychology Review,*

28(3), 505-517.

Lord, A., & McFarland, L. (2010). Pre-service primary teachers' perceptions of early

childhood philosophy and pedagogy: A case study examination. *Australian*

Journal of Teacher Education, 35(3), 1-13.

Marini, Z. A., Dane, A. V., & Bosacki, S. L. (2006). Direct and indirect bully-victims:

differential psychosocial risk factors associated with adolescents involved in

bullying and victimization. Aggressive Behavior, 32(6), 551-569.

doi:10.1002/ab.20155

Marshall, M. L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Graybill, E. C., & Skoczylas, R. B. (2009).

Teacher responses to bullying: Self-reports from the front line. *Journal of School*

Violence, *8*(2), 136-158. doi:10.1080/15388220802074124

Maunder, R. E., Harrop, A., & Tattersall, A. J. (2010). Pupil and staff perceptions of

bullying in secondary schools: comparing behavioural definitions and their

perceived seriousness, *Educational Research, 52*(3), 263-282. doi:

10.1080/00131881.2010.504062

McKinley, N. (2004). Braving the bullies: What speech-language pathologists can do.

 ASHA Leader 21, 16-17.

Merrett, F., & Wheldall, K. (1993). How do teachers learn to manage classroom

 behavior? A study of teachers' opinions about their initial training with special

 reference to classroom behavior management. *Educational Studies, 19*(1), 91-106.

Miller, P. H. (1996). *Theories of developmental psychology*, 3rd Ed. New York: W. H.

 Freeman and Company.

Mishna, F. (2004). A qualitative study of bullying from multiple perspectives. *Children*

 & Schools 26(4), 234-247.

Mishna, F., Pepler, D., & Wiener, J. (2006). Factors associated with perceptions and

 responses to bullying situations by children, parents, teachers, and principals.

 Victims and Offenders, 1, 255-288.

Mishna, F., Scarcello, I., Pepler, D., & Weiner, J (2005). Teachers' understanding of

 bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28, 718-738.

Nansel, T. R., Craig, W., Overpeck, M. D., Saluja, G., & Ruan, W. J. (2004). Cross-

 national consistency in the relationship between bullying behavior and

 psychosocial adjustment. *Archives of Pediatric Adolescent Medicine, 158*(8), 730-

 736.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M. D., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt,

 P. (2001). Bullying behaviours among U. S. youth: Prevalence and association

 with psychosocial adjustment. *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical*

 Association, 285(16), 2094-2100.

Newman, R. S. & Murray, B. J. (2005). How students and teachers view the seriousness of peer harassment: When is it appropriate to seek help? *Journal of Educational Psychology, 97*, 357-365.

Nicolaides, Toda, & Smith, (2002). Knowledge and attitudes about school bullying in trainee teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 72*(1), 105-118.

O'Haver, C. L. (2011). *A study of pre-service and in-service teachers' responses to relational aggression/bullying compared to physical and verbal bullying*. Retrieved from UMI (3456661)

Olweus, D. (1983). *Olweus' Questionnaire on bullying* – first version. Mimeo. Bergen, Norway: University of Bergen.

Olweus, D. (1991) Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In D. Pepler & K. Rubin (Eds). *The Development and Treatment of Childhood Aggression*. (pp. 411-448). Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Olweus, D. (1996). Bullying at school: Knowledge base and an effective intervention program. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 794*: 256-276. doi: 10.1111/j.1749-6632.1996.tb32527x

Olweus, D. (1999). *Norway*. In Smith, P. K., Y. Morita J. Junger-Tas, D. Olweus, R. Catalano, & P. Slee (Eds). In: *The nature of school bullying*. London: Routledge.

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

Pepler, D.J., Craig, W., & Connolly, J. (1997). *Bullying and victimization: The problems and solutions for school-aged children*. Ottawa, ON: National Crime Prevention Council.

Pepler, D.J., Smith, P.K., & Rigby, K. (2004). Looking back and looking forward: Implications for making interventions work effectively. In P.K. Smith, D.

Pepler,& K. Rigby (Eds.), *Bullying in schools: How successful can interventions be?* (pp. 307-324). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Ponce-Garcia, E. (2011). *The Relationship between thinking styles and resilience in young adults.* Masters thesis. Oklahoma State University.

Raskauskas, J., & Modell, S. (2011). Modifying anti-bullying programs to include students with disabilities. *Teaching Exceptional Children, 44*, 60-67.

Ricard, R. J., Brown, A., & Sanders, J. (2002). What's appropriate about developmentally appropriate practices? Observing early childhood development center classroom environments. In *Early Childhood Literacy:Programs & Strategies to Develop Cultural,Linguistic, Scientific, and Healthcare Literacy for Very Young Children & Their Families, 2001 Yearbook*.

Rigby, K. (2002). *A meta-evaluation of methods and approaches to reducing bullying in pre-schools and early primary school in Australia*. Canberra: Attorney-General's Department.

Rigby, K. (1996). Bullying in schools and what to do about it. Bristol: Jessica Kingsley.

Rigby, R., & Bagshaw, D. (2003). Prospects of adolescent students collaborating with teachers in addressing issues of bullying and conflict in schools*. Educational Psychology, 23*(5), 535-546.

Robers, S., Zhang, J., Truman, J. & Snyder, T. D. (2011). *Indicators of school crime and safety*: National Center for Education & Bureau of Justice (joint project). Retrieved from http://www.bjs.gov

Rose, C. A., Monda-Amaya, L. E., & Espelage, D. L. (2011). Bullying perpetration and victimization in special education: A review of the literature. *Remedial and Special Education*, *32*(2), 114-130.

Sahin, M. (2010). Teacher's perceptions of bullying in high schools: A Turkish study. *Social Behavior & Personality: An International Journal*, *38*(1), 127-142

Saucier, G. (1994). Mini-Markers: A brief version of Goldberg's Unipolar Big-Five Markers. *Journal of Personality Assessment, 63(3),* 506-516.

Siann, G., Callaghan, M., Lockhart, R., & Rawson, L. (1993). Bullying: Teachers' views and school effects. *Educational Studies*, *19*(3), 307-321. doi:10.1080/03055699301903306

Skinner, A. T., Babinski, L. M., & Gifford, E. J. (2014). Teachers' expectations and self-efficacy for working with bullies and victims. *Psychology in the Schools 51*(1), 72-84.

Smith, P. K., Madsen, K. C., & Moody, J. C. (1999). What causes the age declines in reports of being bullied at school? Toward a developmental analysis of risks of being bullied. *Educational Research*, *41*, 267-285.

Smith, P. K., Morita, Y., Junger-Tas, J., Olweus, D., Catalano, R. and Slee, P. (1999) (Eds.), In *The nature of school bullying: A cross-national perspective*, New York: Routledge.

Stephenson, P., & Smith, D. (1989). Bullying in the junior school. In D. P. Tatum & D.

    A. Lane (Eds.). *Bullying in school.* (pp. 45-57). Stoke-on-Trent: Trentham Books.

Sternberg, R. J. (1988). Mental self-government: A theory of intellectual styles and their

    development. *Human Development*, *31,* 197-224.

Sternberg, R. J. (1990). *Metaphors of mind: Conceptions of the nature of intelligence*.

