TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF RELATIONAL AND OVERT AGGRESSION: DIFFERENCES IN REFERRALS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE BASED ON GENDER

By

YVETTE LYNN SEGURA

Bachelor of Science
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas
1997

Master of Science
Oklahoma State University
Stillwater, Oklahoma
2000

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
May, 2003

TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF RELATIONAL AND OVERT AGGRESSION: DIFFERENCES IN REFERRALS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE BASED ON GENDER

Thesis Approved:

Melanie C Page
Thesis Adviser

Dean of the Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Melanie Page, Ph.D. for all of her hard work in helping me complete this project. I also would like to thank my parents for all of their support throughout the years. Further, I would like to thank Donna Christenberry and Kay Porter for their help. Finally, I would like to thank the Tulsa Union, Tulsa Jenks, Stillwater, and Cushing Collaborative School Districts for agreeing to participate in my study.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter Page

LIST OF TABLES

Table Page

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Buss (1961, p. 1) defines aggression as "...a response that delivers noxious stimuli to another organism." More recently, however, researchers have conceptualized aggression as behaviors that are intended to cause harm or hurt others (Berkowitz, 1993; Myers, 1990). For purposes of this review, aggression will be conceptualized according to the latter definition.

Recent statistics indicate that aggression and aggressive acts are common among children and adolescents. For example, Geen and Donnerstein (1998) report that a child is arrested for a violent crime every five minutes and 24% of all violent crimes leading to arrest are committed by adolescents. Several studies have found a number of short-term and long-term consequences associated with childhood aggression. For example, Parker and Asher (1987) reviewed the literature on aggression and later personal adjustment. They found support for a relationship between childhood aggression and later dropping out of school and later juvenile and adult crimes. Further, Kokko and Pulkkinen (2000) found that teacher rated aggression at age 8 was predictive of school maladjustment at age 14, which was subsequently related to long-term unemployment.

Additionally, Coie, Dodge, and Kupersmidt (1990) reviewed the literature on peer group behaviors and a child's social status. Coie et al. (1990) found that aggression was

consistently related to social rejection for preschool and school aged children. More recent studies have also found a relationship between aggressive behaviors and peer rejection (Hess & Atkins, 1998; Schwartz, 2000). Hess & Atkins (1998) found that children classified as "aggressive victims" (i.e., children who were victimized by other children and committed aggressive acts against other children) had higher peer ratings of rejection and disruptiveness than their peers. "Aggressive victims" were also perceived by their peers to be less cooperative and less likely to be a leader than other children. In addition, Schwartz (2000) found that children who were aggressive were more likely to experience social and behavioral maladjustment.

Because aggressive behaviors have been linked to a number of maladjustment indices, research has also focused on identifying potential risk and protective factors for aggressive behaviors (e.g., Kokko & Pulkkinen, 2000). One factor that has been consistently identified as a risk for aggression is a child's gender (Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; Hyde, 1984). The following review will examine the literature on gender differences in aggression and explore potential explanations for why gender differences may exist. In addition, the following review will explore factors that may influence the magnitude of gender differences and circumstances that gender differences are most likely to occur.

CHAPTER II

GENDER DIFFERENCES IN AGGRESSION

Studies consistently demonstrate gender differences in aggressive behaviors, with boys being more aggressive than girls (Eagly and Steffen, 1986; Hyde, 1984; Knight, Fabes, & Higgins, 1996; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). For example, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974) found that gender differences in aggression first appear around the age of two, with differences being found up until late adolescence (i.e., college years). Additionally, Hyde's (1984) meta-analytic review found that boys were significantly more aggressive than were girls. However, the magnitude of the difference Hyde found was much smaller than what was originally reported by Maccoby and Jacklin (1974). Specifically, Hyde (1984) found that only 5% of the variance in the level of aggression displayed was attributable to gender. Additionally, she found that the size of the gender difference was found to vary with the age of participants and the year of the study. Gender differences in aggression appeared to decrease over time and effect sizes were smaller in newer studies.

Knight et al.'s (1996) meta-analysis reexamined gender differences in aggression using the same studies that Hyde (1984) used. Knight and colleagues also found that there were differences in the levels of aggression displayed by boys and girls, with boys being more aggressive than girls. However, Knight et al. did not find that gender differences decreased over time, as Hyde did. Knight et al. instead found that gender differences in

aggression were quite stable when (a) a number of study characteristics were controlled for (i.e., type of design, method of measurement, type of aggression used), (b) the year of publication was used as a continuous variable instead of dichotomously, as it was used in Hyde's study, and, (c) the effect size was weighted according to sample size. Knight and colleagues also found that the magnitude of the gender difference in aggression was larger in more recent studies. However, they conclude that this finding is most likely a result of the changes in research methodology over time and not necessarily a true change in the levels of aggression displayed by boys and girls.

Other research on gender differences in aggression suggests that these differences can be moderated by a number of variables. For example, some researchers have investigated the magnitude of gender differences as a function of provocation (Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Bettencourt & Miller, 1996) or arousal regulation (Knight, Guthrie, Page, & Fabes, 2000). For example, Eagly and Steffen's meta-analysis (1986) did not find that the level of provocation in an experimental situation moderated gender differences in aggression. However, Bettencourt & Miller's (1996) more recent meta-analysis did find that gender differences in aggression were moderated by the level of provocation present. Specifically, unprovoked men were found to be more aggressive than were unprovoked women. However, the magnitude of this finding becomes smaller in situations in which provocation is present. Bettencourt & Miller (1996) attribute their different findings to a more sensitive analysis of the literature and a larger sample of literature than was previously available for Eagly and Steffen's (1986) analysis. Finally, Knight and colleagues (2000) found that the magnitude of gender differences in aggression was moderated by the level of arousal in a situation; the magnitude of differences was larger

in situations that produced low or moderate arousal. Knight et al. (2000) also found that the magnitude of gender differences was also influence by a number of other variables (e.g., study design, mean age of the sample, method of assessment).

In conclusion, it appears that the finding that boys are more aggressive than girls is consistent across a number of different studies (e.g., Hyde, 1984; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). However, these studies highlight a number of factors that may influence this effect, including the design of the study and the level of provocation present (e.g., Bettencourt & Miller, 1996; Knight et al., 1996). An examination of possible reasons for gender differences follows.

Potential Explanations for Gender Differences in Aggression

Researchers frequently disagree as to the causes of gender differences in aggression. Some researchers have argued that gender differences in aggression are most likely related to biology (Archer & McDaniel, 1995; Maccoby, 1998; Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974; 1980), whereas others maintain that socialization practices are more important than biology in influencing gender differences in aggression (Bandura, 1973; Bettencourt & Miller; 1996; Block, 1983; Eagly & Steffen, 1986; Lightdale & Prentice, 1994; Tieger, 1980; Zahn-Waxler, 1993). The following review will examine research exploring both biological and social explanations for why gender differences in aggression may exist.

Biological

Maccoby and Jacklin (1974, 1980) argue that gender differences in aggressive behaviors are primarily the result of biological predispositions. They indicate that (a) gender differences in aggression have been found cross-culturally in all cultures examined, (b) differences in aggressive behaviors are found during early childhood, when it is not likely that socialization practices have been able to shape children's behaviors, (c) evidence of greater levels of aggression in subhuman male primates has also been found, and (d) aggressive behaviors are both related to and can be influenced by sex hormones (e.g., testosterone). Recent reviews on the role of testosterone, however, have not found conclusive evidence for its relationship to aggression even when methodology (i.e., serum levels vs. salivary levels) and samples (i.e., community vs. incarcerated) are taken into account (Albert, Walsh, & Jonik, 1993; Archer, 1991; Zoccolillo, 1993).

Despite their contention that gender differences in aggression are biologically predisposed, Maccoby and Jacklin (1974; 1980) do not deny that biology may be influenced by socialization practices and that aggressive behaviors, like all behaviors, may be shaped and modified through learning experiences. In a more recent analysis of gender differences in social behaviors, including aggression, Maccoby (1998) reaffirms her conclusions from her earlier works that biology may predispose boys to be more aggressive than girls. Maccoby indicates that socialization explanations for gender differentiated behaviors are not wrong, they are just "too limited." She does note, however, that it is important to remember that most boys are not aggressive (i.e., they are not frequently fighting with adults and peers).

Archer and McDaniel (1995) also indicate that it is likely that gender differences in aggression are biologically predisposed. They note that while there is evidence that suggests that some societies are more violent than other societies, the finding that boys are more aggressive than girls are is consistent cross-culturally despite the overall levels of aggression present in a society. In addition, Archer and McDaniel argue that unless one accepts the contention that the socialization experiences of boys and girls are the same cross-culturally, it is impossible to deny that gender differences in aggression are likely related to biological differences between boys and girls. As further support for their claim that biological influences are more important than socialization experiences in explaining gender differences in aggression, they describe results from a recent qualitative study of eleven nations. This study found that boys from all eleven countries were more likely to write stories with violent content than girls (in response to a different conflict or problem such as disciplining a child or a public dispute).

Biological explanations for differences in aggression have also focused on the role nature assigns to girls as the primary caretaker of children. Zahn-Waxler (1993) indicates that previous researchers have suggested that nature has prepared men for the role as "warrior" while nature has prepared women for the role of "worrier." However, she indicates that biological explanations emphasizing the role women have in childrearing are too simplistic for explaining why gender differences in aggression are consistently found. She indicates that although masculine aggressive behaviors have served the role of protecting the family, feminine inclinations to protect their young could also play a role in their capacity for aggression. Following this line of reasoning, it would also be reasonable to speculate that girls might be just as aggressive or even more aggressive than boys,

depending on the circumstances. For example, Paul and Galloway (1994) found that women were more likely than men to react to their partner's infidelity by "badmouthing" and harassing their rival.

Differential Socialization Practices

Bandura (1973) was one of the first researchers to argue that gender differences in aggression were related to differential socialization practices. Bandura (1973) argues that aggressive behavior occurs largely because of social reactions that reinforce it, and interpersonal aggression that appears to have no value is largely regulated by the consequences it produces. He further argues that gender differences in aggression are related to differential modeling and reinforcement of behaviors by parents and society that occur because physical aggression is usually regarded as an inappropriate behavior for girls. Bandura (1973) indicates that boys are typically reinforced more for aggressive behaviors while girls are reinforced less. He also provides evidence that suggests gender differences in aggression may disappear if girls are provided with "positive incentives" to aggress (i.e., Bandura, 1965).

Eagly and Steffen's (1986) meta-analysis also suggests that socialization practices are important in gender differences in aggression. Eagly and Steffen found that men were more likely than women to aggress when their behaviors would cause physical injury or pain than when their aggression would cause psychological or social harm. They also found that women were more likely to believe that aggressive behaviors would cause harm to the target, guilt and anxiety in oneself, and a danger to oneself than men were. They argue that these results suggest that aggressive behaviors are influenced by male and

female social roles that emphasize the acceptability of aggression in men and the unacceptability of aggression in women.

