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Playground Observations

- 600 students in grades 3 – 6
- 50 minutes spread over 10 weeks, fall
- 50 minutes spread over 10 weeks, spring

- Show
  - fluidity in participant roles
  - consistency in preferred aggressive methods
Differences Between Aggressors

• Function of aggression
  – Defensive or reactive
  – Obtain dominance & rewards

• Form or method of aggression
  – Direct: face-to-face verbal & physical
  – Indirect: rumors, slander, organized exclusion
Aggressor-Victim Subtypes

• Aggressors 68%
  – Aggressive victims: direct verbal & physical 43%
  – Skilled indirect bullies: gossip, rumors 18%
  – Bully-victims, all methods 7%

• Non-aggressors 32%
  – Non-victimized 25%
  – Directly victimized 3%
  – Indirectly victimized 4%
Aggressive Actions / Hour

- Aggressive Victims
  - Direct Bullying
  - Indirect Bullying
  - Reactive Aggression

- Indirect Bullies
  - Direct Bullying
  - Indirect Bullying
  - Reactive Aggression

- Bully Victims
  - Direct Bullying
  - Indirect Bullying
  - Reactive Aggression
Victimization Experiences /Hour

- Aggressive Victims
  - Direct Victims
  - Indirect Victims
  - Target of Reactive Aggression

- Indirect Bullies
  - Direct Victims
  - Indirect Victims
  - Target of Reactive Aggression

- Bully-Victims
  - Direct Victims
  - Indirect Victims
  - Target of Reactive Aggression

- Direct Victims
  - Direct Victims
  - Indirect Victims
  - Target of Reactive Aggression

- Indirect Victims
  - Direct Victims
  - Indirect Victims
  - Target of Reactive Aggression

- Non-victims
  - Direct Victims
  - Indirect Victims
  - Target of Reactive Aggression
Bystander Reinforcement
Aggressive Actions / Hour

- Aggressive Victims
  - Direct Bullying
  - Indirect Bullying
  - Reactive Aggression

- Indirect Bullies
  - Direct Bullying
  - Indirect Bullying
  - Reactive Aggression

- Bully Victims
  - Direct Bullying
  - Indirect Bullying
  - Reactive Aggression
Predicting Victimization Change

Hourly Rate Change

Direct Bullying  Indirect Bullying

Frequent Fall Reactive Aggression

Frequent Fall Direct Bullying
Classroom Influences

• Attitudes endorsing retaliation
  – ‘It’s okay to hit someone who hit you first’
  – ‘It’s okay to say something mean about someone who really makes you angry’
  – 7 items, alpha = .87
  – Obtained for 535 students in 35 classrooms

• Observed behavior, n = 254
  – Bullying
  – Reactive aggression
### Individual & Classroom Norms

Best & Final Models

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Spring Reactive Aggression / hr</th>
<th></th>
<th>Spring Bullying / hr</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Estimate</td>
<td>SE</td>
<td>t ratio</td>
<td>Estimate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fall</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intercept</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.36</td>
<td>4.28**</td>
<td>1.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>.32</td>
<td>2.42*</td>
<td>-0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td>0.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>2.37**</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactive aggression</td>
<td><strong>0.20</strong></td>
<td>.06</td>
<td><strong>3.20</strong>**</td>
<td>0.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beliefs</td>
<td>-0.17</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>ns</td>
<td><strong>0.53</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class beliefs</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td><strong>2.31</strong>*</td>
<td>-0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class reactive aggres</td>
<td>0.44</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td><strong>2.19</strong>*</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Class bullying</td>
<td>-1.50</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td><strong>-3.10</strong>**</td>
<td>-1.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Research Need: Change Process

• What happens when interventions upset the hierarchy/status quo in classrooms?

• Will aggression increase at least temporarily in some classrooms?

• Can positive leadership opportunities offer rewards that reduce sabotage from entrenched bullies?
Research Need: Cultural & Peer Influences on Response to Threat

• Cultural differences in strategies that contain conflict & aggression

• Positive & negative influence from friends
  – Affects response to threat
  – Affects self-identity in both parties

• Role of reciprocity & obligation
Culturally-specific conflict strategies

- Are often useless when used with individuals that lack cultural knowledge.
- Do not map neatly onto visible ethnic characteristics.
- Violation of implicit cultural expectations for behavior → disconnect.
  - Without knowledge, attributed to deficit in the other.
  - May result in inadvertent insult or escalation.
In-depth Interviews

• Plateau Native Americans
• Mexican Americans
• European Americans
• African Americans
• Investigate
  – Actions of friends in response to threat
  – Effect of actions on self-identity, obligation & influence
  – Cultural influences on response to threat
Following Action for a Threatened Friend

Figure 2. Identity-relevant emotions & appraisal

- **Pride**
- **Guilt**
- **Good Friend**

Means

Action: Reconcile, Calm, Amplify, Proxy, Retaliation
Feelings of Obligation Following a Friend’s Action

![Graph showing feelings of obligation following different actions.](image)
Bullying & Victimization rate/hr

- **Pretest bullying/victimization**
- **No bullying/victimization**

Timeline:
- Pretest
- 6 mo. posttest
- 18 mo. posttest
Bystander Reinforcement rate/hr

![Graph showing Bystander Reinforcement rate/hr](image)
Reactive Aggression rate/hr

![Graph showing the decrease in reactive aggression rate from pretest to 18 months posttest. The graph compares pretest aggression (solid line) and no aggression (dashed line). The aggression rate decreases significantly over time.](image-url)