    New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (1994). Thinking styles: Theory and assessment at the interface between

    intelligence and personality. In R. J. Sternberg & P. Ruzgis (Eds). *Intelligence*

    and personality. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (1997). *Thinking styles.* New York: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J., & Grigorenko, E. L. (1995). Styles of thinking in school. *European*

    Journal of High Ability, *6*(2), 1–18.

Sternberg, R. J., Grigorenko, E. L., & Zhang, L. (2008). Styles of learning and thinking

    matter in instruction and assessment. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *3*(6),

    486-506. doi:10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00095.x

Sternberg, Wagner, & Zhang (2007). *Thinking Styles Inventory – Revised II* (*TSI-R2*),

    Tufts University.

Sternberg, R. J., & Zhang, L. F. (2005). Styles of thinking as a basis of differentiated

    instruction. *Theory into Practice 443*(3), 245-253.

Sullivan, K., Cleary, M., & Sullivan, G. (2004). *Bullying in secondary schools: What it*

    looks like and how to manage it. Thousand Oaks, CA: Corwin Press.

Survey Monkey. Retrieved from https://www.surveymonkey.com

Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., & Sacco, F. C. (2001). An innovative psycho-dynamically influenced approach to reduce school violence. *Journal of the American Academy of Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 40(3), 377-379. doi:10.1097/00004583-200103000-00019

Unnever, & Cornell (2004). Middle school victims of bullying: Who reports being bullied? *Aggressive Behavior*, 38, 373-388.

United Nations Convention on Rights of the Child. Article 19. Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights. Retrieved 23 November 2007 from http://www.ohchr.org/english/law/crc.htm#art19

Viding, E., McCrory, E. J., Blakemore, S. J., & Frederickson, N. (2011) Behavioural problems and bullying at school: can cognitive neuroscience shed new light on an old problem? *Trends in Cognitive Sciences*, *15*(7), 289-291.

Walker, H. M., Colvin, G., & Ramsey, E. (1995). *Antisocial behavior in school: Strategies and best practices*. Pacific Grove, CA:Brooks/Cole.

Wallace, K. (CNN). *Kid's Viral Bullying Video Shows How Frustrated Parents Can Ge*t. (Tuesday, May 13, 2014). http://www.cnn.com/2014/05113/living/bully-frustrated-pareents-video/index

Wang, C. Berry, B., & Swearer, S. (2013). The critical role of school climate in effective bullying prevention. *Theory into Practice*, 52, 296-302.

Whitney, I., Smith, P. K., & Thompson, D. (1994). Bullying and children with special educational needs. In P. K. Smith & S. Sharp (Eds.), *School bullying: Insights and perspectives* (pp. 213-240). London: Routledge.

Williams, F., & Cornell, D. G. (2006). Student willingness to seek help for threats of

    violence in middle school. *Journal of School Violence*, *5*(4), 35-49.

    doi:10.1300/J202v05n04_04

Yoneyama, S. & Naito, A. (2003). Problems with the paradigm: the school as a factor in

    understanding bullying (with special reference to Japan). *British Journal of*

    Sociology of Education, 24(3), 315-329.

Yoon, J. S., and Kerber, K. (2003) Bullying: Elementary teachers' attitudes and

    intervention strategies, *Research in Education, 69*, 27–35.

Zhang, L. F. (2000). Relationship between thinking styles inventory and study process

    questionnaire. *Personality and Individual Differences, 29,* 841–856.

Zhang, L. F. (2002). Thinking styles and cognitive development. *The Journal of Genetic*

    Psychology 163(2), 179-195.

Zhang, L. F. (2008). Thinking styles & emotions. *The Journal of Psychology, 142,* 497-

    515.

Zhang, L. F. (2008). Thinking styles and identifying Chinese university students. The

    American Journal of Psychology, 121, 255-271.

Zhang, L. F. (2009). Anxiety and thinking styles. *Personality and Individual Differences,*

    47, 347-351.

Zhang, L. F., & Postiglione, G. A. (2001). Thinking styles, self-esteem, and

    socioeconomic status. *Personality and Individual Differences, 31*, 1333-1346.

Zhang, L. F., & Sternberg, R. J. (2002). Thinking styles and teachers' characteristics.

    International Journal of Psychology, 37(1), 3-12.

Zhang, L. F., & Sternberg, R. J. (2005). A three-fold model of intellectual styles. *Educational Psychology Review, 17*(1), p. 1.

Zhang, L. F., Sternberg, R. J., & Fan, J. (2013). Revisiting the concept of style match. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 83*, 225-237.

Zhang, L. F., Sternberg, R. J., & Rayner, S. (2012). *Handbook of intellectual styles: Preferences in cognition, learning, and thinking.* New York: Springer Publishing Company.

Zhu, C. & Zhang, L. F. (2011). Thinking styles and conceptions of creativity among university students. *Educational Psychology: An International Journal of Experimental Educational Psychology 31(*3), 361- 375.

Figure 1

Figure 1

Pre-service vs. In-service Teachers

New Survey
- Student bullying and teacher responsibility
- School environment and empathy

Student Bullying Focus
- How serious is bullying?
- Will you intervene?

Bullying in Two Sample Populations
- Is it bullying?
- How serious is it?

Thinking Styles Tests TSI-R2 and BTSI
- Will pre-service scores differ from in-service?

Separate Analyses for Pre-service and In-service

Thinking Styles

Impact of Thinking Style
- How do you rate on six variables?

Non-handicapped vs. Handicapped Victim
- How often do you intervene?

Correlation of TSI-R2 and BTSI
- Will pre-service scores correlate on TSI-R2 and BTSI?
- What about in-service?

BEM
- Do you have more masculinity or femininity traits?

Big Five
- Which personality type intervenes most?

Pre-service only

In-service only

Bullying Intervention Training
- Will it make you intervene more?

13 Thinking Styles
- Who intervenes most?

Non-handicapped and Handicapped
- Who offers more ideas for intervention, Type I or Type II?

Job Satisfaction
- Are you more likely to intervene if satisfied with job?

73

Table 1
Sternberg's Theory of Mental Self-Government within the Threefold Model of Intellectual Styles

5. Dimensions	13. Thinking Styles	Preferences and Characteristics
Function	Legislative [(Type I)]	Work on tasks that require creative strategies; Choose one's own activities.
	Executive [(Type II)]	Work on tasks with clear instructions and structures; implement tasks with established guidelines.
	Judicial [(Type I)]	Work on tasks that allow for one's evaluation; Evaluate and judge the performance of other people.
Form	Hierarchical [(Type I)]	Distribute attention to several tasks that are prioritized according to one's valuing of the tasks.
	Monarchic [(Type II)]	Work on tasks that allow complete focus on one thing at a time.
	Oligarchic [(Type III)]	Work on multiple tasks in the service of multiple objectives, without setting priorities.
	Anarchic [(Type III)]	Work on tasks that would allow flexibility as to what, where, when, and how one works.
Level	Global [(Type I)]	Pay more attention to the overall picture of an issue and to abstract ideas.
	Local [(Type II)]	Work on tasks that require working with concrete details.
Scope	Internal [(Type III)]	Work on tasks that allow one to work as an independent unit.
	External [(Type III)]	Work on tasks that allow for collaborative ventures with other people.
Leaning	Liberal [(Type I)]	Work on tasks that involve novelty and ambiguity.
	Conservative [(Type II)]	Work on tasks that allow one to adhere to the existing rules and procedures in performing tasks.