Other researchers have also suggested that socialization practices influence gender differences in aggression (i.e., Zahn-Waxler, 1993). Zahn-Waxler indicates that "bullying" is seen as more normative for boys than it is for girls. Zahn-Waxler contends that the perception that male aggression is normative is well documented and provides a powerful example: Condrey and Ross (1985, as cited in Zahn-Waxler, 1993) found that boy-boy dyads of preschoolers displaying the same levels of physical aggression were judged to be less aggressive than boy-girl and girl-girl dyads when participants' genders were disguised. She argues that boys are socialized to exploit and assume positions of dominance through violence. She also indicates that accepting "bullying" patterns in boys may be problematic, as ignoring these behaviors may be a missed opportunity to identify problematic behaviors. Despite Zahn-Waxler's argument, however, Lytton and Romney's (1991) meta-analytic review of parental socialization practices found minimal differences in socialization patterns for boys and girls. The only area in which Lytton and Romney found that parents differentially socialized children was in their encouragement of sex-typed activities. However, Zahn-Waxler contends that these results should not be interpreted to mean that biological influences play a more important role in the development of aggression than environmental influences, because meta-analytic reviews equate studies that vary in methodological rigor and environmental influences are often difficult to assess.

Additionally, Lightdale and Prentice (1994) investigated gender differences in aggressive behaviors by asking men and women to predict aggressive behaviors in men

and women in individuated and deindividuated (i.e., anonymous) conditions. Although men and women both expected men to be more aggressive than women, no differences existed in the level of aggression displayed by both genders when social influences guiding their behaviors were removed. Their results support Bandura's (1973) conclusion that gender differences in aggression are largely a function of environmental contingencies and that differences may be minimized when environmental contingencies are changed. Their results also support Eagly and Steffen's (1986) conclusion that gender differences in aggression reflect different gender social roles and expectations regarding the appropriate behavior of men and women.

Finally, Bettencourt and Miller's (1996) results also suggest the importance of social roles in the development of aggressive behaviors. As noted earlier, Bettencourt and Miller found that gender differences in aggression were moderated by the level of provocation present in a situation. Men are typically more aggressive in neutral situations. However, differences fade when the level and type of provocation (e.g., physical attack, threat to self-esteem) are taken into account. Knight et al. (2000) also found that arousal played a factor in the aggressive responses of men and women. In addition, Bettencourt and Miller (1996) found that gender differences in appraisals of the level of danger present in a situation predicted aggressive responding. Bettencourt and Miller suggest that differences in aggressive behaviors as a function of the level of provocation and appraisals concerning the dangerousness of a situation are both a result of gender socialization experiences. In contrast, Lytton and Romney (1991) found that gender socialization experiences were not significantly different, with the exception of differential encouragement of sex-typed activities. However, Lytton and Romney only

investigated parental parenting practices and not necessarily differential societal reinforcement of aggressive behaviors for girls and boys.

Underdetection

Although some researchers argue that gender differences in aggression may be related to biology (e.g., Archer & McDaniel, 1995) and others socialization practices (e.g., Bandura, 1973), it is also possible that the reason gender differences in aggressive behaviors have been found is related to the types of behaviors that have been measured in previous studies. In other words, aggressive behaviors that may be more typical of women may not be the subject of research studies and, as a result, aggressive behaviors in women may be underdetected. For example, Zahn-Waxler (1993) provides an example of aggression that may be undetected: abusive behaviors towards offspring. Zahn-Waxler also suggests that it may be in the best interest of society to ignore forms of abuse that are committed by girls because of the disruption to society that would occur if girls were incarcerated for violent behaviors. Although she provides no data to support her contention that maternal abusive behaviors are likely underestimated, there is evidence that reported child abuse cases are likely an underestimate of the actual child abuse cases that exist (Kalichman, 1993). Furthermore, research indicates that mothers are more likely to abuse their children than fathers (Gelles, 1998).

Conclusions. Based on previous research examining gender differences in aggression, it appears that there are gender differences in aggressive behaviors, with boys being more aggressive than girls. Although researchers have speculated as to why gender

differences may exist (i.e., biology, socialization, underdetection), there is no concrete evidence to suggest that gender differences in aggression are related to one specific cause. It seems more likely that gender differences in aggression are influenced by a number of factors, including biology and socialization practices. It is also possible that previous research has demonstrated differences in aggression between boys and girls because of the type of aggression being assessed. One major limitation of previous research on gender differences in aggression is that previous studies have focused mainly on physical and verbal types of aggression. Crick and Grotpeter (1995) speculate that it is possible that fewer studies have been conducted on female forms of aggression because the complexity and subtleness of the behaviors make them harder to detect. Because it is plausible that gender differences in aggression may be minimized or completely disappear if other forms of aggression are investigated, the following review will focus on examining another type of aggression that may be more normative in female groups (i.e., *relational* aggression (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995)).

Differences in the Expression of Aggression:

Overt vs. Relational

Geen (1990) indicates that several early researchers investigating aggressive behaviors postulated that gender differences in aggression were a function of the type of behaviors being assessed. He notes that Bandura (1973) speculated that boys and girls differ in their preferred means of aggression, with boys tending to prefer more physical means while girls may prefer non-physical ways, such as verbal aggression. Other research has also suggested differences in the types of aggression preferred and displayed

by boys and girls (Bjorkqvist, 1994; Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992; Cairns, Cairns, Neckerman, Ferguson, & Gariepy, 1989; Feshbach, 1969; Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, & Peltonen, 1988).

Overt Aggression. Crick (1997) defines the type of aggression most commonly studied in previous aggression research as *overt* aggression. Overt aggression refers to behaviors that harm others or intend to harm others through physical damage or the threat of physical damage. Crick and Grotpeter (1995) argue that overt forms of aggression (e.g., physical and verbal aggression) are consistent with the types of goals that previous research has suggested are important to boys. Specifically, Crick and Grotpeter indicate that previous research has suggested that themes of instrumentality (i.e., behaviors are seen as a means to an end) and physical dominance appear to be more relevant within boy peer groups than within girl peer groups (e.g., Block, 1983). Because instrumentality and physical dominance are important themes in male groups, it is likely that physical and verbal forms of aggression such as beating up a peer or threatening harm to a peer would be more common among boys than among girls because girls are likely to emphasize different goals in their peer groups.

Relational Aggression. Crick and Grotpeter (1995) indicate that previous research has suggested that themes involving relational issues (e.g., establishing intimate friendships) are more relevant among female peer groups (e.g., Block, 1983). Crick and Grotpeter suggest that because girls are more concerned with developing intimate relationships with their peers, they will exhibit a type of aggression that will effectively harm the peer relationships of the target (i.e., angrily retaliating against a child by

excluding her from one's play group; ignores another when she is mad at her). Crick and Grotpeter labeled this type of behavior *relational* aggression.

Gender Differences in Relational and Overt Aggression

Birth to Three Years of Age

Crick et al. (1999) indicate that no research to date has investigated relational aggression in children that fall within this age range. Crick and colleagues speculate, however, that studies in this area are likely to be difficult for a number of reasons. First, Crick et al. note that children first begin to develop speech and language abilities during this time frame. The authors indicate that most acts of a relationally manipulative nature require the capacity for language. Second, relationally aggressive acts that are nonverbal may necessitate a higher level of cognitive abilities than most children this age have. Therefore, the authors speculate that it may be necessary for advanced language, cognitive, and social abilities to have developed before children can engage in relationally aggressive acts. Although the authors' speculate that developmental milestones may be a prerequisite to the development of relational aggression, they do not deny the possibility that relationally aggressive acts may occur during this period.

Three to Five Years of Age

A few studies have investigated whether relationally aggressive acts are present in children aged three to five years and whether gender differences in overt and relational aggression exist (Casas & Crick, 1997 as cited in Crick et al., 1999; Crick, Casas, &

Mosher, 1997; McNeilly-Choque, Hart, Robinson, Nelson, & Olsen, 1996). Crick et al. (1997) found that relationally aggressive acts do appear in preschool aged children. In addition, evidence for gender differences in the types of aggression preferred and displayed by boys and girls also exists. Crick et al. first examined overall mean differences in relational and overt forms of aggression. Boys were found to be significantly more overtly aggressive than were girls (by teacher report). Additionally, girls were found to be significantly more relationally aggressive than were boys (by teacher report). Crick et al. also investigated which forms of aggression were most prevalent for those boys and girls whose aggression scores were one standard deviation above the sample mean. According to results from teacher ratings, 26% of the girls and 0% of the boys were classified as relationally aggressive, whereas 12% of the boys and 3% of the girls were classified as overtly aggressive. These results differ, however, from classifications based on peer ratings. Peer derived assessments identified 11% of the boys and 7% of the girls as overtly aggressive with 9% of the boys and 3% of the girls identified as relationally aggressive. These results diverge from previous research on school-aged children that used only peer nomination procedures (Crick and Grotpeter, 1995). The authors indicate that there may be several reasons for the discrepant findings. They speculate that the results may be due to (a) lack of statistical power, (b) developmental differences in children's ability to use or understand aggressive behaviors, or (c) children's lack of awareness of gender differences in aggressive behaviors.

Crick et al. (1997) also investigated whether relational aggression was related to indices of social psychological adjustment in preschool aged children. Again, both peer derived and teacher derived indices of psychological functioning were utilized. Peer

assessments found that relationally aggressive behaviors were significantly related to peer rejection and peer acceptance for boys. Additionally, relational aggression was related to peer rejection for girls. Teacher ratings of relational aggression were significantly related to both peer reports of peer acceptance and teacher reports of peer acceptance for boys. Teacher ratings of relational aggression predicted peer reports of peer rejection and teacher reports of depressed effect among girls. Results from Crick et al. (1997) also found that relational aggression added variance in the prediction of maladjustment for both boys and girls.

Casas and Crick (1997) (as cited in Crick et al., 1999) replicated Crick et al. (1997) with a larger sample size (i.e., n = 120 compared to n = 65). Results were not consistent with findings from the original study. Although Casas and Crick again found evidence that preschoolers engage in relational forms of aggression, they did not find differences between peer and teacher rated assessments on the percentage of girls that engage in relationally aggressive behaviors. In other words, both peer and teacher ratings found that the aggressive girls were more likely to use relational methods whereas aggressive boys were more likely to use overt methods.

McNeilly-Choque et al. (1996) investigated gender differences in relational aggression among a larger sample of preschool aged children than the two previous studies. Naturalistic observations, peer ratings, and teacher ratings were all utilized as assessment methods. Results showed that preschool girls were more relationally aggressive and less physically aggressive than boys when naturalistic observations and teacher ratings were the method of assessment. No differences in levels of relational aggression were found when peer assessments were used. However, peer assessments

revealed that boys demonstrated more physically aggressive behaviors than girls. Teacher ratings also revealed significant gender differences in the types of relational aggression used (i.e., verbal vs. nonverbal). Girls were more likely to demonstrate more verbal forms of relational aggression than were boys. No gender differences emerged for nonverbal forms of relational aggression.

