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The purpose of this study was to investigate what behaviors tend to be viewed as respectful or disrespectful between interacting high school students. Participants who completed the survey were 149 high school students on O’ahu. Comparisons were made across cultures to determine both common and culture-specific experiences of various peer behaviors as respectful or disrespectful in peer interactions. The data were analyzed for scenarios participants thought were respectful or disrespectful, which resulted in a more refined description and definition of respect and disrespect, and a better understanding for why it is valuable. Analysis showed which behaviors students perceived as respectful or disrespectful, as well as cross cultural comparisons. Results suggested that certain behaviors were viewed as respectful, and others were viewed as disrespectful, as well as explained any differences in perceptions of behaviors between cultures.
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THE IDENTIFICATION OF BEHAVIORS PERCEIVED AS RESPECTFUL AND DISRESPECTFUL BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS EVALUATING PEER INTERACTIONS

Statement of the Problem

The critical role of nurturing environments for promoting human well-being relies heavily upon ideals of respect (Biglan, Flay, Embry, & Sandler, 2012). A nurturing environment is characterized as an environment that fosters successful development and prevents psychological and behavioral problems. To be deemed a nurturing environment, there needs to be a minimization of biologically or psychologically toxic events, a promotion of pro-social behavior, limitations and monitoring for behavior problems, and psychological flexibility. If we want to prevent multiple problems and increase the prevalence of young people who develop successfully, we must increase the prevalence of nurturing environments.

Peterson and Skiba (2000) defined school climate as the feelings that the students have about the school environment over a period of time. These feelings come from the comfortability each individual feels in the environment, and whether the individual feels the environment is supportive of learning, appropriately organized, and safe. Climate also refers to the positive and negative feelings about the school environment. Therefore, comfortable and supportive feelings would support effective and efficient learning as well as positive student behavior and attitude. Conversely, negative feelings such as concern, fear, frustration, and loneliness would negatively effect learning and behavior.

Woods (2007) explained that students define supportive and caring learning environments as those in which their administrators, teachers, and other students and
adults in the school deliberately and intentionally provide them with support and respect in and out of the classroom. Students need a safe and nurturing environment to optimally learn, and mutual respect is the key to providing this (Woods, 2007). School cultures that do not provide an environment where mutual respect is shared between individuals negatively affect school environment and inhibit learning. According to Flay and Allred (2003), a wide range of youth behaviors are related and have common causes, and that effective positive youth development needs to combine the principles of effective character development, health promotion, disease prevention, and academics.

Woods (2007) explained that educators have an urgent need to learn more about the role of behavior, emotion, values, character, and social skills in improving student academic performance, wellbeing, and life success. Johnson (1999) stated that learning is only possible in an environment that is free of violence and that encourages mutual respect, self-confidence, and cooperation. According to Flay and Allred (2010), schools also are expected to prevent violence, substance use, bullying, and other disruptive behaviors, all of which are clearly linked to student values, character, and school performance. Mental health concerns also become more prevalent as students move into adolescence, and can contribute to behavioral problems that detract from achievement. Flay (2002) described that problem or risky behaviors, unhealthy behaviors, antisocial behaviors, poor mental health, and poor academic achievement, remain highly prevalent and continue to pose critical dilemmas for parents and educators. However, Flay (2002) goes on to explain that positive and healthy behaviors, pro-social behavior, mental health, and academic achievement are positive outcomes of youth development that are still
evident, but need to be fostered as much as possible through the creation of nurturing environments.

**Inter-cultural Sensitizer**

The Inter-cultural Sensitizer (ICS), also called the "culture assimilator" (Brislin, Landis, & Brandt, 1983), has been a carefully researched inter-cultural training technique. The ICS focuses on explanations of behavior from the point of view of the host's culture. Salzman (1990) explained that it makes attributions isomorphic to those of hosts concerning the meaning of frequently misunderstood behaviors and situations.

There are many features of ICS that distinguish it from other methods. For example, its research base, which is used both in developing instruments and evaluating their effectiveness, its theoretical foundation in attribution theory, and its ability to increase learning of the uses of psychological principles.