Note. Descriptive note. Adapted from "A threefold model of intellectual styles," by Zhang, L. and Sternberg, R. J., 2005, *Educational Psychology Review, 17 (1)*, p. 1. Copy right 2005 by Springer Science + Business Media, Inc. Adapted.

Table 2

Teacher Characteristics and a Percentage within Type

Characteristic	Pre-service		In-service	
Self-identity				
Caucasian	43	(86)	36	(90)
Native American	3	(6)	2	(5)
Hispanic	3	(6)	0	(0)
Asian	1	(2)	1	(2.5)
Black	0	(0)	1	(2.5)
Age mean	24		43	
Grade taught/desired				
K-6th	32	(64)	17	(42.5)
7th-9th	7	(14)	9	(22.5)
10th-12th	11	(22)	14	(35)
Subject taught/desired				
English/foreign language	16	(32)	16	(40)
Math	13	(26)	6	(15)
Science	7	(14)	10	(25)
History	7	(14)	4	(10)
Art	5	(10)	3	(7.5)
Choir	1	(2)	1	(2.5)
Physical Science	1	(2)	0	(0.0)

Note: The first number in each column is the number of participants. It is followed by the percent in parentheses.

Table 3
Perceived Seriousness of Bullying and Teacher Responsibility Expressed as a Percentage

| | Pre-service | | | | | In-service | | | | | |
| | Agree/ strongly agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree/ Strongly disagree | Total | | Agree/ strongly agree | Neither agree nor disagree | Disagree/ Strongly disagree | Total | | |
	n	n	n	M	SD	n	n	n	M	SD	p
Serious problem	32 (64.0)	16 (32.0)	2 (04.0)	2.10	.95	27 (67.5)	8 (20.0)	5 (12.5)	2.02	1.14	.735
Bullying by boys serious	40 (80.0)	4 (08.0)	6 (12.0)	1.92	1.10	31 (77.5)	5 (12.5)	4 (10.0)	1.92	.97	.982
Bullying by girls serious	39 (78.0)	5 (10.0)	6 (12.0)	1.86	1.19	35 (87.5)	3 (07.5)	2 (05.0)	1.65	.92	.363
Not a natural part of growing up	23 (46.0)	10 (20.0)	17 (34.0)	2.86	1.26	17 (42.5)	12 (30.0)	11 (27.5)	2.75	1.13	.668
Not just tattling or teasing	4 (8.0)	16 (32.0)	30 (60.0)	3.88	1.06	7 (17.5)	5 (12.5)	28 (70.0)	3.7	1.04	.423
Social competence	14 (28.0)	16 (32.0)	20 (40.0)	3.26	1.24	8 (20.0)	8 (20.0)	24 (60.0)	3.67	1.16	.109
No backup plan	13 (26.0)	12 (24.0)	25 (50.0)	3.30	1.16	9 (22.5)	7 (17.5)	24 (60.0)	3.42	1.20	.618
Appropriate strategies	24 (48.0)	13 (26.0)	13 (26.0)	2.66	1.06	26 (65.0)	9 (22.5)	5 (12.5)	2.25	1.03	.069
Bullies not my responsibility	5 (10.0)	4 (08.0)	41 (82.0)	4.22	1.20	2 (05.0)	0 (05.0)	38 (95.0)	4.57	.75	.090
Ignore	6 (12.0)	4 (08.0)	40 (80.0)	4.20	1.19	2 (05.0)	2 (05.0)	36 (90.0)	4.55	.81	.103
Can ID	33 (66.0)	11 (22.0)	6 (12.0)	2.28	1.09	2 (65.0)	13 (32.5)	1 (02.5)	2.32	.73	.816
Confident*	23 (46.0)	10 (20.0)	17 (34.0)	2.84	1.18	27 (67.5)	9 (22.5)	4 (10.0)	2.25	.95	.010
Unable to stop bullying	13 (26.0)	9 (18.0)	28 (56.0)	3.46	1.11	10 (25.0)	11 (27.5)	19 (47.5)	3.27	1.13	.438
Intervention will not last	8 (16.0)	8 (16.0)	34 (68.0)	3.62	1.07	4 (10.0)	8 (20.0)	28 (70.0)	3.77	.86	.459
Long-term consequences for those bullied	38 (76.0)	5 (10.0)	7 (14.0)	1.88	1.19	36 (90.0)	2 (05.0)	2 (05.0)	1.65	.80	.278

Note: * indicates significance at the *p* < .05 level.

Table 4
School Environment and Empathy in Regard to Dealing with Bullying Expressed as a Percentage

	Pre-service					In-service					
	Agree/ strongly agree n	Neither agree nor disagree n	Disagree/ Strongly disagree n	Total M	SD	Agree/ strongly agree n	Neither agree nor disagree n	Disagree/ Strongly disagree n	Total M	SD	p
School climate*	28 (56.0)	12 (24.0)	10 (20.0)	2.56	1.25	32 (80.0)	6 (15.0)	2 (05.0)	1.82	.87	.002
Counsel & administration can handle	25 (50.0)	15 (30.0)	10 (20.0)	2.58	1.13	24 (60.0)	9 (22.5)	7 (17.5)	2.42	1.17	.526
Think cannot handle if send to office*	13 (26.0)	11 (22.0)	26 (52.0)	3.46	1.15	5 (12.5)	0 (00.0)	35 (87.5)	4.05	1.13	.017
Expect to know policy	40 (80.0)	2 (04.0)	8 (16.0)	1.76	1.17	32 (80.0)	5 (12.5)	3 (07.5)	1.85	.92	.692
Think policy will be effective	31 (62.0)	9 (18.0)	10 (20.0)	2.44	1.15	15 (37.5)	16 (40.0)	9 (22.5)	2.85	1.03	.081
Expect to know school guidelines	29 (58.0)	12 (24.0)	9 (18.0)	2.58	1.07	25 (62.5)	14 (35.0)	1 (02.5)	2.20	.79	.065
Expect administrative support	36 (72.0)	7 (14.0)	7 (14.0)	2.14	1.21	33 (82.5)	1 (02.5)	6 (15.0)	2.02	1.12	.645
Others not as concerned as I am	11 (22.0)	24 (48.0)	15 (30.0)	3.06	.84	9 (22.5)	12 (30.0)	19 (47.5)	3.22	1.17	.455
Witness before intervene	12 (24.0)	13 (26.0)	25 (50.0)	3.30	1.28	8 (20.0)	6 (15.0)	26 (65.0)	3.70	1.14	.126
Role of media*	31 (62.0)	15 (30.0)	4 (08.0)	2.18	1.00	13 (32.5)	18 (45.0)	9 (22.5)	2.82	1.03	.004
Show empathy to victims	38 (76.0)	5 (10.0)	7 (14.0)	1.86	1.19	35 (87.5)	3 (07.5)	2 (05.0)	1.67	1.00	.435
Impact of faith in God	21 (42.0)	19 (38.0)	10 (20.0)	2.64	1.19	20 (50.0)	10 (25.0)	10 (25.0)	2.72	1.36	.753
Bullies lack empathy	19 (38.0)	18 (36.0)	13 (26.0)	2.76	1.15	26 (65.0)	5 (12.5)	9 (22.5)	2.37	1.19	.124
Teachers can make students feel empathy	17 (34.0)	22 (44.0)	11 (22.0)	2.86	1.05	16 (40.0)	14 (35.0)	10 (25.0)	2.77	1.14	.715

Note: * indicates significance at the $p < .05$ level.