School-Aged Children

Crick et al. (1999) indicate in their review of childhood aggression that the bulk of research on relational aggression has focused on middle childhood (9-12 years of age). Crick and Grotpeter (1995) investigated the frequency of different types of aggression among a school-aged sample of children (i.e., 3rd –6th graders). They hypothesized that girls would be most likely to harm peers through relational means (i.e., purposeful manipulation and harm to their targets' peer relationships), whereas boys would be most likely to harm peers through overt (i.e., physical and verbal) means. Results supported their hypothesis. Crick and Grotpeter (1995) found that girls who were classified by their peers as aggressive were more likely to demonstrate relational methods of aggression than overt means, whereas boys classified as aggressive were more likely to use overt methods. In addition, mean differences in aggression types revealed girls were more likely to use relational methods of aggression than boys were and boys were more likely to use overt methods of aggression than girls were. They also found that gender differences in aggression were minimized when relational forms of aggression were assessed in addition to overt forms of aggression, with 27% of the boys classified by their peers as aggressive compared to 22% of the girls.

Additionally, results supported previous research among preschool aged children that relational aggression is associated with adverse consequences (Crick et al., 1997; Casas & Crick, 1997 as cited in Crick et al., 1999). Specifically, Crick and Grotpeter found that relationally aggressive children were significantly more likely to be rejected by their peers than their nonrelationally aggressive peers were. This finding was significant even when the authors controlled for overt levels of aggression. In addition, relationally aggressive children were also more likely to report significantly higher levels of depression, loneliness, and isolation and lower levels of peer acceptance relative to their peers.

In another study, Crick (1997) again found support for gender differences in overt and relational forms of aggression. Boys were viewed as being significantly more overtly aggressive than were girls and girls were perceived to be significantly more relationally aggressive than were boys. Like her previous studies, Crick also investigated the social-psychological adjustment of children engaging in aggressive acts. Overall, results from teacher ratings and self-reports indicated that overtly aggressive children demonstrated significantly more externalizing difficulties than their peers, whereas relationally aggressive children were perceived to be significantly more internalizing than their peers (according to teacher ratings). In addition, relationally aggressive children were also perceived as being more externalizing than their nonaggressive peers were, a finding that had not been investigated in previous studies. Additionally, results suggested that overtly aggressive girls and relationally aggressive boys were significantly more maladjusted than overtly aggressive boys and relationally aggressive girls (i.e., children who engaged in

nonnormative forms of aggression were more maladjusted than children who engaged in normative forms of aggression).

Additionally, Rys and Bear (1997) investigated the relationship between relational aggression and peer relationships in a sample of third and sixth grade students. Results from Rys and Bear were somewhat different than results from previous research (e.g., Crick, 1997). When using mean scores of relational aggression based on teacher and peer reports, they did not find that girls were significantly more aggressive than boys were. When they used procedures designed to identify subgroups of aggressive and nonaggressive children (i.e., Crick 's classification scheme), gender differences emerged. Boys were more prevalent in the overtly aggressive or combined group (83% and 82%, respectively), whereas girls were more prevalent in the relationally aggressive group (95%). Rys and Bear also found that children who engaged in aggressive behaviors were more likely to be rejected by their peers. Specifically, boys who engaged in overtly aggressive behaviors were more likely to be rejected by their peers. For boys, relationally aggressive behaviors did not add to the prediction of peer rejection. For girls, however, relationally aggressive behaviors were more strongly related to ratings of peer rejection than overtly aggressive behaviors. In addition, relationally aggressive behaviors added to the prediction of peer rejection over and above variance explained by overt aggression.

Henington, Hughes, Cavell, and Thompson (1998) also reported different results than what has been previously reported (i.e., Crick and Grotpeter, 1995). Henington et al. found that boys displayed higher levels of both relational and overt forms of aggression than girls did (according to peer ratings). Additionally, when subgroups of children were examined (i.e., children who scored one standard deviation or higher than the mean

sample score), boys and girls were found to demonstrate similar levels of relationally aggressive behaviors. The author's speculate that their findings may be different from previous research (i.e., Crick and Grotpeter, 1995) because of the age of their sample. Crick and Grotpeter's sample included children in 3rd-6th grades, whereas Henington et al.'s sample included children in the 2nd and 3rd grades. They also indicated that other researchers (i.e., O'Connell, Pepler, & Kent, 1995 as cited in Henington et al., 1998) have found that boys in 1st-6th grades were more likely to use relational forms of aggression in lower grades whereas, girls' use of relationally aggressive behaviors increased with age.

Crick and colleagues have also examined children's normative beliefs about aggression (i.e., Crick, Bigbee, & Howes, 1996). Results indicated that both boys and girls perceive relational forms of aggression as more typical of girls, whereas physical forms of aggression are more typical of boys. Crick and colleagues also found that boys and girls were able to agree about the norms for aggression among boys, but had difficulty agreeing about normative aggressive acts for girls. Boys tended to view girls as engaging in more physical types of aggression than girls viewed other girls doing. Crick, et al., (1996) speculates about why boys and girls may differ on their views of the prevalence of physical aggression. Crick, et al., hypothesizes that overt forms of aggression, which are more common among boys, are easier for both boys and girls to observe. However, relationally aggressive acts may be less visible to boys because of their subtlety. The authors also argue that it may be possible that boys fail to take into account gender differences in aggression (i.e., they assume the norms for girls are the same as the norms for boys).

Relational and overt forms of aggression have also been found to be stable over time among school-aged (i.e., 9-12 year-olds) children (Crick, 1996). Specifically, Crick (1996) found that both overt and relational forms of aggression were stable over one-month, six-month, and yearlong periods. Similar to previous research (i.e., Crick & Grotpeter, 1995), she found that children displaying relational forms were more likely to be have future social-psychological difficulties than their nonrelationally aggressive peers. In addition, results suggested that relational aggression was uniquely associated with future adjustment difficulties only for girls (i.e., relational aggression did not add to the prediction of future maladjustment over and above overt aggression for boys).

Adolescence and Adulthood

Two recent studies have investigated whether relational forms of aggression and gender differences in the expression of aggressive behaviors also exist within adolescence and adulthood (Crick, Werner, & Schellin, 1998; MacDonald & O'Laughlin, 1997). Crick, et al., (1998) (as cited in Crick et al., 1999) assessed college students' normative beliefs about aggression. Participants were asked to generate responses to four questions regarding what people do when they are trying to be "hurtful" or "mean" to others. Results indicated that relational forms of aggression appear to be prevalent in young adulthood. However, gender differences in self-reports of relational aggression were not found. Another difference that emerged from previous research on preschool and school-aged children was that relationally aggressive acts were often described as involving damage to another's feelings of acceptance by peers of the opposite gender. Younger children's forms of relational aggression typically focus on making the target feel less

accepted within same gender groups (Crick et al., 1999). Crick et al. (1999) indicates that the changing nature of relational aggression in early adulthood is consistent with changes in the structure of the peer group that occurs in adolescence and early adulthood (i.e., increasing interest in members of the opposite gender). MacDonald & O'Laughlin (1997) (as cited in Crick et al., 1999), however, found that mid-adolescent girls reported higher levels of relational aggression than did boys.

Conclusions. The previous review provides some evidence to support Crick and colleagues' contention that gender differences in aggression may exist because previous research has focused mainly on overt forms of aggression (see Hyde, 1984 for a review). There is also support for the constructs of relational and overt aggression cross culturally (e.g., Hart, Nelson, Robinson, Olsen, & McNeilly-Choque, 1998; Tomada & Schneider, 1997). Overall, it appears that (a) girls prefer relational forms of aggression, whereas boys prefer overt methods, (b) boys and girls that display significantly higher levels of aggression than their peers differ in their preferred modes; aggressive boys prefer overt means, whereas aggressive girls prefer relational methods, (c) gender differences in relational and overt forms of aggression are likely present in early and middle childhood, and (d) both relational and overt forms of aggression are associated with psychosocial maladjustment (i.e., peer rejection, externalizing and internalizing difficulties). Because research suggests that both relational and overt forms of aggression are related to a number of indices of maladjustment, it is critical that children who are engaging in these behaviors are identified. Although parents may seek the services of a mental health professional when they are experiencing difficulties with their child, teachers also play an

important role in the identification of emotionally and behaviorally disturbed children (Lancelotta & Vaughn, 1989).

School Referrals for Disciplinary Action and/or Emotional Disturbance

Children spend a substantial portion of their day at school within the classroom environment. As a result, teachers may be more likely to notice when a child is experiencing difficulties. In addition, it may be that certain problematic behaviors (i.e., aggression towards peers) are more likely to appear within the school environment. When a child is identified by the teacher as having difficulties in the classroom, the teacher frequently has the important responsibility of referring a child for disciplinary action and/or special services. This next section will focus on examining literature that investigates (a) frequently referred behavior problems, (b) child characteristics that may influence the referral process, and, (c) teacher characteristics that may influence referral decisions.

Most Frequently Referred Problems

Research on child referrals for services suggests that teachers are more likely to refer for academic reasons than for behavioral issues (Tarnowski, Anderson, Drabman, & Kelly, 1990). For example, Tarnowski and colleagues (1990) investigated the frequency of referral problems in a sample of 144 boys and 78 girls referred for a psychoeducational evaluation. They found that 68% of referrals were for suspected learning problems, followed by Attention Deficit/Hyperactivity Disorder (28.38%), immaturity (2.25%), and

behavior problems (.90%). Additionally, Gottlieb, Gottlieb, & Trongone (1991) found that teachers were most likely to refer a child for a psychoeducational evaluation if the child was having academic difficulties. Specifically, they found that 55.2% of teacher referrals were for academic reasons, 34.1% were for a combination of academic and behavioral reasons, and 10.7% were for behavioral problems alone. In studies that investigated referrals for disciplinary action, insubordination, noncompliance, and defiance of authority emerged as important factors influencing teachers' decisions to refer (McFadden, Marsh, Price, & Hwang, 1992; Skiba, Peterson, & Williams, 1997).

Child Characteristics Influencing the Referral Process

Gender. Gregory (1977) found that teachers viewed problems in girls differently than problems in boys. Specifically, teachers were more likely to refer girls for special services than they were boys with identical problems (e.g., learning problems in math, being withdrawn). Although Gregory notes that both boys and girls described as aggressive are both likely to be referred for services, aggressive boys were more likely to be referred for services than aggressive girls. Aggression was the number one reason boys were referred and it was second for girls behind reading problems. Gregory suggests that teachers may perceive aggressive boys as being more difficult to handle than aggressive girls. However, she also speculates that it is equally likely that differences in referral rates may reflect a greater concern on the part of teachers for a boy with adjustment difficulties than for a girl with adjustment difficulties.

Other researchers have also found evidence for gender differences in teacher referrals (Gottlieb et al., 1991; McFadden et al., 1992; Skiba et al., 1997). For example,

Gottlieb et al. (1991) found that teachers were twice as likely to refer boys for a psychoeducational evaluation than girls. Additionally, McFadden et al. (1992) found that boys comprised three fourths of all discipline referrals. Finally, Skiba and colleagues (1997) found that teachers were more likely to refer boys to the office for disciplinary intervention than girls.