ICS focuses on the acquisition of knowledge or information, using techniques of feedback and reinforcement. Material used covers feelings and behaviors of the persons involved, creating an incorporation of affective, cognitive, and behavioral content. Therefore, these components, both in the process of learning and the content learned, are brought together in the ICS.

According to Albert (1983), the ICS has been the most extensively evaluated cross-cultural training method. Many evaluation studies have shown it effective in reaching the method's goals, including: enabling participants to make attributions, imparting knowledge of the subjective culture of the target group, helping participants interact more effectively with persons from the other cultures, improving knowledge and
application of cross-cultural communication concepts, increasing inter-cultural sensitivity
(For reviews of the studies, see Albert 1983; see also Cushner 1989, and Pollard 1989).
Albert (1983) explained that despite a few inconsistencies, the overall consistency and
strengths of the findings are impressive, especially when taking into consideration
various ICS techniques used, populations involved, and approach of the research.
Therefore, the ICS was shown to be a useful and versatile method that has been
effectively applied to various populations and situations.

**Critical Incident Technique**

Flanagan's (1954) critical incident technique is used for collecting direct
observations of student behavior that have critical significance and meet
methodologically defined criteria. These observations are kept track of as incidents,
which are then used to understand and develop broader psychological principles. Critical
incidents are described as an occurrence that makes a significant contribution, either
positively or negatively, to an activity or phenomenon. Critical incident technique is a
flexible method that relies on various procedures. The first procedure is determining and
reviewing the incident. The next involves collecting details of the incident from
participants. When all of the facts are collected, critical issues are identified. Decisions
can be made for resolving issues based on various possible solutions. The final and most
important aspect in the evaluation determines whether or not the solution works. This
study utilized critical incident methodology.
Research Questions

Schools have the task to create a culture of mutual respect so that students learn to their highest potential in an optimally nurturing environment (Biglan, Flay, Embry, & Sandler, 2012). Acts of mutual respect must have certain characteristics, and certain behaviors must occur between individuals for them to feel respected or disrespected. I was interested in which behaviors tended to be viewed as respectful or disrespectful by students in their interactions with each other in high school. Also, if there is variability in the perception of these behaviors between individuals due to differences in cultural background, it may be difficult to ascertain which behaviors are attributed to each respectful or disrespectful interaction. Therefore, are there cross cultural differences in the attributions of respect and disrespect to behaviors that occur in student-student interaction?

Research Question #1: What behaviors tend to be viewed as respectful or disrespectful by students in their interactions with each other in high school?

Research Question #2: Are there cross cultural differences in the attributions of respect and disrespect to behaviors that occur in student-student interaction?
Literature Review

Problem Behaviors Affect School Cultures

Substance use and aggressive, violent, or disruptive behaviors occur at problematic levels among American youths (Singh et al., 2007, Beets et al., 2009). Early initiation of substance use and engaging in violent behaviors during childhood place children at a greater risk of psychopathology, aggressive behaviors, and continuation of substance use during adolescence and into adulthood. Leary, Kowalski, Smith, and Phillips (2003), conducted case studies of 15 school shootings between 1995 and 2001 to examine the possible role of social rejection and lack of respect in school violence. Acute or chronic rejection, in the form of ostracism, bullying, and/or romantic rejection, was present in all but two of the incidents. In addition, the shooters tended to have psychological problems involving depression. When examining the role of respect at school, Mayseless and Scharf (2011) advocate an increased emphasis on respect in schools, and other contexts, because of its potential for reducing aggression and violence. According to Ertesvag (2007), disobedient pupils, off-task behavior, and bullying are common problems in schools in many countries. They interfere with teaching, create an unsafe learning environment, and challenge the staff. Also, adolescents with conduct disorder frequently engage in aggressive and disruptive behaviors. Often these behaviors are controlled or managed through behavioral or other psychosocial interventions. Sometimes such interventions do not always ensure lasting changes in an adolescent’s response repertoire so that he or she does not engage in aggression when exposed to the same situations that gave rise to the behavior previously (Singh et al., 2007). However,
appropriately designed and implemented school-based prevention programs can prevent or reduce negative behaviors (Beets et al., 2009). Thus, prevention programs that can reduce the incidence of such behaviors should provide clear public health benefits, and an appropriate program must be implemented in order to facilitate a healthy and optimal school culture and environment.