Table 5

Pre-service and In-service Teachers' Determination of whether a Situation Involves Bullying as a Percentage

Characteristic	Pre-service		In-service	
Students with disabilities				
Scenario #2 Down's (Verbal)	68/68	(100.0)	43/44	(97.7)
Scenario #8 Legally Blind (Verbal)	53/57	(93.0)	36/42	(85.7)
Scenario #3 Cerebral Palsy (Physical)	62/68	(91.2)	38/44	(86.4)
Scenario #9 Dyslexic (Eye Roll)	30/52	(57.7)	21/41	(51.2)
Scenario #5 Tourette's (Exclusion)	32/57	(56.1)	14/42	(33.3)
*Scenario #11 ADHD (Dirty Looks)	28/52	(53.8)	11/41	(26.8)
Students without disabilities				
Scenario #4 Stupid (Verbal)	64/68	(94.1)	39/44	(88.6)
*Scenario #1 Hit Someone (Physical)	61/68	(89.7)	35/44	(79.0)
Scenario #6 Rumors (Verbal)	46/57	(80.7)	31/42	(73.8)
Scenario #7 (Exclusion)	44/57	(77.2)	27/42	(64.3)
Scenario #12 (Eye Roll)	38/52	(73.1)	27/41	(65.9)
Scenario #10 (Dirty Looks)	26/52	(50.0)	16/41	(39.0)

Note: The table indicates identification of scenario as bullying. The * indicates statistically significant at $p < .05$ for the *seriousness* of the offense.

Table 6

Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions Related to Thinking Styles

| | Thinking Styles | | |
Variables	I	II	Rating Scale
seriousness	3.57	3.48	1-5
empathy	2.57	2.21	1-4
intervention	3.98	3.70	1-5
sympathy	4.24	4.10	1-5
involvement	3.60	3.32	1-6
comprehensiveness	1.13	1.10	0-10

Note: This is data for pre-service teachers. The first, third, and fourth variables have a 5-point *Likert* scale. The second variable has a 4-point scale. The fifth variable has a 1 to 6 rating with 6 indicating the most involvement. The fifth variable is the number of self-determined interventions up to 10 per scenario averaged across all participants' scores.

Table 7
Teacher Response and Comprehensiveness by Personality Type

Personality	Pre-service			In-service		
Type of personality according to the Big Five	Number and percent per category *n*	Average number of scenarios responded to per participant	Average number of interventions per participant	Number and percent per category *n*	Average number of scenarios responded to per participant	Average number of interventions per participant
Extraversion	3 (7.14)	3.67	4.33	8 (24.24)	2.75	3.38
Agreeableness	32 (76.19)	3.34	4.19	13 (39.40)	4.92	6.15
Conscientiousness	4 (9.53)	4.75	6.00	3 (9.09)	6.00	7.67
Neurotic	0 (0.00)	0.00	0.00	0 (0.00)	0.00	0.00
Openness/intellect	3 (7.14)	2.00	2.00	9 (27.27)	5.00	6.67

Table 8

In-service Teachers' Perceptions Related to Thinking Styles

Variables	Thinking Styles		Rating Scale
	I	II	
seriousness	3.23	3.33	1-5
empathy	2.50	2.08	1-4
intervention	3.74	3.73	1-5
sympathy	3.97	4.10	1-5
involvement	3.34	3.46	1-6
comprehensiveness	1.19	1.07	0-10

Note: This is data for in-service teachers. The first, third, and fourth variables have a 5-point *Likert* scale. The second variable has a 4-point scale. The fifth variable has a 1 to 6 rating with 6 indicating the most involvement. The fifth variable is the number of self-determined interventions up to 10 per scenario averaged across all participants' scores.

APPENDICES

Appendix A: Survey for Assessing Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions about Bullying

(Curb & Kennison, 2012)

1. My grades in high school averaged a/an

  A

  B

  C

  D

2. Age: _____

3. Ethnicity: Check one

  ____Caucasian ___Black ___Asian ___Native American ___Hispanic

4. Highest level of education completed – circle one

  college freshman

  college sophomore

  college junior

  college senior

5. Number of times taught a class

6. Type of school where plan to teach

  public or independent

  private, religious, or non-denominational

charter

7. Where I live

　　urban

　　rural

8. Main subject emphasis: circle one: math　　science　　English/foreign language

　　history　band　choir　art　physical education

9. Grade desired to teach

　　pre-k or k　grades 1-3　grades 4-6　grades 7-9　grades 10-12

10. How many courses did you take in child development?

　　one　two　three　four　five　more than five

　　Bullying is defined as an intentional negative behavior that is typically repeated

and target at someone who has trouble defending himself or herself (often this is thought

of as an imbalance of power) Olweus 2011, 1983, 1996, 1991).

For the following Items #11 through #41, a 5-point Likert scale will be used with the

following labels: strongly agree -1, agree -2; neutral -3; disagree-4; and strongly

disagree-5.

11. Bullying is not a natural part of growing up.

12. Those who bully are socially competent.

13. I did not have courses in my college in which the curriculum or the instructor

　　specifically addressed how to deal with bullying.

14. I know appropriate strategies for various developmental ages of students.

15. Bullying by boys is a serious problem in schools.

16. Bullying by girls is a serious problem in schools.

17. I feel confident in dealing with bullies.

18. If my plan for dealing with bullies does not work, I do not have a backup plan in

     mind.

19. I would describe myself as someone who shows empathy toward victims of bullying.

20. Students who bully lack empathy for others.

21. The teacher can make students feel empathy for others.

22. A student's bullying intervention training determines how he/she responds to being

     involved in bullying prevention/intervention activities.

23. Other teachers are not as concerned about bullying as I am.

24. I believe that teachers whose actions show they have faith in God will have empathy

     for students who are bullied.

25. I expect the school to give me guidelines for dealing with specific types of bullying.

26. I expect the school policies for bullying will be effective.

27. Dealing with bullying will not be one of my responsibilities as a teacher.

28. Most bullying is just tattling or teasing.

29. I believe there may be long-term consequences for those who are bullied.

30. I think that I will be able to identify the bullies.

31. Whether or not I intervene in bullying depends on whether the situation is witnessed

     by me.

32. I feel that I will be unable to stop bullying.

33. Bullying interventions that I will try will not last.

34. It is helpful to ignore the bullying.

35. I expect the administration will support me when I intervene in bullying.

36. I expect to know the school policy on bullying.

37. I think the school will try to keep the media from finding out about the bullying that

    happens.

38. If I intervene in bullying and send them to the office, I am afraid administration will

    think that I cannot manage the class.

39. I trust the counselors and administration to handle bullying situations of the students.

40. I think bullying will be a serious problem in the schools.

41. I think the school climate will be one that disapproves of bullying.

For the following Items #42 through #46, a 5-point Likert scale will be used: very

much-1, much-2; some-3; not much-4; and not at all-5.

42. I bullied other students when I was in school.

43. I was bullied physically when I was in school.

44. I experienced verbal bullying in the form of any one or more of the following: being

    called names, mocked, being humiliated or intimidated, hearing racist comments

    when I was in school.

45. I was bullied by being excluded from joining a group or party when I was in school.

46. I experienced relational aggression when I was in school. Specifically, this included

    one or more of the following: others making up rumors about me, rolling their

    eyes at me, or ignoring me when I contributed a comment.