One study found that girls were more likely to be referred to the principal for disciplinary action (Neese, 1998). Neese manipulated gender in a number of different vignettes. She found that teachers for grades K-6 would be more likely to refer girls to the principal for disciplinary action than boys. However, this finding was behavior specific, such that teachers were more likely to refer girls displaying physically aggressive behaviors (i.e., pushing) than they were boys displaying physically aggressive behaviors. Neese also found that teachers were more likely to discipline boys for using indirect forms of aggression (i.e., becoming friends with another as revenge) than they were girls.

Age. Research also suggests that age plays a factor in the referral process. For example, Drabman, Tarnowski, & Kelly (1987) found that younger children in a class were more likely to be referred for mental health services than were older children. Tarnowski et al. (1990) extended and replicated Drabman et al. (1987). Tarnowski and colleagues also found that younger children were more likely to be referred for educational services than older children. This finding was a pattern that was consistent across all grades examined (i.e., grades K-8). In addition, the referral pattern was not simply a result of differences in children's aptitude and achievement. In fact, younger children had the lowest rate of qualification for special services. However, the authors

qualify these results by indicating that younger children's lack of qualification for special services does not necessarily mean that they were not having problems at school. Wallingford and Pruitt (2000) also investigated age as a factor in special education referrals for children in grades K-5. Wallingford and Pruitt found that children with later birth-dates (i.e., younger children) were over-referred for special education evaluations. This finding was not consistent across grades, however. The finding was only significant for the youngest children (i.e., children aged 5-7). The authors speculate that teachers may have unrealistic expectations regarding appropriate levels of academic achievement, which may influence the over-referral of younger children.

Ethnicity/Race. A student's ethnicity/race has also been found to influence teachers' referrals for services. For example, Gottlieb et al. (1991) found that teachers were more likely to refer minority students (i.e., African Americans, Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans) for a psychoeducational evaluation than Caucasian students. The authors posit that greater referral rates for minority students compared to Caucasian students may have been related to the differences in Full Scale IQ (as measured by the WISC-R) and standardized achievement scores (as measured by the group administered California Achievement Test) of Caucasian and minority students. They found that Caucasian students typically scored higher than minority students did on these measures. Additionally, McFadden et al. (1992) found that African American children were more likely to be referred for disciplinary action than were Caucasian or Hispanic children. Skiba et al. (1997) also reported that African American students were more likely to be

referred for disciplinary action than other ethnic/racial groups. This finding is noteworthy given that approximately 50% of the sample was African American.

Other Child Characteristics. Other child factors have also been found to influence teachers' referral decisions. Skiba et al. (1997) found that low SES students were more likely to be referred for disciplinary action than other students were. Although Skiba et al. (1997) did not investigate whether this finding was independent of race, they report that other researchers have found that minority overrepresentation in school referrals appears to be independent of SES (e.g., McCarthy & Hoge, 1987 as cited in Skiba et al., 1997). In addition, studies have also found that attractive children are less likely to be referred for services (Algozzine & Ysseldyke, 1981).

Teacher Characteristics Influencing the Referral Process

Studies in this area have suggested that teachers are not without bias when making referrals. For example, Schwartz, Wolfe, and Cassar (1997) found that the years of experience a teacher had made a difference in which students were likely to be referred for emotional disturbance. Teachers who were experienced (i.e., had had their own classroom in a public school) were compared to preservice student teachers (i.e., teachers who had student teaching experience, but had not yet had their own classroom) on a number of variables relevant to the referral process. Schwartz and colleagues found that teachers' referrals for services were influenced by their locus of control and self-esteem. Specifically, teachers who had not yet had their own classroom were more likely to make

a referral if they had an external locus of control and low self-esteem. Additionally, Schwartz et al. (1997) found that experienced teachers were less likely to refer children with higher levels of impulse control for an assessment of emotional disturbance. Experienced teachers were also less likely to refer children they judged as attractive. Finally, Schwartz et al. found that younger teachers who had not yet had their own classrooms were more likely to refer children they judged as being low in social judgment and self-esteem.

In addition, a teacher's self-efficacy has been found to influence special education referrals (Podell & Soodak, 1993). Podell and Soodak found that teachers with a greater sense of self-efficacy concerning their teaching abilities were less likely to refer children they perceived as having mild learning and/or behavioral problems. In addition, teachers who were confident in their abilities were less likely to be influenced by factors designed to bias their referral decisions (e.g., low SES). Finally, Podell and Soodak found that SES was the most important factor influencing the referral decisions of teachers who were less confident in their teaching skills.

Neese (1998) also found that specific teacher characteristics may influence their behaviors towards their students. Male teachers were more likely than female teachers were to verbally reprimand female students when female students were displaying physical aggression (i.e., pushing). Male teachers were also more likely to ignore indirectly (i.e., relationally) aggressive behaviors than female teachers were. Neese speculates that it is possible that male teachers do not recognize relationally aggressive behaviors as aggressive because they are not using these behaviors themselves. She also

speculates that male teachers may not view relationally aggressive behaviors as severe enough to warrant intervention.

Conclusions. It appears a number of child and teacher characteristics are important in the referral process. First, it appears that a child's gender, race/ethnicity, and SES all play an important role in whether a child is referred for services. Results from the literature suggest (a) boys are more likely to be referred than girls are, (b) African Americans are more likely to be referred than any other racial/ethnic group, even in communities in which they are not a minority, and, (c) factors such as a child's SES and attractiveness may influence whether they are referred for services. In addition, it appears that several teacher factors are important in determining which children are referred for services. A teacher's experience, locus of control, self-esteem, and self-efficacy may all influence which children are referred for services. Finally, it appears that some problems are more likely to be referred than others are. For example, it appears that teachers are more likely to refer for academic reasons than behavioral reasons. In addition, it appears that children displaying noncompliant and defiant behaviors are more likely to be referred strictly for disciplinary action than are children displaying other behavior problems.

Limitations of Previous Research

Although much research in the past decade has been conducted investigating relational and overt aggression in preschool and children in the third through sixth grades, little research exists on these constructs in adolescence and adulthood. Additionally, no research has investigated relationally and overtly aggressive behaviors in grades K-1 and

only one study has investigated these constructs among children in the 2nd grade (e.g., Henington et al., 1998). Research studies investigating relational and overt aggression have also had samples that were primarily Caucasian and African American (e.g., Crick, 1996; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995). Little research exists on these constructs with other ethnic groups.

Additionally, research on overt and relational aggression has indicated that teachers perceive children who engage in high rates of these behaviors as significantly more maladjusted than nonaggressive children. However, no studies have investigated whether teachers are more likely to refer overtly and relationally aggressive children for disciplinary action and/or an assessment of emotional disturbance. In addition, research has investigated whether children view overtly and relationally aggressive behaviors as normative (i.e., Crick et al., 1996). Again, however, no studies have investigated whether teachers perceive these behaviors as normative or acceptable.

Researchers have also investigated a number of child and teacher characteristics that influence which children are most likely to be referred. However, only one study has examined teacher referrals for disciplinary action of overt and relationally aggressive behaviors (i.e., Neese, 1998) and no study has examined teacher referrals for emotional disturbed evaluations of overt and relationally aggressive behaviors. Finally, only one study has manipulated child gender (via vignettes) to investigate differential referrals for services (e.g., Neese, 1998). The present study will attempt to address some of the limitations of previous research by manipulating child gender to investigate (a) teachers' perceptions on how normative, disruptive, and acceptable relationally and overtly

aggressive behaviors are, and (b) teachers' referrals for services based on type of aggression and gender.

Hypotheses of Current Study

The present study has six hypotheses. First, it is hypothesized that teachers will perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more normative for girls than for boys, whereas they will perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more normative for boys than for girls. Second, it is hypothesized that teachers will perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more disruptive than relationally aggressive behaviors. Third, it is hypothesized that teachers will perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for girls than for boys, whereas they will perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for boys than for girls. Fourth, it is hypothesized that children displaying nonnormative forms of aggression (i.e., boys who display relational forms of aggression, girls who display overt forms of aggression) will be disciplined more often than children displaying normative forms of aggression. Fifth, it is hypothesized that children displaying nonnormative forms of aggression will be the most likely to be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation. Finally, it is hypothesized that boys displaying overt forms of aggression will be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation more often than will girls displaying relational forms of aggression.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Participants

Approximately 422 teachers were recruited for participation in the study in the spring of 2001, fall of 2001, and spring of 2002 and 113 participated (See Table 1). There were 4 men and 109 women, with a mean age of 43.04, SD = 11.06. Approximately 93% of the sample was Caucasian with 6% from other ethnic groups and 1% of unknown ethnicity. Teachers were recruited from several school districts in Central Oklahoma. Only teachers who taught grades 3-6 were recruited. Informed consent was required of all participants and all participants were entered into a drawing for a $100 gift certificate.

Teachers were recruited from elementary and middle schools from the following school districts in Oklahoma: Jenks, Tulsa Union, Stillwater, and a collaborative rural school district with services coordinated from an office in Cushing. Teachers from the Tulsa Union school district comprised 85% of the sample whereas teachers from Stillwater and the remaining school districts were 8% and 7%, respectively.

Table 1

Demographic Characteristics of Sample: N = 113

Category	*n*	% Sample
Age		
24-30 years	27	23.9
31-40 years	13	11.5
41-50 years	40	35.4
51-63 years	33	29.2
Gender		
Male	4	3.5
Female	109	96.5
Race/Ethnicity		
Caucasian	105	92.9
Hispanic	1	0.9
Asian	1	0.9
Native American	4	3.5
Other	1	0.9
Unknown	1	0.9
Grade Taught		
3rd	31	27.4
4th	26	23.0
5th	37	32.7
6th	12	10.6
Other	7	6.2
Years Teaching		
1-9	22	35.4
10-19	28	28.3
20-33	37	36.3
School District		
Tulsa Union	96	85.9
Stillwater	9	8.0
Jenks	1	0.9
Cushing	7	6.2
Collaborative		

Measures

Demographic Form. Teachers completed a short demographic form (See Appendix A) that asked the teacher to provide information such as age, race/ethnicity, gender, years of education, years of teaching experience, school district, and current grade taught.

Teacher Perceptions Form. Each teacher was provided with 10 vignettes specifically designed for this study. Two different versions were used, with alternating genders for each vignette. Each vignette described a child with a behavioral or emotional problem. Teachers completed a short questionnaire with six questions designed to assess their opinions regarding the child in the story. Each question had responses that formed a seven or a ten-point Likert scale. Responses ranged from "Not at all..." to "Very..." (see Appendix B).

Four of the ten vignettes described children demonstrating overt and relational aggressive behaviors. Relational and overtly aggressive behaviors were taken from Crick and Grotpeter (1995). Items used in the vignettes describing overt aggression included: "hits, pushes others," "yells, calls others mean names," and "starts fights." Items used in the vignettes describing relational aggression included: "when mad, gets even by keeping the person from being in their group of friends," "tells friends they will stop liking them unless friends do what they say," and "when mad at a person, ignores them or stops talking to them." The other six vignettes described children with other behavioral and emotional problems (e.g., symptoms of anxiety and depression). Items descriptions for each of these vignettes were chosen from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental

Disorders: Fourth Edition (*DSM-IV*) (American Psychiatric Association, 1994). These extra vignettes were included to help prevent participants from determining the hypotheses of the study. In addition, each teacher was asked to answer three questions regarding the nature of the study. These questions were included as a manipulation check of the study (see Appendix C).