**Respect in Social Context**

Cultural and universal respect have been defined in various ways, such as quality of treatment based on individuals’ status in the group, the degree to which they are liked by the group, and or how fairly they are treated in interactions with group members (Mayseless et al., 2011). To support these ideas, Goodman (2009) explained that respect includes universal human dignity, autonomy, and equality. Ausch (2010) explored the development of concepts of respect and disrespect and suggested it has an affective component. Highlighted affective states like pride, honor, and admiration are related to gaining respect from others, and avoiding disrespectful interactions. Building on conceptualizations from social psychology, a conceptual framework for the study of respect in developmental contexts was established. Mayseless et al., (2011) explained two kinds of respect, unconditional and contingent, and distinguished between four related but distinct ways in which respect and disrespect are involved in preventing or fostering aggression: (a) respecting others, (b) being respected, (c) being disrespected or humiliated, and (d) respecting oneself. With similar ideas, Huo et al., (2010) explained that these different conceptions are integrated in a dual pathway model of respect. The model’s prediction was that fair treatment from group members shaped attitudes toward
the group and self via two distinct pathways: status and inclusion. Huo et al., (2010) continued to discuss when and to what extent members of a common group respected and valued one's ethnicity, explaining that it encouraged social engagement and well-being. Also, respect was linked to more positive evaluations of both school and students as well as lower levels of school disengagement. After reviewing the premises of respect, Goodman (2009) found that there was a blend between minimal and full respect, by separating "respect-due" from "respect-earned." While the former should be granted unconditionally to all, the latter was contingent upon qualities that one possesses or acquires over time.

Deutsch and Jones (2008) described authority as an important component of youth relations, and explained that respect emerged as an important construct which influences youths' perceptions of their relationships. Lance (2010) contended that the commitment of the students respect for each other was identified as being a key factor to learning. Also, Talmy (2009) explained that local constructions of respect in class served as a powerful socializing resources, working to produce order in the form of classroom control, as well as hierarchies, along lines of expertise and status. Howard (2010) explained that respect was implicitly tied to certain ways of speaking in situated classroom interactions. With this evidence, therefore, respect can play an important role in creating an optimal learning environment.

**Role of Respect**

Woods (2007) explained that students' perception of a learning environment they deem to be supportive and caring promotes their sense of belongingness and commitment
to learning, which in turn improves their academic achievement. Mayer (1995) demonstrated that schools with high levels of victimization and frequent punishment have higher rates of aggressive social behavior; the aversive ways people treat each other in these settings was a major reason for the high levels of aggression. Therefore, respect for one another may be the first step in minimizing aggression, creating a more nurturing environment for promotion of well-being, and optimal learning scenarios. The role of respect in reducing aggression and violence has been discussed and examined primarily by social psychologists who study relationship dynamics. In intergroup conflicts, Mayeless et al., (2011) explained that respect has been recognized as an important form of positive regard that helps diffuse aggressive impulses. Respect, therefore, may play a role in mitigating aggression in the developmental context of school as well. Woods (2007) contended that at-risk high school students perform at higher levels socially, emotionally, and academically when they perceive that they are in a supportive caring learning environment and regarded as respected members of the school community. Meraviglia, Becker, Rosenbluth, Sanchez, and Robertson (2003) discussed the importance of a positive school climate in which inappropriate behaviors are not tolerated and staff members respond consistently to incidents to reduce bullying and sexual harassment. Also, Perkins and Mebert (2005) explained that efforts to form pro-social attitudes or to redirect discriminatory behaviors were more likely to succeed if they are informed by an understanding of the developmental processes that give rise to stigma, social exclusion, and devaluing of difference on the one hand, and pro-social responses of social acceptance and respect for diversity on the other.
To understand the role and importance respect plays in school culture, Ausch (2010) explained that respect was a key ingredient in positive social relationships as well as a foundation for just societies. Respect was also an important social lubricant that preserves face and enhances one's self esteem. In more detail, Huo, Binning, and Molina (2010) described that feelings of respect affect important aspects of group functioning and members’ psychological well-being. Goodman (2009) discussed respect as foundational to common ethical beliefs and described it as a cardinal virtue in schools. Also, increased amounts of violence are experienced when there is lack of mutual respect within the school culture. With the evidence provided, to prevent violence and aggression, a culture of mutual respect must be achieved.