Please complete the following statement.

47. In regard to bullying, I wish…_____

    _____

    _____

Appendix B: Survey for Assessing In-service Teacher's Perceptions about Bullying

(Curb & Kennison, 2012)

1. Teacher certification

      state

      national

      both

2. Age: _____

3. Ethnicity: Check one

      ____Caucasian   ___Black   ___Asian   ___Native American   ___Hispanic

4. Highest level of education completed – circle one

      bachelor's degree

      master's degree

      doctoral degree

      post-doctoral

5. Number of years taught

6. Type of school of most service

      public or independent

      private, religious, or non-denominational

      charter

7. Location of school

      urban

rural

8. Main subject emphasis: circle one: math   science   English/foreign language

history   band   choir   art   physical education

9. Grade primarily taught

pre-k or k   grades 1-3   grades 4-6   grades 7-9   grades 10-12

10. How many courses did you take in child development?

one   two   three   four   five   more than five

Bullying is defined as an intentional negative behavior that is typically repeated and target at someone who has trouble defending himself or herself (often this is thought of as an imbalance of power) Olweus 2011, 1983, 1996, 1991).

For the following Items #11 through #41, a 5-point Likert scale will be used with the following labels: strongly agree -1, agree -2; neutral -3; disagree-4; and strongly disagree-5.

11. Bullying is not a natural part of growing up.

12. Those who bully are socially competent.

13. I did not have courses in my college in which the curriculum or the instructor

specifically addressed how to deal with bullying.

14. I know appropriate strategies for various developmental ages of students.

15. Bullying by boys is a serious problem in schools.

16. Bullying by girls is a serious problem in schools.

17. I feel confident in dealing with bullies.

18. If my plan for dealing with bullies does not work, I do not have a backup plan in

mind.

19. I would describe myself as someone who shows empathy toward victims of bullying.

20. Students who bully lack empathy for others.

21. The teacher can make students feel empathy for others.

22. A teacher's level of job satisfaction determines how he/she responds to being involved in bullying prevention/intervention activities.

23. Other teachers are not as concerned about bullying as I am.

24. I believe that teachers whose actions show they have faith in God will have empathy for students who are bullied.

25. I expect the school to give me guidelines for dealing with specific types of bullying.

26. The school policies for dealing with bullying are effective.

27. Dealing with bullying is not one of my responsibilities as a teacher.

28. Most bullying is just tattling or teasing.

29. I believe there may be long-term consequences for those who are bullied.

30. I think that I can identify the bullies.

31. Whether or not I intervene in bullying depends on whether the situation is witnessed by me.

32. I feel that I will be unable to stop bullying.

33. Bullying interventions that I will try will not last.

34. It is helpful to ignore the bullying.

35. The administration will support me when I intervene in bullying.

36. I know the school policy on bullying.

37. The school will try to keep the media from finding out about the bullying that happens there.

38. I intervene in bullying and send students to the office, I am afraid administration

　　　 will think that I cannot manage the class.

39. I trust the counselors and administration to handle bullying situations of the students.

40. Bullying is a serious problem in the schools.

41. The school climate will be one that disapproves of bullying.

For the following Items #42 through #46, a 5-point Likert scale will be used: very

much-1, much-2; some-3; not much-4; and not at all-5.

42. I bullied other students when I was in school.

43. I was bullied physically when I was in school.

44. I experienced verbal bullying in the form of any one or more of the following: being

　　　 called names, mocked, being humiliated or intimidated, hearing racist comments

　　　 when I was in school.

45. I was bullied by being excluded from joining a group or party when I was in school.

46. I experienced relational aggression when I was in school. Specifically, this included

　　　 one or more of the following: others making up rumors about me, rolling their

　　　 eyes at me, or ignoring me when I contributed a comment.

Please complete the following statement.

47. In regard to bullying, I wish…_____

　　　 _____

　　　 _____

　　　 _____

Appendix C: Thinking Styles Inventory—Revised II (*TSI-R2*)

Sternberg, R. J., Wagner, R. K., & Zhang, L. F., Tufts University, 2007

This questionnaire is about the different strategies and ways people use to solve

problems, to carry out tasks or projects, and to make decisions. To respond to this

questionnaire, read each statement carefully and decide how well the statement fits the

way that you typically do things at school, at home, or on a job. Circle 1 if the statement

does not fit you at all; that is, you never do things this way. For each statement, circle one

of the 7 numbers next to the corresponding item number on the answer sheet. Circle 7 if

the statement fits you extremely well, that is, you almost always do things this way. Use

the values in between to indicate that the statement fits you in varying degrees.

1=Not At All Well, 2=Not Very well, 3=Slightly Well, 4= Somewhat Well,

5=Well, 6=Very Well, 7=Extremely Well

There are, of course, no right or wrong answers. Please read each statement and circle the

number on the scale next to the statement that best indicates how well the statement

describes you.

Please proceed at your own pace, but do not spend too much time on any one statement.

1. I prefer to deal with problems that require me to attend to a lot of details.

2. When talking or writing about ideas, I prefer to focus on one idea at a time.

3. When starting a task, I like to brainstorm ideas with friends or peers.

4. I like to set priorities for the things I need to do before I start doing them.

5. When faced with a problem, I use my own ideas and strategies to solve it.

6. In discussing or writing on a topic, I think that the details and facts are more important than the overall picture.

7. I tend to pay little attention to details.

8. I like to figure out how to solve a problem following certain rules.

9. I like to control all phases of a project, without having to consult with others.

10. I like to play with my ideas and see how far they go.

11. I am careful to use the proper method to solve any problem.

12. I enjoy working on things that I can do by following directions.

13. I stick to standard rules or ways of doing things.

14. I like problems where I can try my own way of solving them.

15. When trying to make a decision, I rely on my own judgment of the situation.

16. I can switch from one task to another easily, because all tasks seem to me to be equally important.

17. In a discussion or report, I like to combine my own ideas with those of others.

18. I care more about the general effect than about the details of a task I have to do.

19. When working on a task, I can see how the parts relate to the overall goal of the task.

20. I like situations where I can compare and rate different ways of doing things.

21. When working on a project, I tend to do all sorts of tasks regardless of their degree of relevance to the project undertaken.

22. When I'm in charge of something, I like to follow methods and ideas used in the past.

23. I like to check and rate opposing points of view or conflicting ideas.

24. I prefer to work on projects that allow me to put in a lot of detailed facts.

25. In dealing with difficulties, I have a good sense of how important each of them is and

in what order to tackle them.

26. I like situations where I can follow a set routine.

27. When discussing or writing about a topic, I stick to the points of view accepted by my

    colleagues.

28. I like tasks and problems that have fixed rules to follow in order to complete them.

29. I prefer to work on a project or task that is acceptable to and approved by my peers.

30. When there are several important things to do, I do those most important to me and to

    my colleagues.

31. I like projects that have a clear structure and a set plan and goal.

32. When working on a task, I like to start with my own ideas.

33. When there are many things to do, I have a clear sense of the order in which to do

    them.

34. I like to participate in activities where I can interact with others as a part of a team.

35. I tend to tackle several problems at the same time because they are often equally

    urgent.