Previous research has found both peer and teacher rated assessments of overt and relational aggression to be highly reliable. Coefficient alphas ranged from .82 to .96 for the relationally aggressive subscale whereas coefficient alphas ranged from .94 to .97 for the overt aggression subscale (Crick, 1995, 1996; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Crick et al., 1997; Grotpeter & Crick, 1996). Crick (1996, 1997) reported test-retest reliability values for a four-week interval to be .82 for the relationally aggressive subscale and .90 for the overtly aggressive subscale. Factor analyses have also confirmed the existence of two separate factors, with eigenvalues greater than one and high factor loadings (i.e., ranging from .73 to .91). The two subscales have been found to be moderately correlated ($r = .54$ to $r = .57$).

Teacher Efficacy Scale. Teacher efficacy was assessed using Podell and Soodak's (1993) 16-item shortened version of Gibson and Dembo's (1984) 30-item Teacher Efficacy Scale (See Appendix D). The Teacher Efficacy Scale has two subscales that measure teachers' beliefs about their own effectiveness as a teacher (i.e., Personal Teaching Efficacy) and their beliefs about the effectiveness of teachers in general (i.e., General Teaching Efficacy). Item responses on the Teacher Efficacy Scale range from 1 to 6 on a Likert scale with 1 indicating "strongly disagree" and 6 indicating "strongly

agree." The 16-item scale was found by Gibson and Dembo to have adequate reliability with a coefficient alpha of .79. Further, internal consistency coefficient alphas for the Personal Teaching Efficacy and General Teaching Efficacy factors were .78 and .75, respectively. Podell and Soodak found a coefficient alpha for the 16-item scale to be .75 and alphas of .75 and .65 for the two subscales measuring Personal Teaching Efficacy and General Teaching Efficacy, respectively. Other researchers have also confirmed the existence of the two factors, with coefficient alphas ranging from .75 to .81 for the Personal Teaching Efficacy subscale and .64 to .77 for the General Teaching Efficacy subscale (Anderson, Greene, & Loewen, 1988; Burley, Hall, Villeme, & Brockmeier, 1991; Hoy & Woolfolk, 1993; Moore & Esselman, 1992; Saklofske, Michaluk, & Randhawa, 1988; Soodak & Podell, 1993). Coefficient alphas for the present study were .67 for the 16-item scale, .72 for the Personal Teaching Efficacy subscale, and .64 for the General Teaching Efficacy subscale.

Procedure

Permission to recruit teacher participants from Tulsa Union, Jenks, and Stillwater Public schools was initially obtained by the school districts' superintendents. Individual principals of each school were then contacted by the investigator in order to determine the number of teachers eligible at each school. Permission to recruit participants from Cushing Co-Op schools was obtained by the coordinator of special education services for these schools. Each school received several packets of questionnaires that included an informed consent, demographic form, Teacher Efficacy Scale, vignettes, and Teacher Perceptions Form. Each packet was then placed in the school mailboxes of the eligible

teachers. In an introductory letter, teachers were made aware of the risks and benefits of participation in the study. Each teacher's name was entered into a drawing for a $100 gift certificate to Wal-Mart. Teachers were provided with a prepaid envelope they used to mail the completed measures to the researcher. Teachers were also informed that they could contact the researcher if they had any questions and were provided with the name, e-mail address, and phone number of the researcher. Additionally, teachers were provided with the name and number of the IRB office at OSU should they have any further questions.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Preliminary Analyses

Because two different versions of story vignettes were used, 24 t-tests were conducted comparing each of the six questions on the Teacher Perceptions Form for each version to ensure that responses were not different depending on the version received. In order to control the error rate per comparison, a Bonferroni correction was used with the Family Wise error rate set at .10. Thus, the per test α was = .004. None of the t-tests comparing each version of the story was significant. As previous research has suggested differences in responding by gender (Neese, 1998), 24 t-tests were also conducted to examine whether differences existed in the present study. Again, a Bonferroni correction was used to control the error rate per comparison such that α = .004. Significant differences were found for only two of the 24 t-tests. Therefore, the whole sample of men and women teachers was used for all analyses.

Because past research has suggested that a teacher's self-efficacy and number of years of experience may affect referral decisions (e.g., Schwartz, Wolfe, and Cassar, 1997; Podell & Soodak, 1993), a correlation matrix was constructed in order to investigate whether model variables were intercorrelated. Results from this matrix indicated that a teacher's Personal Teaching Efficacy was not related to any of the

dependent variables. However, the number of years an individual has been teaching was related to several variables (see Table 2). Although years an individual has been teaching was related to several variables, no clear pattern of relationships emerged. As teaching efficacy was not related to any of the dependent variables, and no clear pattern of relationships emerged between number of years teaching and dependent variables, neither variable was used as a covariate in analyses. Additionally, in a within subjects design, covariates are unnecessary as they adjust each person's score for the groups' mean and there is only one group in a within subjects design (Page, Braver, MacKinnon, in press.). Finally, for all hypotheses, distributions were examined in order to check for normality. Although some distributions were slightly skewed, data was not transformed since research suggests that the F test is not particularly affected when distributions are not normal and sample size is greater than or equal to 12 (Keppel, 1991).

Table 2

Significant Intercorrelations between Dependent Variables and Number of Years Teaching

Dependent Variable	Number of Years Teaching
Overt Girl, Question 1	-.20*
Relational Girl, Question 1	-.23*
Relational Girl, Question 4	-.32**
Relational Boy, Question 4	-.26**
Overt Boy, Question 4	-.20*
Overt Girl, Question 6	-.25**

Note: *Correlation is significant at the .05 level; **Correlation is significant at the .01 level.

Primary Analyses

Hypothesis One

Hypothesis one stated that teachers would perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more normative for girls than for boys, whereas they would perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more normative for boys than for girls. In order to test Hypothesis One, two planned within subjects contrasts were conducted. Contrast one tested teachers' perceptions of how normative relationally aggressive behaviors were for girls versus boys. Contrast two tested teachers' perceptions of how normative overtly aggressive behaviors were for girls versus boys. Contrast one results were statistically significant, $F(1, 110) = 14.23$, $p = .00$, $\omega^2 = .12$, Power = .96. An examination of means indicated that teachers perceived relationally aggressive behaviors as more normative for girls than for boys (See Table 3). Contrast two results were not statistically significant, $F(1, 112) = .41$, $p = .52$, $\omega^2 = .00$, Power = .01. Thus, teachers did not perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more normative for boys than for girls.

Table 3

Means for Relational and Overt Aggression by Gender for Hypothesis One

Gender of Child	Type of Aggression	*M*	*SE*
	Relational		
Boy		4.23	.15
Girl		4.70	.14
	Overt		
Boy		2.49	.13
Girl		2.40	.13

Hypothesis Two

Hypothesis Two stated that teachers would perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more disruptive than relationally aggressive behaviors. In order to test Hypothesis Two, two new variables were created: an overt aggression score and a relational aggression score. The overt aggression score is the mean of responses for question 2 for the stories in which a child committed an overt act of aggression (one boy story and one girl story). Similarly, the relational aggression score is the mean of responses for the stories in which the child committed a relational act of aggression (one boy story and one girl story). A one factor (i.e., overt aggression vs. relational aggression) within subjects ANOVA was conducted for question two (i.e., how disruptive the child's behavior is perceived to be). Results from this analysis were statistically significant, $F(1, 110) = 337.79$, $p = .00$, $\omega^2 = .75$, Power = 1.00. An examination of means indicated that teachers perceived overtly aggressive behaviors as more disruptive ($M = 6.32$, $SE = .08$) than relationally aggressive behaviors ($M = 4.51$, $SE = .12$). Thus, Hypothesis Two was supported.

Hypothesis Three

Hypothesis Three stated that teachers would perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for girls than for boys, whereas they would perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for boys than for girls. In order to test Hypothesis Three, two planned within subjects contrasts were conducted. Contrast one tested teachers' perceptions of the acceptability of relationally aggressive behaviors for

girls versus boys. Contrast two tested teachers' perceptions of the acceptability of overtly aggressive behaviors for girls versus boys. Contrast one results were statistically significant, $F(1, 110) = 4.15$, $p = .04$, $\omega^2 = .04$, Power = .52. An examination of means indicated that teachers perceived relationally aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for girls than for boys (See Table 4). Contrast two results were not statistically significant, $F(1, 112) = .67$, $p = .42$, $\omega^2 = .01$, Power = .13. Thus, teachers did not perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for boys than for girls.

Table 4

Means for Relational and Overt Aggression by Gender for Hypothesis Three

Gender of Child	Type of Aggression	*M*	*SE*
	Relational		
Boy		2.14	.10
Girl		2.34	.10
	Overt		
Boy		1.14	.04
Girl		1.17	.04

Hypothesis Four

Hypothesis Four stated that children displaying nonnormative forms of aggression (i.e., boys who display relational forms of aggression, girls who display overt forms of

aggression) would be disciplined more often than children displaying normative forms of aggression. In order to test Hypothesis Four, two new variables were created. Two normative aggression scores were created, one for question 4 and one for question 5. The normative aggression score is the mean of responses for each respective question (i.e., for question 4 and then for question 5) for overtly aggressive boys and relationally aggressive girls. Two nonnormative aggression scores were also created, one for question 4 and one for question 5. The nonnormative aggression score is the mean of responses for each respective question (i.e., for question 4 and then for question 5) for relationally aggressive boys and overtly aggressive girls. Two one factor (i.e., normative aggression vs. nonnormative aggression) within subjects ANOVAs were then conducted, one for question four and one for question five. Results indicated that children who displayed nonnormative forms of aggression were not disciplined more often than children displaying normative forms of aggression (e.g., time-out, verbal reprimand), $F(1, 110) = .09$, $p = .76$, $\omega^2 = .00$, Power = .06. Further, results showed that children displaying nonnormative forms of aggression were not more likely to be sent to the office for disciplinary action than children displaying normative forms of aggression, $F(1, 109) = .29$, $p = .59$, $\omega^2 = .00$, Power = .08. Thus, Hypothesis Four was not supported.

Supplementary Analyses. In order to explore whether there was a main effect of gender, aggression, or an interaction of the two for both questions 4 and 5, two 2 X 2 (Gender X Type of Aggression) within subjects ANOVAs were conducted. Results showed a main effect of Type of Aggression for question four, indicating that children displaying overt forms of aggression were more likely to be disciplined (e.g., time-out,

verbal reprimand) than children displaying relational forms of aggression $F(1, 110) = 119.32$, $p = .00$, $\omega^2 = .52$, Power = 1.00 (See Table 5). For question four, the interaction and main effect of gender were nonsignificant. For question five, a main effect for Gender, $F(1, 109) = 4.58$, $p = .04$, $\omega^2 = .04$, Power = .56, and for Type of Aggression, $F(1, 109) = 292.75$, $p = .00$, $\omega^2 = .73$, Power = 1.0 was found. Specifically, results showed that boys were more likely to be sent to the office for disciplinary action than girls. Additionally, children displaying overt forms of aggression were more likely to be sent to the office for disciplinary action than children displaying relational forms of aggression (See Table 5).The interaction for question five was nonsignificant.