Attribution and Inter-cultural Relations

Attributions are the inferences we make about the causes of behavior, which help us answer questions about behavior (Weiner, 1992; Kelley, 1967). Hewstone, Fincham, and Jaspars (1983) explained that when your action or motives for the action are questioned, you need to explain the reasons for your action. Also, Salzman (1990) stated that individuals from different cultures bring to cross-cultural interactions different implicit as well as explicit frameworks for interpreting experience. These differences in interpretive frameworks may lead members of two different cultures to view the same situation or behavior differently. Salzman (1990) explained that we, therefore, do not respond directly to the events we experience; we respond to the meanings or interpretations we give to these events. Albert (1983) stated that the result may be confusion, misunderstanding or conflict. Salzman (1990) further explained that even
with the best of intentions, the development of mutually respectful and cooperative inter-
cultural relations can be difficult due to attributional differences.

From a motivational perspective on attribution, Weiner (1992) proposed that individuals have initial affective responses to the potential consequences of the intrinsic or extrinsic motives of the actor, which in turn influence future behavior. This means a person's own perceptions or attributions as to why they succeeded or failed at an activity may determine the amount of effort the person will use for future activities. Weiner (1992) suggested that individuals exert their attribution search and cognitively evaluate casual properties of the behaviors they experience. When attributions lead to positive affect and high expectancy of future success, such attributions should result in greater willingness to approach similar achievement tasks in the future than those attributions that produce negative affect and low expectancy of future success. When an internal attribution is made, the cause of the given behavior is assigned to the individual's characteristics such as ability, personality, mood, efforts, attitudes, or disposition. When an external attribution is made, the cause of the given behavior is assigned to the situation in which the behavior was seen, such as the task, other people, or luck (that the individual producing the behavior did so because of the surrounding environment or the social situation). These two types lead to very different perceptions of the individual engaging in a behavior.

Also, with regard to bias and errors in attribution, Gilbert (1995) explained the fundamental attribution error as a tendency to overvalue dispositional or personality-based explanations for behavior while undervaluing situational explanations. The
fundamental attribution error is most visible when people explain and assume the behavior of others. A person's culture can lead to attributional error as well. Wang's (1993) research showed that culture, either individualist or collectivist, affects how people make attributions. Jones and Nisbett (1971) explained that there can also be attributional bias or error from either the actor or the observer, where people tend to attribute other people's behaviors to their dispositional factors while attributing own actions to situational factors. Even in the same situation, people’s attribution can differ depending on their role. Dispositional attribution, according to Pettigrew (1979), is a tendency to attribute people’s behaviors to their dispositions; that is, to their personality, character, and ability.

Regarding perceptual salience and attribution, according to Aronson (1992), when people try to make attributions about another's behavior, their information focuses on the individual. Their perception of the individual is lacking most of the external factors which might affect the individual. The gaps tend to be skipped over and the attribution is made based on the perception information most salient. The most salient perceptual information dominates a person's perception of the situation. Huffman (2012) explained that for individuals making behavioral attributions about themselves, the situation and external environment are entirely salient, but their own body and behavior are less so. This leads to the tendency to make an external attribution in regards to their own behavior.