36. When faced with a problem, I like to solve it in a traditional way.

37. I like to work alone on a task or a problem.

38. I tend to emphasize the general aspect of issues or the overall effect of a project.

39. I like to follow definite rules or directions when solving a problem or doing a task.

40. I tend to give equal attention to all of the tasks I am involved in.

41. When working on a project, I like to share ideas and get input from other people.

42. I like projects where I can study and rate different views or ideas.

43. I tend to give full attention to one thing at a time.

44. I like problems where I need to pay attention to details.

45. I like to challenge old ideas or ways of doing things and to seek better ones.

46. I like situations where I interact with others and everyone works together.

47. I find that when I am engaged in one problem, another comes along that is just as important.

48. I like working on projects that deal with general issues and not with nitty-gritty details.

49. I like situations where I can use my own ideas and ways of doing things.

50. If there are several important things to do, I focus on the one most important to me and disregard the rest.

51. I prefer tasks or problems where I can grade the designs or methods of others.

52. When there are several important things to do, I pick the ones most important to my friends and colleagues.

53. When faced with a problem, I prefer to try new strategies or methods to solve it.

54. I like to concentrate on one task at a time.

55. I like projects that I can complete independently.

56. When starting something, I like to make a list of things to do and to order the things by importance.

57. I enjoy work that involves analyzing, grading, or comparing things.

58. I like to do things in new ways not used by others in the past.

59. When I start a task or project, I focus on the parts most relevant to my peer group.

60. I have to finish one project before starting another one.

61. In talking or writing down ideas, I like to show the scope and context of my ideas,

that is, the general picture.

62. I pay more attention to parts of a task than to its overall effect or significance.

63. I prefer situations where I can carry out my own ideas, without relying on others.

64. I like to change routines in order to improve the way tasks are done.

65. I like to take old problems and find new methods to solve them.

APPENDIX D

Appendix D: Thinking Styles in Regard to Bullying. (*BTSI*) (Modified by Kennison, S. & Curb, L. (2012). Based on Thinking Styles Inventory—Revised II (*TSI-R2*) Sternberg, R. J., Wagner, R. K., & Zhang, L. F., Tufts University, 2007

This questionnaire is about the different strategies and ways pre-service and in-service teachers solve problems, to carry out tasks or projects, and to make decisions. To respond to this questionnaire, read each statement carefully and decide how well the statement fits the way that you typically would respond to instances of bullying among students. Circle 1 if the statement does not fit you at all; that is, you never do things this way. For each statement, circle one of the 7 numbers next to the corresponding item number on the answer sheet. Circle 7 if the statement fits you extremely well, that is, you almost always do things this way. Use the values in between to indicate that the statement fits you in varying degrees.

1=Not At All Well, 2=Not Very well, 3=Slightly Well, 4= Somewhat Well,

5=Well, 6=Very Well, 7=Extremely Well

There are, of course, no right or wrong answers. Please read each statement and circle the number on the scale next to the statement that best indicates how well the statement describes you.

Please proceed at your own pace, but do not spend too much time on any one statement.

1. I prefer to use an approach to deal with bullying that involves a lot of details.

2. I prefer an approach to bullying that allows me to focus on one idea at a time.

3. I like to brainstorm ideas on bullying with peers.

4. I like to set priorities for dealing with bullying before I begin intervening.

5. I use my own ideas and strategies to solve a problem involving bullying among students.

6. In discussing a case of bullying, I think that the details and facts are more important than the overall picture.

7. I tend to pay little attention to the details of a case of bullying.

8. I like to figure out how to solve the bullying problem following certain rules.

9. I like to control all phases of the bullying problem, without having to consult with others.

10. I like to play with my ideas in regard to bullying and see how far they go.

11. I am careful to use the proper method to solve the problem of bullying.

12. I enjoy working on the problem of bullying by following directions.

13. I stick to standard rules or ways of dealing with bullying.

14. I like approaches where I can try my own way of solving the case of bullying.

15. When trying to make a decision, I rely on my own judgment of the situation of bullying.

16. I can switch from one aspect of the case of bullying easily, because all aspects of the case seem to me to be equally important.

17. In a discussion or report about the case of bullying, I like to combine my own ideas with those of others.

18. I care more about the general effect than about the details of the case of bullying that I have to handle.

19. I can see how the parts relate to the overall resolution of the case of bullying.

20. I like situations where I can compare and rate different ways of approaching the bullying.

21. I tend to do all sorts of tasks regardless of their degree of relevance to the bullying situation at hand.

22. When I'm in charge of dealing with bullying, I like to follow methods and ideas used in the   past.

23. I like to check and rate opposing points of view or conflicting ideas regarding bullying.

24. I prefer to work with approaches to deal with bullying that allow me to put in a lot of detailed facts.

25. In dealing with difficulties regarding bullying, I have a good sense of how important each of them is and in what order to tackle them.

26. I like situations of bullying where I can follow a set routine.

27. When discussing a case of bullying, I like to stick to the points of view accepted by my colleagues.

28. I like approaches to bullying that have fixed rules to follow in order to complete them.

29. I prefer to use an approach to bullying that is acceptable to and approved by my peers.

30. When there are several important things to do in regard to bullying, I do those most important to me and to my colleagues.

31. I like approaches to bullying that have a clear structure and a set plan and goal.

32. I like to start with my own ideas when doing something related to bullying.

33. When there are many things to do in regard to bullying, I have a clear sense of the order in which to do them.

34. I like to participate in a approaches to the case of bullying where I can interact with others as a part of a team.

35. I tend to tackle several problems relating to bullying at the same time because they are often equally urgent.

36. I like to solve a problem of bullying in a traditional way.

37. I like to work alone on the problem of bullying.

38. I tend to emphasize the general aspect of issues or the overall effect of the case of bullying.

39. I like to follow definite rules or directions when trying to solve the problem of bullying.

40. I tend to give equal attention to all of the case of bullying that I am dealing with.

41. I like to share ideas and get input from other people when working on a project to deal with bullying.

42. I like approaches where I can study and rate different views or ideas on bullying.

43. I tend to give full attention to one thing at a time when dealing with bullying.

44. I like approaches where I need to pay attention to details to solve a bullying situation.

45. I like to challenge old ideas or ways of doing things and to seek better ones to deal with bullying.

46. I like approaches where I interact with others in regard to bullying issues and everyone works together.

47. I find that when I am engaged in one approach to dealing with bullying, another

appears to be just as important.

48. I like working on approaches that deal with general issues of bullying and not with nitty-gritty details.

49. I like approaches where I can use my own ideas and ways of doing things regarding bullying.

50. If there are several important things to do regarding bullying, I focus on the one most important to me and disregard the rest.

51. I prefer approaches where I can grade the designs or methods others use in regard to bullying.

52. When there are several important things to do regarding bullying, I pick the ones most important to my friends and colleagues.

53. I prefer to try new strategies or methods to solve bullying problems.

54. I like to concentrate on one task at a time when dealing with bullying.

55. I like approaches to bullying that I can handle independently.

56. I like to make a list of things to do in regard to bullying and to order the things by importance.

57. I enjoy approaches to bullying that involve analyzing, grading, or comparing things.

58. I like to do things regarding bullying in new ways not used by others in the past.

59. I focus on the parts most relevant to my peer group in regard to bullying.

60. I have to finish one approach regarding bullying before starting another one.

61. I like to show the scope and context of my ideas, that is, the general picture, in regard to bullying.

62. I pay more attention to parts of the approach regarding bullying than to its overall

effect or significance.