Table 5

Means for Significant Effects for Questions Four and Five

Question	Category	M	SE
4			
	Type of Aggression		
	Overt	93.15	1.05
	Relational	69.91	2.40
5			
	Gender of Child		
	Boy	51.27	2.23
	Girl	47.96	2.33
	Type of Aggression		
	Overt	74.32	2.66
	Relational	24.91	2.52

Hypothesis Five

Hypothesis Five stated that children displaying nonnormative (i.e., boys displaying relational forms of aggression, girls displaying overt forms of aggression) forms of aggression would be the most likely to be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation. The same process that was used to test Hypothesis Four was also used for Hypothesis Five. Specifically, two new variables were created. The normative aggression score is the mean of responses for question six for overtly aggressive boys and relationally aggressive girls. The nonnormative aggression score is the mean of responses for question six for relationally aggressive boys and overtly aggressive girls. A one factor (i.e., normative aggression vs. nonnormative aggression) within subjects ANOVA was then conducted for question six. Results found that children displaying nonnormative forms of aggression ($M = 35.23$, $SD = 23.51$) were not more likely to be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation that children displaying normative forms of aggression ($M = 35.13$, $SD = 21.82$), $F(1, 110) = .02$, $p = .88$, $\omega^2 = .00$, and Power = .05. Thus, hypothesis five was not supported.

Hypothesis Six

Hypothesis Six stated that boys displaying overt forms of aggression would be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation more often than girls displaying relational forms of aggression. A within subjects planned contrast was conducted comparing the two. Results showed that boys displaying overt forms of aggression ($M = 53.69$, $SE = 3.06$) were more likely to be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation

than girls displaying relational forms of aggression ($M = 16.31$, $SE = 2.06$), $F(1, 112) = 144.68$), $p = .00$, $\omega^2 = .56$, and Power = 1.0. Thus, Hypothesis Six was supported.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

The purpose of the present study was to examine (a) teachers' perceptions of how normative, disruptive, and acceptable relationally and overtly aggressive behaviors are, and (b) teachers' referrals for services based on type of aggression and gender. Further, because past research has suggested that a teacher's gender, self-efficacy, and number of years of experience may affect discipline and referral decisions (e.g., Neese, 1998; Schwartz, Wolfe, and Cassar, 1997; Podell & Soodak, 1993), these variables were also examined in order to determine what relationship, if any, they had with outcome variables.

Summary of Findings

Preliminary Analyses

Preliminary analyses found no differences in responding according to story version received. Significant differences in responding between men and women were also not found. Finally, results examining the relationships between a teacher's personal teaching efficacy and number of years teaching did not reveal a specific relationship between these variables and outcome variables.

Primary Analyses

Hypothesis One. Hypothesis One stated that teachers would perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more normative for girls than for boys, whereas they would perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more normative for boys than for girls. Hypothesis One was partially supported; teachers did, in fact, perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more normative for girls than for boys.

Hypothesis Two. Hypothesis Two stated that teachers would perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more disruptive than relationally aggressive behaviors. Hypothesis Two was supported; teachers did perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more disruptive than relationally aggressive behaviors.

Hypothesis Three. Hypothesis Three stated that teachers would perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for girls than for boys, whereas they would perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for boys than for girls. Results partially supported Hypothesis Three; teachers did perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for girls than for boys. However, teachers did not perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more acceptable for boys than for girls.

Hypothesis Four and Supplementary Analyses. Hypothesis Four stated that children displaying nonnormative forms of aggression (i.e., boys who display relational forms of aggression, girls who display overt forms of aggression) would be disciplined more often than children displaying normative forms of aggression. Results did not support Hypothesis Four. Supplementary analyses found that children displaying overt

forms of aggression were more likely to be disciplined than children displaying relational forms of aggression. Further, results showed that boys were more likely to be sent to the office for disciplinary action than girls.

Hypothesis Five. Hypothesis Five stated that children displaying nonnormative (i.e., boys displaying relational forms of aggression, girls displaying overt forms of aggression) forms of aggression would be the most likely to be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation. Hypothesis Five was not supported; children displaying nonnormative forms of aggression were not more likely to be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation than children displaying normative forms of aggression. It appears that teachers do not perceive relationally aggressive behaviors in boys as more warranting of an emotionally disturbed evaluation than overtly aggressive behaviors in girls.

Hypothesis Six. Hypothesis Six stated that boys displaying overt forms of aggression would be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation more often than girls displaying relational forms of aggression. Hypothesis Six was supported; boys displaying overt forms of aggression were more likely to be referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation than girls displaying relational forms of aggression.

Conclusions

Contrary to previous studies which found that a teacher's Personal Teaching Efficacy and years of teaching influenced referral decisions (e.g., Schwartz, Wolfe, and Cassar, 1997; Podell & Soodak, 1993), results examining relationships between a teacher's personal teaching efficacy and number of years teaching also revealed no

specific relationship between these variables and outcome variables. However, Podell and Soodak (1993) used vignettes that were specific to academic problems. Additionally, Schwartz, Wolfe, and Cassar (1997) measured years of experience differently from the present study (i.e., they compared teachers with their own classrooms to teachers still in training without their own classroom).

Results from the current study also suggest that teachers' perceptions of relationally and overtly aggressive behaviors not only differ, but also differ according to gender of the child. For example, teachers perceive relationally aggressive behaviors as more normative and acceptable for girls than for boys, but do not perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more normative and acceptable for boys than for girls. A possible explanation for these findings may be related to study demographics. First, because most teachers in the present study were women, they may be biased in their view of what constitutes a normative or acceptable behavior because they may be likely to engage in those behaviors themselves. Another possible explanation concerns the nature of the behaviors themselves. Perhaps, because of recent occurrences of violence within school systems around the nation, teachers have become sensitized to acts of overt aggression and their perceptions regarding these behaviors have been shaped accordingly.

Additionally, results from the current study suggest that teachers view overtly aggressive behaviors as more disruptive than relationally aggressive behaviors. However, when the researcher conceptualized this question, it was assumed that teachers would assume disruptive referred to others, such as the child's peers or the teacher. Several teachers, however, made comments on vignettes specific to children displaying internalizing symptoms such as anxiety or depression that queried the meaning of

disruptive intended by the researcher. Specifically, teachers queried whether disruptive meant disruptive to "others" or to "him/herself." Future research examining how disruptive relationally aggressive and overtly aggressive behaviors are should specify the researcher's intention. Results from the present study also suggest that teachers are more likely to discipline children who display overt forms of aggression than they are children who display relational forms of aggression. This finding is important because it suggests that teachers may not realize that relationally aggressive behaviors are associated with adverse consequences (e.g., Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Crick et al., 1997) and that children displaying these behaviors are in need of intervention. Teachers may also be more likely to discipline children displaying overt forms of aggression because the victim's reaction may be more visible (e.g., hitting back) than the victim's reaction to relational aggression.

Further, results from the present study add support to previous research (e.g., Gottlieb, 1991; McFadden, 1992) that suggests boys are more likely to be referred for disciplinary action and an emotionally disturbed evaluation than girls. A possible explanation for this finding may be one that was posed by Gregory (1977) who found that teachers viewed similar behaviors in boys and girls differently. Gregory speculated that differences in referral rates might reflect a greater concern on the part of teachers for a boy with adjustment difficulties than for a girl with adjustment difficulties. Another explanation is suggested by results from Hypothesis Two and supplementary analyses from Hypothesis Four, which found that teachers perceive overtly aggressive behaviors as more disruptive than relationally aggressive behaviors and children displaying overtly aggressive behaviors are more likely to be disciplined than children displaying relationally aggressive behaviors. If, as Crick's line of research suggests, girls engage in

relationally aggressive behaviors more frequently than overtly aggressive behaviors, then girls would, as a result, be disrupting a teacher's classroom less frequently than boys would be disrupting the classroom. Additionally, if boys are engaging in overtly aggressive behaviors more frequently than girls, then they are most likely being disciplined more frequently than girls. Finally, it is possible that boys are disciplined and referred for services more often because they are more active than girls and engage in "rough and tumble" play more often than girls (DiPietro, 1981; Hines & Kaufman, 1994). Thus, boys may be more likely to be referred because teachers more frequently notice them.

Contrary to Neese (1998), results from the current study did not find that children who displayed nonnormative forms of aggression were disciplined more often than children displaying normative forms of aggression. Differences between the present study and Neese's study may be due to a number of factors, including a difference in the way behaviors were defined in each study. Specifically, Neese's study used vignettes that separated behaviors into categories referred to as verbal, indirect, and physically aggressive behaviors. Therefore, a behavior that may be considered verbally aggressive in Neese's study (e.g., threatening to beat up a classmate after school) would be categorized as overtly aggressive in the present study. Another possible explanation could be the differences in samples. The present study's sample was 97% female whereas Neese's sample was only 74% female. Neese's sample also included teachers from grades K-12 whereas the present study only included teachers from grades 3-6.

Methodological Considerations

There are a number of limitations associated with this study that should be noted. First, because participant recruitment occurred partially during the fall of 2001, it was likely influenced by the terrorist attacks of September 11th. A poor response from teachers in the fall of 2001 prompted the researchers to recruit again in the spring of 2002. Additionally, the present study, like previous research studies (e.g., Crick, 1996; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995) investigating relational and overt aggression in children, is limited by the lack of heterogeneity of participant's race. Specifically, the present study had a sample that was primarily Caucasian (i.e., 93%). It is unknown whether teachers of different racial and ethnic groups would perceive the behaviors in the present study the same way. Results from Neese (1998) suggest that African American teachers may perceive and respond to aggressive behaviors differently than Caucasian teachers. The present study is also limited by the sample size. Although significant effects were found, for some of these effects power was lower than optimal (i.e., .80). Therefore, future studies attempting to replicate results should obtain a larger sample. A further limitation concerns the few number of male participants (i.e., four). Again, Neese's study suggests that male teachers may perceive and respond to aggressive behaviors in girls and boys differently than female teachers.

Additionally, the present study is limited because of the nature of its design. Although the vignettes allowed for an element of realism, it is possible that teachers would respond differently in a real life situation than they have indicated in the present study. Other factors in a real life situation may also influence whether or not a particular

child is disciplined or referred for services, such as the number of students in a classroom or a teacher's previous experience with the child. Another difference from the current study and previous research (i.e., Neese, 1998) is the range of teachers recruited. Neese's study included teachers from grades K-12 and found different results for teachers that taught grades K-6 compared to teachers who taught grades 7-12.