According to Triandis (1972), the occurrence, form and meaning of a particular behavior in a particular situation may differ across cultures due to differences in norms,
values, role perceptions and experiences. Heider (1958) indicated that we are constantly engaged in the process of making inferences about causes and motives of behaviors in order to make our worlds more predictable and understandable. Although the behaviors that are or are not performed in any interaction are important, Albert and Triandis (1979) contended that it was the interpretations we give to these behavior that were critical. Salzman (1990) explained attributions as the answer to the vital "why" questions about a behavior. Discrepancies in attributions may result in misunderstandings, low interpersonal attraction, rejection, and even conflict. Social psychology (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, & Solomon, 1982; Greenberg & Rosenfield, 1979; Jones & Nisbett, 1971; Ross, 1977) has provided evidence that attributional biases may be based on perceptual, self-esteem maintenance, and ethnocentric factors.

Summary

Because of the prevalence of problematic behaviors, and the role respect plays in mitigating these problems, prevention programs that can reduce the incidence of such behaviors should provide clear public health benefits. Therefore, an appropriate program must be implemented in order to facilitate a healthy and optimal school culture and environment. Woods (2007) contended that academic achievement will improve with a supportive and caring learning environment. Also, the occurrence, form and meaning of a particular behavior in a particular situation may differ from culture to culture due to differences in norms, values, role perceptions and experiences.
Method

Participants

From one high school site on O‘ahu, 28 boys and 25 girls from 14 to 18 years of age were conveniently sampled administered the Critical Incident (Episode Generation) Student/Student Form (Appendix A). This high school site was predominantly Asian, and most students were of low socio-economic status. Using Flanagan's (1954) critical incident methodology (See Appendix A), these students described their own critical incidences of respectful or disrespectful interactions between peers, which were then developed into exemplar incidents of respectful or disrespectful interactions. These exemplar incidents were then analyzed for themes of respectful or disrespectful behavior to be used to create a Likert scale tool (Appendix B) to measure what behaviors tended to be viewed as respectful or disrespectful between high school students.

For the next part of the study, 63 male and 86 female students from two high schools on O‘ahu were conveniently sampled to participate and administered The Respect Survey (Appendix B). Of the high school sites chosen to participate, both had students of low socio-economic status, and were of various ethnic and cultural backgrounds. One of the schools had a predominantly Asian population, with many foreign students as well. The other high school had many students from O‘ahu, intermixed with students from families that serve in the military. The frequency table below summarizes demographics for: Primary Ethnic Identification, Primary Cultural Influence, First Language Learned, Age in Years.
Table 1

Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Ethnic Identification</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Cultural Influence</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>European-American</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>10.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian-American</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>48.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic/Latino</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>First Language Learned</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spanish</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Korean</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>46.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>37.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Research Design and Procedure

This study was divided into two parts. For the first part of the study, the Critical Incident (Episode Generation) Student/Student Form (Appendix A) was used as a preliminary identifier of themes of respectful behavior or disrespectful behavior. This
form was administered by Dr. Michael Salzman to 53 students from one high school site on O‘ahu. As stated above, this high school had a predominantly Asian student population, with many foreign students as well. The form asked participants to describe incidents of feeling respected or disrespected, and each incident in the questionnaire was then interpreted for students experiencing either respect or disrespect. These incidents were then grouped by themes of respectful or disrespectful behaviors or interaction, initially identified by Dr. Michael Salzman. Flanagan's (1954) critical incident technique was used as a model for data collection, acting as the structure for the Critical Incident (Episode Generation) Student/Student Form (Appendix A). Critical incidents can be gathered in various ways, but for the Critical Incident (Episode Generation) Student/Student Form (Appendix A), critical incidents were gathered through respondents sharing respectful or disrespectful incidents they experienced.