63. I prefer approaches where I can carry out my own ideas regarding dealing with bullying, without relying on others.

64. I like to change routines in order to improve the way tasks are done in regard to bullying.

65. I like to find new methods to use to try to solve bullying problems.

Appendix E: Bem Sex-Role Inventory

Use the following scale to rate each of the words in the list:

1   Never or almost never true

2   Usually not true

3   Sometimes but infrequently true

4   Occasionally true

5   Often true

6   Usually true

7   Always or almost always true

_____

1. Self-reliant

2. Yielding

3. Helpful

4. Defends own beliefs

5. Cheerful

6. Moody

7. Independent

8. Shy

9. Conscientious

10. Athletic

11. Affectionate

12. Theatrical

13. Assertive

14. Flatterable

16. Strong personality

17. Loyal

18. Unpredictable

19. Forceful

20. Feminine

21. Reliable

22. Analytical

23. Sympathetic

24. Jealous

25. Has leadership abilities

26. Sensitive to the needs of others

27. Truthful

28. Willing to take risks

29. Understanding

30. Secretive

31. Makes decisions easily

32. Compassionate

33. Sincere

34. Self-sufficient

35. Eager to soothe hurt feelings

36. Conceited

37. Dominant

38. Soft-spoken

39. Likable

40. Masculine

41. Warm

42. Solemn

43. Willing to take a stand

44. Tender

45. Friendly

46. Aggressive

47. Gullible

48. Inefficient

49. Acts as a leader

50. Childlike

51. Adaptable

52. Individualistic

53. Does not use harsh language

54. Unsystematic

55. Competitive

56. Loves children

57. Tactful

58. Ambitious

59. Gentle

60. Conventional

Appendix F: Bullying Attitudes Questionnaire

Please read each vignette and answer the questions that follow.

1. What is your definition of bullying?

2. Does this scenario contain bullying? A student comes to you and says, "So-and-so hit

me during passing period, and I did nothing to deserve it. This happens all the

time!" You did not witness the event, but it is evident that the student is very

upset.

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

_____

_____

_____

_____

9. Does this scenario contain bullying? A student has Down's Syndrome. This student

has a flattened looking face, upward slanted eyes, and a protruding tongue. A

group of students passed by and yell out, "Why are you do down today" and

laugh. The student replies, "I'm not down." The others say, "Yes, you are!

You're down with Down's Syndrome!"   The student complains to you about this

and says it has happened before. You did not witness this activity. Does this

scenario contain bullying?

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

       strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

         strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

       strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

         strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

       not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

       10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

       _____

       _____

       _____

       _____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

       in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

       _____

       _____

       _____

       _____

16. Does this scenario contain bullying? A student who has cerebral palsy walks with a

       limp. Someone from a regular classroom walks behind the student with

       disability and pushes the student to the side to get him out of the way in order to

get through the crowded hall. You witnessed this event and heard that students

had done it before.

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

_____

_____

_____

_____

23. Does this scenario contain bullying? A student comes over to you, *very upset*, saying

they were called "stupid" and "retarded" by another student. The student has been

complaining about this student's comments quite a bit lately. You did not witness

the event.

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

_____

_____

_____

_____

30. Does this scenario contain bullying? At break time after lunch, some of the students

are playing chess. A student who is mainstreamed comes up and wants to play

the winner. The others tell the student that there is a long list of others waiting to

play the winner. You witnessed this event for two days in a row.

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

_____

_____

_____

_____

37. Does this scenario contain bullying? A student comes to talk to you and is very

upset. Rumors are going around school that this student lives in a car and

purchases clothes from the goodwill store. The student said there was another

rumor that the family has no food the family begs on the corners of a busy

intersection.

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

    not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

      very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

    strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

      strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

    strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

      strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

    not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

    10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

    _____

    _____

    _____

    _____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

    in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

    _____

    _____

    _____

44. Does this scenario contain bullying? A student comes to you and complains that they were not allowed to play baseball during lunch time for the third time this week because they are not in the "in" crowd. This student's face shows the student is very upset. You did not witness the event.

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to 10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

_____

_____

_____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

_____

_____

_____

_____

51. Does this scenario contain bullying?   A student who is legally blind wears "bottlepop" lenses. This student hears a rumor about him that goes like this: "Have you seen that   kid's bug eyes? I heard that those glasses attract mosquitoes! That's why that kid seems to scratch all the time." This student says that a friend keeps hearing this rumor and shared it. You did not witness this.

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

   not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to 10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

   _____

   _____

   _____

   _____

58. Does this scenario contain bullying? A dyslexic student shares ideas for the upcoming party, and the other students just "roll their eyes" at the student. You witness this activity occurring on several occasions.

   yes   no

   1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

   not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

      very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to 10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

_____

_____

_____

_____

65. Does this scenario contain bullying? A student came to me very upset. The student said, "They were asking for ideas for the games for the party and I suggested some. They didn't say anything, but just gave me dirty looks. The student said this had happened before. You did not witness these

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

     not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

       very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

     strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

       strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

     strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

       strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

     not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

     10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

     _____

     _____

     _____

     _____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

     in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

     _____

     _____

72. Does this scenario contain bullying? A student who is ADHD (attention-deficit

hyperactivity disorder) yelled out, "Hey, I want to go with you to the game" as

this student ran and jumped in the middle of the group gathered in the hall. They

turned and gave the student dirty looks. The student turned and walked away,

looking upset. You have witnessed this activity before.

yes   no

1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

_____

_____

_____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

   in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

_____

_____

_____

_____

79. Does this scenario contain bullying?   The student has not been observed doing

   anything to antagonize others. When the student is assigned to a group for a

   project, the student offers ideas which are met with smirks and eye rolling by the

   others in the group. The student expresses feelings of sadness to you because this

   has happened   several times. You did not witness this incident.

   yes   no

   1   2

3. In your opinion, how serious is this situation?

   not at all serious   not very serious   moderately serious   serious

        very serious

4. I would be upset by the bully's behavior.

   strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

        strongly agree

5. I would feel sympathetic toward the victim.

strongly disagree   disagree   neither disagree nor agree   agree

    strongly agree

6. How likely are you to intervene in this situation?

    not at all likely   not very likely   somewhat likely   likely   very likely

7. Would you intervene in this situation? If so, tell all of the things you would do (up to

    10 ideas). If you are not likely to intervene, why not?

_____

_____

_____

_____

8. Think about how a colleague would handle this. What would be wrong actions to take

    in this incident? Why would these not be ideal?"

_____

_____

_____

_____

APPENDIX
The 40-Item Mini-Marker Set

How Accurately Can You Describe Yourself?

Please use this list of common human traits to describe yourself as accurately as possible. Describe yourself as you see yourself at the present time, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you are generally or typically, as compared with other persons you know of the same sex and of roughly your same age.

Before each trait, please write a number indicating how accurately that trait describes you, using the following rating scale:

	Inaccurate			?		*Accurate*		
Extremely	*Very*	*Moderately*	*Slightly*		*Slightly*	*Moderately*	*Very*	*Extremely*
1	*2*	*3*	*4*	*5*	*6*	*7*	*8*	*9*

____ Bashful	____ Energetic	____ Moody	____ Systematic
____ Bold	____ Envious	____ Organized	____ Talkative
____ Careless	____ Extraverted	____ Philosophical	____ Temperamental
____ Cold	____ Fretful	____ Practical	____ Touchy
____ Complex	____ Harsh	____ Quiet	____ Uncreative
____ Cooperative	____ Imaginative	____ Relaxed	____ Unenvious
____ Creative	____ Inefficient	____ Rude	____ Unintellectual
____ Deep	____ Intellectual	____ Shy	____ Unsympathetic
____ Disorganized	____ Jealous	____ Sloppy	____ Warm
____ Efficient	____ Kind	____ Sympathetic	____ Withdrawn

(Saucier)

Appendix H: The Empathy Quotient (EQ) – (Baron-Cohen & Wheelwright, 2004).