Future Directions

In conclusion, it appears that teachers perceive relationally aggressive behaviors differently than they do overtly aggressive behaviors. Additionally, boys or children displaying overt forms of aggression are more likely to be disciplined and referred for an emotionally disturbed evaluation than girls or children displaying relational forms of aggression. Interventions directed at decreasing aggressive behaviors within the school system should focus on educating teachers as to the negative consequences associated with children engaging in relational forms of aggression, as well as children who are victims of relational forms of aggression. Interventions directed at children should focus on education of the detrimental effects of both relational and overt forms of aggression. Special attention may need to be directed towards education on gender differences in the types of behaviors most commonly displayed. Teachers may also need to be educated that children who are victims of aggression may need other services (e.g., a referral to the school counselor, therapy) to help them cope more effectively.

Future research investigating relationally and overtly aggressive behaviors should strive for samples that are more heterogeneous in order to investigate the role a teacher's ethnicity and gender have in their perceptions of these behaviors and their decisions to

discipline and/or refer a child for services. Additionally, future research should also investigate other child variables that may influence teacher perceptions, such as socioeconomic status and ethnicity. Future research investigating these constructs should also attempt to investigate whether studies with a more experimental component have different conclusions than those using story vignettes. For example, a future research study might include a longitudinal design with actual classrooms being followed to see which children are most likely to be referred and disciplined. Trained researchers could also be involved to judge whether children displaying overt behaviors are disciplined and referred for services more than children displaying relational behaviors. Another possibility would be correlating sociometric ratings done by children with teachers' referrals for discipline and/or psychoeducational evaluations. Additionally, future research should also consider allowing for other possibilities for teacher action other than a referral for disciplinary action or an emotionally disturbed evaluation. For example, future research may add a qualitative component allowing teachers' to express their usual procedures on handling "difficult" children.

Future research investigating how normative relational and overt behaviors are should also consider using different words and different questions to assess teachers' perceptions. For example, it is possible that the question "How typical is this child's behavior?" may obtain different results than "How normal is this child's behavior?"

REFERENCES

Albert, D. J., Walsh, M. L., & Jonik, R. H. (1993). Aggression in humans: What is its biological foundation? *Neuroscience and Biobehavioral Reviews, 17,* 405-425.

Algozzine, B., & Ysseldyke, J. E. (1981). Special education services for normal children: Better safe than sorry? *Exceptional Children, 48,* 238-243.

Archer, J. (1991). The influence of testosterone on human aggression. *British Journal of Psychology, 82,* 1-28.

Archer, D., & McDaniel, P. (1995). Violence and gender: Differences and similarities across societies. In R. B. Ruback, & N. A. Weiner (Eds.), *Interpersonal Violent Behaviors: Social and Cultural Aspects* (pp. 63-88). New York, NY: Springer.

Bandura, A. (1965). Influence of models' reinforcement contingencies on the acquisition of imitative responses. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1,* 589-595.

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Bettencourt, B. A., & Miller, N. (1996). Gender differences in aggression as a function of provocation: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 119,* 422-447.

Berkowitz, L. B. (1993). *Aggression: Its Causes, Consequences, and Control.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Bjorkqvist, K. (1994). Sex differences in physical, verbal, and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles, 30*, 177-188.

Bjorkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? *Aggressive Behavior, 18,* 117-127.

Block, J. H. (1983). Differential premises arising from differential socialization of the sexes: Some conjectures. *Child Development, 54,* 1335-1354.

Buss, A. H. (1961). *The Psychology of Aggression.* New York, NY: Wiley.

Cairns, R. B., Cairns, B. D., Neckerman, H. J., Ferguson, L. L., & Gariepy, J. (1989). Growth and aggression: 1. Childhood to early adolescence. *Developmental Psychology, 25,* 320-330.

Coie, J. D., Dodge, K. A., & Kupersmidt, J. B. (1990). Peer group behavior and social status. In S. R. Asher, & J. D. Coie (Eds.), *Peer rejection in Childhood* (pp. 17-59). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

Crick, N. R. (1995). Relational aggression: The role of intent attributions, feelings of distress, and provocation type. *Development and Psychopathology, 7,* 313-322.

Crick, N. R. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression, and prosocial behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child Development, 67,* 2317-2327.

Crick, N. R. (1997). Engagement in gender normative versus nonnormative forms of aggression: Links to social-psychological adjustment. *Developmental Psychology, 33(4),* 610-617.

Crick, N. R., Bigbee, M. A., & Howes, C. (1996). Gender differences in children's normative beliefs about aggression: How do I hurt thee? Let me count the ways. *Child Development, 67,* 1003-1014.

Crick, N. R., Casas, J. F., & Mosher, M. (1997). Relational and overt aggression in preschool. *Developmental Psychology, 33(4),* 579-588.

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

Crick, N. R., Werner, N. E., Casas, J. F., O'Brien, K. M., Nelson, D. A., Grotpeter, J. K., & Markon, K. (1999). Childhood aggression: A new look at an old problem. In R. A. Dienstbier, & D. Bernstein (Eds.), *Gender and Motivation* (pp.75-141). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.

DiPietro, J. A. (1981). Rough and tumble play: A function of gender. *Developmental Psychology, 17,* 50-58.

Drabman, R. S., Tarnowski, K. J., & Kelly, P. A. (1987). Are younger children in a classroom disproportionately referred for childhood academic and behavior problems? *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 55,* 907-909.

Eagly, A. H., & Steffen, V. J. (1986). Gender and aggressive behavior: A meta-analytic review of the social psychological literature. *Psychological Bulletin, 100(3),* 309-330.

Feshbach, N. D. (1969). Sex differences in children's modes of aggressive responses toward outsiders. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 15,* 249-258.

Geen, R. G. (1990). *Human Aggression.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Geen, R. G., & Donnerstein, E. (Eds.). (1998). *Human Aggression: Theories, Research, and Implications for Social Policy.* San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Gelles, R. J. (1998). The youngest victims: Violence toward children. In R. K. Bergen (Ed.), *Issues in Intimate Violence* (pp. 5-24), Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Gottlieb, J., Gottlieb, B. W., & Trongone, S. (1991). Parent and teacher referrals for a psychoeducational evaluation. *The Journal of Special Education, 25,* 155-167.

Gregory, M. K. (1977). Sex bias in school referrals. *Journal of School Psychology, 15,* 5-8.

Grotpeter, J. K. & Crick, N. R. (1996). Relational aggression, overt aggression, and friendship. *Child Development, 67,* 2328-2338.

Hart, C. H., Nelson, D. A., Robinson, C. C., Olsen, S. F., & McNeilly-Choque, M. K. (1998). Overt and relational aggression in Russian nursery-school-age children: Parenting style and marital linkages. *Developmental Psychology, 34,* 687-697.

Henington, C., Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A., & Thompson, B. (1998). The role of relational aggression in identifying aggressive boys and girls. *Journal of School Psychology, 36,* 457-477.

Hess, L. E., & Atkins, M. S. (1998). Victims and aggressors at school: Teacher, self, and peer perceptions of psychosocial functioning. *Applied Developmental Science, 2,* 75-89.

Hines, M., & Kaufman, F. R. (1994). Androgen and the development of human sex-typical behavior: Rough and tumble play and sex of preferred playmates in children with congentital adrenal hyperplasia (CAH). *Child Development, 65,* 1042-1053.

Hyde, J. S. (1984). How large are gender differences in aggression? A developmental meta-analysis. *Developmental Psychology, 20,* 722-736.

Kalichman, S. (1993). *Mandated Reporting of Suspected Child Abuse: Ethics, Law, & Policy.* Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.

Keppel, G. (1991). *Design and Analysis: A Researcher's Handbook* (3rd ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Knight, G. P., Fabes, R. A., & Higgins, D. A. (1996). Concerns about drawing causal inferences from meta-analyses: An example in the study of gender differences in aggression. *Psychological Bulletin, 119,* 410-421.

Knight, G. P., Guthrie, I. K., Page, M. C., & Fabes, R. A. (in press). Arousal and gender differences in aggression: A meta-analysis. *Aggressive Behavior.*

Kokko, K., & Pulkkinen, L. (2000). Aggression in childhood and long-term unemployment in adulthood: A cycle of maladaptation and some protective factors. *Developmental Psychology, 36,* 463-472.

Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Bjorkqvist, K., & Peltonen, T. (1988). Is indirect aggression typical of females? *Aggressive Behavior, 14,* 403-414.

Lancelotta, G. X., & Vaughn, S. (1989). Relation between types of aggression and sociometric status: Peer and teacher perceptions. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 81,* 86-90.

Lightdale, J. R., & Prentice, D. A. (1994). Rethinking sex differences in aggression: Aggressive behavior in the absence of social roles. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20,* 34-44.

Lytton, H., & Romney, D. M. (1991). Parents' differential socialization of boys and girls: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin, 109,* 267-296.

Maccoby, E. E. (1998). *The Two Sexes: Growing up Apart, Coming Together.* Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1974). *The Psychology of Sex Differences.* Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press.

Maccoby, E. E., & Jacklin, C. N. (1980). Sex differences in aggression: A rejoinder and reprise. *Child Development, 51,* 964-980.

McFadden, A. C., Marsh, G. E., Price, B. J., & Hwang, Y. (1992). A study of race and gender in the punishment of school children. *Education and Treatment of Children, 15,* 140-146.

McNeilly-Choque, M. K., Hart, C. H., Robinson, C. C., Nelson, L. J., & Olsen, S. F. (1996). Overt and relational aggression on the playground: Correspondence among different informants. *Journal of Research in Childhood Education, 11,* 47-67.

Myers, D. G. (1990). *Social Psychology.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Neese, D. E. K. (1998). Teachers' perceptions of gender differences in child aggression. Doctoral dissertation, Purdue University, 1997). *Dissertation Abstracts International, 59(1-B),* 423.

Page, M. C., Braver, S. A., & MacKinnon, D. P. (In press). *Levine guide to SPSS for analysis of variance* (2nd ed.). Mawjah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum & Associates.

Parker, J. G., & Asher, S. R. (1987). Peer relations and later personal adjustment: Are low-accepted children at risk? *Psychological Bulletin, 102,* 357-389.

Paul, L., & Galloway, J. (1994). Sexual jealousy: Gender differences in response to partner and rival. *Aggressive Behavior, 20,* 79-100.

Phillipsen, L. C., Deptula, D. P., & Cohen, R. (1999). Relating characteristics of children and their friends to relational and overt aggression. *Child Study Journal, 29,* 269-289.

Podell, D. M., & Soodak, L. C. (1993). Teacher efficacy and bias in special education referrals. *Journals of Educational Research, 86*, 247-253.

Rys, G. S., & Bear, G. G. (1997). Relational aggression and peer relations: Gender and developmental issues. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 43,* 87-106.

Schwartz, D. (2000). Subtypes of victims and aggressors in children's peer groups. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 28,* 181-192.

Schwartz, N. H., Wolfe, J. N., & Cassar, R. (1997). Predicting teacher referrals of emotionally disturbed children. *Psychology in the Schools, 34*, 51-61.

Skiba, R. J., Peterson, R. L., & Williams, T. (1997). Office referrals and suspension: Disciplinary intervention in middle schools. *Education and Treatment of Children, 20,* 295-315.