Then, for the second part of the study, a review of the themes of respectful or disrespectful behavior from Appendix A was performed by reading each incident, identifying a theme of respect or disrespect, and then tallying the amount each theme occurred in the incidents. When this process was finished, a comparison between themes previously identified by Dr. Salzman and themes identified during the review was made. In comparing the themes, I was in full agreement with the themes of respectful and disrespectful behaviors previously identified by Dr. Salzman. After all incidents were analyzed, themes of respectful and disrespectful behavior or interactions were identified based upon their frequency within the incidents. The three themes regarding respectful or disrespectful interaction most frequently found in the incidents were Attention (A),
Equality (E), and Value (V). In other words, in most of the interactions or scenarios described by participants in Appendix A, for a student to feel respected or disrespected, they felt either attention, or a lack thereof, equality, or inequality, or felt valued, or not. This was determined based upon each participants’ descriptions of their experiences of respectful and disrespectful interactions in high school in the Critical Incident (Episode Generation) Student/Student Form. Following the analysis, comparison, and the identification of theme-based exemplar incidents of respectful or disrespectful behaviors or interactions, a Likert scale, The Respect Survey (Appendix B) were developed based upon these themes. Each of the created scenarios for The Respect Survey, therefore, encompassed one or more of these three themes of respect of disrespect. The new scale (Appendix B) depicted scenarios of interacting high school students and measured students' views or perceptions of what behaviors tended to be viewed as respectful or disrespectful. A new set of 149 student participants from two high schools on O‘ahu were conveniently selected and administered The Respect Survey (Appendix B). As described above, of the participating high school sites, both had students from low socio-economic status, and were of various ethnic and cultural backgrounds. One of the schools was a predominantly Asian and foreign population. The other high school had many students from O‘ahu, intermixed with students from families that serve in the military. The Respect Survey was made up of 9 respectful interaction scenarios, and 9 disrespectful interaction scenarios. It was judged on a Likert scale, from 1-6, 1 being very disrespectful, and 6 being very respectful. When the scenarios were created, special attention was given to the most important themes (Attention, Equality, and Value) coming
from the described incidents of respectful interaction and disrespectful interaction from Appendix A. Items were given a letter (A, E, or V) based upon which of the three themes of respect or disrespect they came under (Attention, Equality, and Value). Then, they were given a number based upon what order they came in for each of the themes. Finally, they were labeled with an “R” for a respectful interaction, or a “DR” for a disrespectful interaction. For example, the first question on the survey was a disrespectful scenario with attention as its theme, so it was named A1DR. The goal of the new scale (Appendix B) was to provide a more specific definition as to what behaviors are interpreted as respectful or disrespectful between interacting high school students. After each scenario rating, there was space left for participants to comment on the scenario if they chose to do so. This allowed for further investigation and understanding of possible student reactions to each respectful or disrespectful scenario, as well as an opportunity for general feedback. During the data gathering sessions, I introduced myself, explained to the participants the goal of the study, and gave directions for completing the survey. I also gave participants the opportunity to ask questions.

For data analysis, I analyzed the data for reliability, as well as completed an exploratory factor analysis. Also, I explored commonalities and comparisons across culture using MANOVA statistical analyses.

**Data Analysis**

After collecting the data, an analysis was accomplished to identify respectful and disrespectful behaviors or interactions using frequencies, reliability measures, exploratory factor analyses, and MANOVA. All analyses were done using the Statistical Product and
Service Solutions (SPSS) statistical package.

A report of the frequencies on students’ endorsement of an incident as respectful or disrespectful was calculated, including means, standard deviations, and percentages. This allowed for statements to be made that a particular behavior was seen as respectful or disrespectful, and also by a given percentage of respondents.

Next, Cronbach's alpha was used to measure internal consistency or reliability of the survey. After deeming the scale to be adequately reliable, an exploratory factor analysis was then completed to explain what factors were involved in respect as a construct or structure. Factor analyses were performed on the three themes of attention, equality, and value, as well as for the general themes of respect and disrespect. Finally, a MANOVA was used to determine if responses differed across primary cultural influences of the participants. This distinguished the cross cultural differences in the attributions of respect and disrespect to behaviors that occur in student-student interaction.

**Role of the Researcher**

My role as the researcher was that of a theme analyzer and creator, scale constructor, survey facilitator, data collector, statistical analyzer, and writer. When implementing and drawing conclusions from this research, it was important to consider the effect of my background. Academically, I am trained in psychology and education. However, I have no formal experience creating data collection tools or using critical incident methodology. This may have led to the creation of a tool with mediocre reliability and validity, and to my misinterpretation of participants beliefs of respectful or
disrespectful interactions or behaviors. This also affected my analyses of the surveys in judging variables that influenced respect or disrespect, and may have led to incorrect assumptions and interpretations of the data. For clarification purposes and to minimize misinterpretations, I allowed for student questions before each data collection session, although not many questions were asked.