Below is a list of statements. Please read each statement *carefully* and rate how strongly

you agree or disagree with it by circling your answer. There are no right or wrong

answers, or trick questions. IN ORDER FOR THE SCALE TO BE VALID, YOU MUST

ANSWER EVERY QUESTION.

Please respond to each of the following as 1- strongly agree; 2-slightly agree; 3- slightly

disagree; 4-strongly disagree

1. I can easily tell if someone else wants to enter a conversation.

2. I prefer animals to humans.

3. I try to keep up with the current trends and fashions.

4. I find it difficult to explain to others things that I understand easily, when they don't

   understand it the first time.

5. I dream most nights.

6. I really enjoy caring for other people.

7. I try to solve my own problems rather than discussing them with others.

8. I find it hard to know what to do in a social situation.

9. I am at my best first thing in the morning.

10. People often tell me that I went too far in driving my point home in a discussion.

11. It doesn't bother me too much if I am late meeting a friend.

12. Friendships and relationships are just too difficult, so I tend not to bother with them.

13. I would never break a law, no matter how minor.

14. I often find it difficult to judge if something is rude or polite.

15. In a conversation, I tend to focus on my own thoughts rather than on what my listener

    might be thinking.

16. I prefer practical jokes to verbal humor.

17. I live life for today rather than the future.

18. When I was a child, I enjoyed cutting up worms to see what would happen.

19. I can pick up quickly if someone says one thing but means another.

20. I tend to have very strong opinions about morality.

21. It is hard to me to see why some things upset people so much.

22. I find it easy to put myself in somebody else's shoes.

23. I think that good manners are the most important thing a parent can teach their child.

24. I like to do things on the spur of the moment.

25. I am good at predicting how someone will feel.

26. I am quick to spot when someone in a group is feeling awkward or uncomfortable.

27. If I say something that someone else is offended by, I think that that's their problem,

    not mine.

28. If anyone asked me if I liked their haircut, I would reply truthfully, even if I didn't

    like it.

29. I can't always see why someone should have felt offended by a remark.

30. People often tell me that I am very unpredictable.

31. I enjoy being the center of attention at any social gathering.

32. Seeing people cry doesn't really upset me.

33. I enjoy having discussions about politics.

34. I am very blunt, which some people take to be rudeness, even though this is unintentional.

35. I don't tend to find social situations confusing.

36. Other people tell me I am good at understanding how they are feeling and what they are thinking.

37. When I talk to people, I tend to talk about their experiences rather than my own.

38. It upsets me to see an animal in pain.

39. I am able to make decisions without being influenced by people's feelings.

40. I can't relax until I have done everything I had planned to do that day.

41. I can easily tell if someone else is interested or bored with what I am saying.

42. I get upset if I see people suffering on news programs.

43. Friends usually talk to me about their problems as they say that I am very understanding.

44. I can sense if I am intruding, even if the other person doesn't tell me.

45. I often start new hobbies but quickly become bored with them and move on to something else.

46. People sometimes tell me that I have gone too far with teasing.

47. I would be too nervous to go on a big rollercoaster.

48. Other people often say that I am insensitive, though I don't always see why.

49. If I see a stranger in a group, I think that it is up to them to make an effort to join in.

50. I usually stay emotionally detached when watching a film.

51. I like to be very organized in day to day life and often make lists of the chores I have to do.

52. I can tune into how someone else feels rapidly and intuitively.

53. I don't like to take risks.

54. I can easily work out what another person might want to talk about.

55. I can tell if someone is masking their true emotion.

56. Before making a decision, I always weigh up the pros and cons.

57. I don't consciously work out the rules of social situations.

58. I am good at predicting what someone will do.

59. I tend to get emotionally involved with a friend's problems.

60. I can usually appreciate the other person's viewpoint, even if I don't agree with it.

APPENDIX I

Appendix I: Short Form Preference Survey

Which of the following scenarios describes you best? Select the first box for Scenario #1: select the second box for Scenario #2.

Scenario #1 If I were at a bullying workshop, I would like to have the freedom to think of my own interventions. I realize there is a lot to do in regard to bullying, and I would prioritize the things that need to be done. I realize that each bullying situation may be different and somewhat ambiguous, but that doesn't bother me. I am interested in myself and each person seeing the whole issue and selecting interventions that he or she believes will work. At the end of the semester, we can evaluate and judge the interventions each of us used and determine which worked best.

Scenario #2 If I were at a bullying workshop, I would like to receive a set of clear guidelines and instructions to follow in each type of bullying incident. I would like to focus on one task regarding bullying intervention at a time. I want to know the punishment for each type of bullying that goes on.

How accurately does this scenario you selected describe you?

Appendix J: **Assessing Pre-service Teachers' Perceptions of Training**

1. All in all, I am very satisfied with my training in bullying.

     disagree

     somewhat disagree

     neutral

     somewhat agree

     agree

     strongly agree

2. There are times when I wish my training in dealing with bullies was better.

     strongly disagree

     disagree

     somewhat disagree

     neutral

     somewhat agree

     agree

     strongly agree

3. There are many things I would like to change about my bullying training.

     strongly disagree

     disagree

     somewhat disagree

     neutral

     somewhat agree

     agree

strongly agree

4. I am satisfied with my bullying training just the way it is.

strongly disagree

disagree

somewhat disagree

neutral

somewhat agree

agree

strongly agree

Appendix K: **Assessing Teachers 'Perceptions of Job Satisfaction Survey**

1. All in all, I am very satisfied with my teaching job.

      strongly disagree

      disagree

      somewhat disagree

      neutral

      somewhat agree

      agree

      strongly agree

2. There are times when I regret my decision to have selected teaching as a profession.

      strongly disagree

      disagree

      somewhat disagree

      neutral

      somewhat agree

      agree

      strongly agree

3. There are many things I would like to change about my teaching job.

      strongly disagree

      disagree

      somewhat disagree

      neutral

      somewhat agree

agree

strongly agree

4. I am satisfied with my teaching job just the way it is.

strongly disagree

disagree

somewhat disagree

neutral

somewhat agree

agree

strongly agree

VITA

Lisa Annette Curb

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Dissertation: TEACHER PERCEPTION OF BULLYING AND THINKING STYLE

Major Field: Psychology

Biographical:

Education:

Completed the requirements for Master of Science in Psychology at Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 2011

Completed the requirements for Master of Education in Reading at University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 1987

Completed the requirements for the Bachelor of Arts in English at University of Oklahoma, Norman, OK 1983

Experience:

Graduate Teaching Assistantship, Oklahoma State University, August 2008 through May 2014

Secondary Teacher, Western Heights High School, August 1988 through May 2001

Adjunct Professor, Learning Skills, Oklahoma City Community College, August 1987 through December 1997

Professional Memberships:

Current: Psi Chi; Golden Key International Honor Society, ONTOP

Past: SWPA, ORA, APA, OPA