Soodak, L. C., & Podell, D. M. (1993). Teacher efficacy and student problem as factors in special education referral. *Journal of Special Education, 27,* 66-81.

Tarnowski, K. J., Anderson, D. F., Drabman, R. S., & Kelly, P. A. (1990). Disproportionate referrals for child academic/behavior problems: Replication and extension. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 58, 240-243.

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

Tomada, G., & Schneider, B. H. (1997). Relational aggression, gender, and peer acceptance: Invariance across culture, stability over time, and concordance among informants. *Developmental Psychology, 33,* 601-609.

Wallingford, E. L., & Prout, H. T. (2000). The relationship of season of birth and special education referral. *Psychology in the Schools, 37,* 379-387.

Zahn-Waxler, C. (1993). Warriors and worriers: Gender and psychopathology. *Development and Psychopathology, 5,* 79-89.

Zoccolillo, M. (1993). Gender and the development of conduct disorder. *Development and Psychopathology, 5,* 65-78.

APPENDIXES

APPENDIX A

DEMOGRAPHIC FORM

Today's Date: ____/____/____ Date of Birth: ____/____/____

Circle or write a response that best represents your answer to the following statements and questions. Please remember that all answers are confidential.

1. Your gender is: (1) Male (2) Female

2. Your race/ethnicity is: (1) Caucasian/Anglo (2) Hispanic, non Caucasian

(3) African-American/Black (4) Asian (5) Native American (6) Other:

3. What grade do you teach? : 3rd 4^{th} 5^{th} 6^{th}

4. How many years have you been teaching?

5. How many years of education do you have? (1) Bachelor's Degree

(2) Master's Degree

(3) Doctorate (4) Other:

6. Which school district do you teach in?

APPENDIX B

STORIES

General Directions: The following pages contain a number of fictional stories about children. Following each story are six questions that will ask you your opinions about the child in the story. Please answer each question honestly and to the best of your ability. Please assume that you know absolutely nothing about the child in the story except for what is stated. There are no right or wrong answers. After you have completed a set of answers, please do not go back and change them. Remember that all answers are kept confidential. Thank you.

Story #1

Suzie often hits others. She also tells other children that she will beat them up unless they do what she says. Sometimes, she is overheard calling others mean names.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #2

John is frequently irritable. He reports that he feels tired almost every day. During the past two weeks, he seems to be more emotional and twice has broken down in tears for no apparent reason.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #3

Brittany often excludes children from her playgroup when she is mad at them. She is sometimes overheard gossiping about other children in the class. She frequently tells her friends she will stop liking them if they don't do what she says.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story#4

Chad often fidgets or squirms in his seat. He has difficulty waiting for his turn. He is disorganized and frequently loses homework assignments.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #5

Tracy often seems sad. During a recent parent teacher conference, her mother and father reported that she has been having trouble sleeping. The other day she exclaimed, "I can't do anything right," when she was having difficulty with an assignment.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story # 6

Billy often reports that he has a stomachache. He seems anxious to get home at the end of the day. Sometimes, he gets upset and wants to call home just to make sure that his mother is okay.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #7

Lesley frequently doesn't seem to be listening. She has trouble staying seated and often wanders around the classroom. She also appears to have difficulty paying attention in class.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Story #8

Tommy spreads rumors about other children. When mad at peers, he ignores them. In order to "get even" with another child, he will try to exclude them from his group of friends.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Story #9

Mary often worries that bad things are going to happen to her family. She always reports that she a headache. She says that she won't spend the night at a friend's house because she doesn't like being away from home.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #10

Mark often kicks or punches others. He also says mean things to insult others and tries to "bully" his peers so he can get his way.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Stories

General Directions: The next few pages contain a number of fictional stories about children. Following each story are six questions that will ask you your opinions about the child in the story. Please answer each question honestly and to the best of your ability. Please assume that you know absolutely nothing about the child in the story except for what is stated. There are no right or wrong answers. After you have completed a set of answers, please do not go back and change them. Please complete both sides. Thank you.

Story # 1

Mark often hits others. He also tells other children that he will beat them up unless they do what he says. Sometimes, he is overheard calling others mean names.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

Story #2

Tracy is frequently irritable. She reports that she feels tired almost every day. During the past two weeks, she seems to be more emotional and twice has broken down in tears for no apparent reason.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #3

Tommy often excludes children from his playgroup when he is mad at them. He is sometimes overheard gossiping about other children in the class. He frequently tells his friends he will stop liking them if they don't do what he says.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story#4

Lesley often fidgets or squirms in her seat. She has difficulty waiting for her turn. She is disorganized and frequently loses homework assignments.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #5

John often seems sad. During a recent parent teacher conference, his mother and father reported that he has been having trouble sleeping. The other day he exclaimed, "I can't do anything right," when he was having difficulty with an assignment.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story # 6

Mary often reports that she has a stomachache. She seems anxious to get home at the end of the day. Sometimes, she gets upset and wants to call home just to make sure that her mother is okay.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #7

Chad frequently doesn't seem to be listening. He has trouble staying seated and often wanders around the classroom. He also appears to have difficulty paying attention in class.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #8

Brittany spreads rumors about other children. When mad at peers, she ignores them. In order to "get even" with another child, she will try to exclude them from her group of friends.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Normal — Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Disruptive — Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Not at all Acceptable — Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #9

Billy often worries that bad things are going to happen to his family. He always reports that he a headache. He says that he won't spend the night at a friend's house because he doesn't like being away from home.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0% 10% 20% 30% 40% 50% 60% 70% 80% 90% 100%

Story #10

Suzie often kicks or punches others. She also says mean things to insult others and tries to "bully" her peers so she can get her way.

Please circle the response that best represents your answer to the following questions.

1. How normal is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Normal						Very Normal

2. How disruptive is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Disruptive						Very Disruptive

3. How acceptable is this child's behavior?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Not at all Acceptable						Very Acceptable

4. How likely would you be to discipline (e.g., verbally reprimand, put in time-out) this child?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

5. How likely would you be to send this child to the office for disciplinary action?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

6. How likely would you be to refer this child for an emotionally disturbed evaluation?

0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

APPENDIX C

FOLLOW-UP QUESTIONNAIRE

Follow-up Questionnaire

1. Do you have any thoughts about the purpose of this study? If yes, please write out idea below.

2. Do you have any thoughts about what the hypotheses of the study are? If yes, please write out your ideas below.

3. Did you use any other information other than what was provided in the stories to answer story questions? If yes, please explain below.

APPENDIX D

TEACHER EFFICACY MEASURE

Please indicate the degree to which you agree or disagree with each statement below by circling the appropriate numeral underneath each statement. Please complete reverse side as well.

1. When a student does better than usual, many times it is because I exerted a little extra effort.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

2. The hours in my class have little influence on students compared to the influence of their home environment.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

3. The amount a student can learn is primarily related to family background.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

4. If students aren't disciplined at home, they aren't likely to accept any discipline.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

5. When a student is having difficulty with an assignment, I am usually able to adjust it to his/her level.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

6. When a student gets a better grade than usual, it is generally because I found better ways of teaching the student.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

7. When I really try, I can get through to most difficult students.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

8. A teacher is very limited in what he/she can achieve because a student's home environment is a large influence on his/her achievements.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

9. When the grades of my students improve, it is usually because I found more effective teaching strategies.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

10. If a student masters a new concept quickly, this might be because I knew the necessary steps in teaching that concept.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

11. If parents would do more with their children, I could do more.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

12. If a student did not remember information I gave in a previous lesson, I would know how to increase his/her retention in the next lesson.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

13. If a student in my class becomes disruptive and noisy, I feel assured that I know some techniques to redirect him/her quickly.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

14. The influences of a student's home experiences can be overcome by good teaching.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

15. If one of my students couldn't do an assignment, I would be able to accurately assess whether the assignment was at the correct level of difficulty.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

16. Even a teacher with good teaching abilities may not reach many students.

1	2	3	4	5	6
Strongly disagree	Moderately disagree	Disagree slightly more than agree	Agree slightly more than disagree	Moderately agree	Strongly agree

APPENDIX E

INSTITUTIONAL REVIEW BOARD

APPROVAL FORM

Oklahoma State University
Institutional Review Board

Protocol Expires: 3/17/03

Date : Monday, March 18, 2002 IRB Application No AS0140

Proposal Title: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF OVERT AND RELATIONAL AGGRESSION: DIFFERENCES IN REFERRALS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE BASED ON GENDER

Principal Investigator(s) :

Y. Segura
215 N Murray
Stillwater, OK 74078

Melanie Page
408 N Murray
Stillwater, OK 74078

Reviewed and Expedited **Continuation**

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s) : Approved

Signature :

Carol Olson, Director of University Research Complian

Monday, March 18, 2002
Date

Approvals are valid for one calendar year, after which time a request for continuation must be submitted. Any modifications to the research project approved by the IRB must be submitted for approval with the advisor's signature. The IRB office MUST be notified in writing when a project is complete. Approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. Expedited and exempt projects may be reviewed by the full Institutional Review Board.

Oklahoma State University
Institutional Review Board

Protocol Expires: 4/1/02

Date : Monday, April 02, 2001 IRB Application No AS0140

Proposal Title: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF OVERT AND RELATIONAL AGGRESSION: DIFFERENCES IN REFERRALS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE BASED ON GENDER

Principal Investigator(s) :

Y. Segura
215 N Murray
Stillwater, OK 74078

Melanie Page
408 N Murray
Stillwater, OK 74078

Reviewed and Processed as: Expedited

Approval Status Recommended by Reviewer(s) : Approved

Signature : Carol Olson

Carol Olson, Director of University Research Compliance

Monday, April 02, 2001
Date

Approvals are valid for one calendar year, after which time a request for continuation must be submitted. Any modifications to the research project approved by the IRB must be submitted for approval with the advisor's signature. The IRB office MUST be notified in writing when a project is complete. Approved projects are subject to monitoring by the IRB. Expedited and exempt projects may be reviewed by the full Institutional Review Board.

#2

Vita

Yvette Lynn Segura

Candidate for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

Thesis: TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF RELATIONAL AND OVERT AGGRESSION: DIFFERENCES IN REFERRALS FOR DISCIPLINARY ACTION AND EMOTIONAL DISTURBANCE BASED ON GENDER

Major Field: Clinical Psychology

Biographical

Education: Graduated from Manzano High School, Albuquerque, New Mexico in May of 1993; received Bachelor of Science degree in Psychology with a Minor in English from Texas A&M University in May, 1997; received Master of Science Degree with a major in Psychology from Oklahoma State University in July, 2000; completed the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree with a major in Clinical Psychology at Oklahoma State University in May, 2003.

Experience: Research Assistant for Dr. Bryan Neighbors August, 1997 to May, 2000; Research Assistant for Dr. Melanie Page, May 2000 to present; completed clinical internship at The University of Louisville School of Medicine, August, 2001; graduate instructor, Oklahoma State University.

Professional Memberships: American Psychological Association; Association for the Advancement of Behavior Therapy.