I have never worked, nor have I ever established relationships with the high school student participants. This may have posed challenging for me to know exactly how to create scenarios fit for these participants, and for the participants to accurately rate the scenarios. Also, participants may have rated the scenarios based on what they thought I would expect, and not really what they believed was the true rating. To reduce discomfort and minimize anxiety, I introduced myself before each data collection, educated them about the research project and the survey procedures, and reassured them that their genuine opinions were desired.
Results

Reliability

Cronbach's alpha was used to measure internal consistency, or reliability of the survey. In this study, it was effective in measuring reliability because of the type of measure used--multiple scenarios with a Likert scale rating system in a survey form.

The Cronbach's alpha level for the respectful scenario items was 0.661, indicating a somewhat satisfactory level of internal consistency. According to the Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted statistics, if items E1R and V5R were deleted from the survey, Cronbach's alpha level would increase to 0.738. Therefore, these items weakened the internal consistency, and could be removed to improve reliability of the scale.

The Cronbach's alpha level for the disrespectful scenarios was 0.715, indicating an acceptable level of internal consistency. According to the Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted statistics, removing any of the disrespectful scenarios from the survey would not improve internal consistency level, indicating that all the items (although they did not have high internal consistency) were appropriate for the measure.

Both Cronbach's alpha levels for respectful scenario items and disrespectful scenario items were lower than when all of the items were combined. Therefore, to exemplify the strongest internal consistency, the items from both respectful scenarios and disrespectful scenarios were combined to provide the reliability measure. The Cronbach's alpha level of all the items (respectful scenarios and disrespectful scenarios) in the survey was 0.789, indicating an acceptable level of internal consistency. According to the Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted statistics, if item E1R or item V5R were deleted,
internal consistency would increase to 0.801, or a higher level of internal consistency. The Corrected Item-Total Correlation value were low (0.028 and 0.140) for these items as well, so removal of E1R and V5R would lead to only a small improvement in Cronbach's alpha, and the reliability of the scale.

Overall, a Cronbach's alpha level of 0.789 for both respectful scenario items and disrespectful scenario items indicated an acceptable level of internal consistency, allowing for the survey to be a reliable measure of respectful and disrespectful scenarios of interacting high school students.

**Frequencies of Ratings for Disrespectful Scenario Items**

The scenario item A1DR (See Appendix B) dealt with one high school student directly insulting another high school student, and was rated by participants as disrespectful (\(M=1.30, S.D.=0.542\)), and very disrespectful by 73.8% of the participants.

However, scenario item E2DR was not as clear, with only 23.5% of participants rating the scenario as very disrespectful. Yet, it still received a rating of disrespectful (\(M=2.13, S.D.=0.765\)). This scenario depicted a girl being bumped and not receiving an apology.

The group rejection scenario, item V2DR, was rated as very disrespectful by 75.2% of the participants, and received a rating of disrespectful by participants (\(M=1.29, S.D.=0.536\)).

The next disrespectful scenario, item A2DR involved inattentive and inappropriate student interaction during a class presentation. This scenario was rated as very disrespectful by only 47% of the participants, but still received, on average, a
disrespectful rating \((M=1.71, \text{ S.D.}=0.756)\).

Interruption by a classmate, item E3DR received a very disrespectful rating from only 30.9% of the participants, but again received disrespectful ratings \((M=1.97, \text{ S.D.}=0.771)\).

For inequality scenario E4DR, 77.9% of the participants thought the scenario of not being listened to while giving a presentation was very disrespectful \((M=1.28, \text{ S.D.}=0.570)\).

The scenario involving negative attention, item A4DR, depicted a girl being verbally harassed by boys. This scenario was rated by 84.6% of participants as very disrespectful, the most of any item \((M=1.17, \text{ S.D.}=0.409)\).

In the next inequality scenario, item E5DR, one student cut in front of another in line. This elicited a 40.3% very disrespectful rating from participants, and was given an overall disrespectful rating \((M=1.82, \text{ S.D.}=0.831)\).

Item E6DR, our final disrespectful scenario, exemplified exclusion from group play, and was rated by only 43% of participants as very disrespectful, but still maintained a rating of disrespect \((M=1.85, \text{ S.D.}=0.860)\).

**Frequencies of Ratings for Respectful Scenario Items**

The first respectful scenario, Item E1R, dealt with friends protecting each other from bullying, and was rated as respectful \((M=5.72, \text{ S.D.}=0.556)\), and very respectful by 77.9% of the participants.

The next scenario, Item V1R, exemplified one student valuing and encouraging another. This scenario was given an overall respectful rating by participants \((M=5.40, \text{ S.D.}=0.701)\).
S.D.=0.666), and was rated as very respectful by 49.7% of the participants.

In Item V3R, one student was injured, and another came to her aid. For this scenario, 83.2% of the participants rated this scenario as very respectful, and in general, participants rated this item as respectful (M=5.82, S.D.=0.420).

Item A3R emphasized attentiveness and reassurance, and was rated by only 39.6% as very respectful, but still maintained an overall respectful rating (M=5.28, S.D.=0.666).

In Item V4R, exchanging help with assignments was rated by 70.5% of the participants as very respectful, and was given a respectful rating (M=5.67, S.D.=0.538).

In Item V5R, one student shared secrets with another student. This scenario was rated as very respectful by 49.0% of the participants, and received, on average, a respectful rating (M=5.28, S.D.=0.789).

Item V6R portrayed praise, admiration, and value during student classroom interaction. This scenario was rated by 80.5% of the participants as very respectful, and was found, on average, to be respectful behavior (M=5.75, S.D.=0.556).

Due to the attention given during class presentations, Item A5R was given a rating of very respectful by 75.2% of the participants, and was given a respectful rating (M=5.70, S.D.=0.551).

Item A6R also dealt with attentiveness during classwork, and was rated by 64.4% of the participants as very respectful, and was deemed, on average, a respectful behavior or interaction (M=5.57, S.D.=0.629).
Table 2

*Frequencies of Ratings*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>S.D.</th>
<th>Percent Rated Very Respect/Disrespect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A1DR</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.542</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2DR</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>0.765</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2DR</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.536</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2DR</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.756</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3DR</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>0.771</td>
<td>30.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4DR</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.570</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4DR</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>0.409</td>
<td>84.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5DR</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>0.831</td>
<td>40.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6DR</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.860</td>
<td>43.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1R</td>
<td>5.72</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>77.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1R</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>49.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3R</td>
<td>5.82</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>83.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3R</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.666</td>
<td>39.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4R</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>0.538</td>
<td>70.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5R</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>0.789</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6R</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>80.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5R</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>0.551</td>
<td>75.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6R</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>0.629</td>
<td>64.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Factor Analysis**

Initially, I created a structure with three constructs (Attention, Equality, and Value) to exemplify respect and disrespect, and ran a factor analysis to provide evidence of this. However, my results did not show evidence of the three constructs. Therefore, I used a data driven approach, meaning I interpreted the structure from the all item factor analysis, and used respect and disrespect as the two constructs of the structure.

First, I checked to see if the all item factor analysis was appropriate, using several very important parts of the output: the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett’s test of sphericity. The KMO statistic varies between 0 and 1, and a value of 0 indicates that the sum of partial correlations is large relative to the sum of
correlations. This represents diffusion in the pattern of correlations, making factor analysis likely to be appropriate. A value close to 1 indicates that patterns of correlations are relatively compact, and so factor analysis should yield distinct and reliable factors. Kaiser (1974) recommends accepting values greater than 0.5 as acceptable, values between 0.7 and 0.8 are good, values between 0.8 and 0.9 are great and values above 0.9 are superb. For this data, the value was 0.725, which falls into the range of being good. Therefore, we should be confident that factor analysis was appropriate for the data.

Bartlett's measure tested the null hypothesis that the original correlation matrix was an identity matrix. For the data, Bartlett's test was highly significant (p < 0.001), and therefore factor analysis was appropriate.

At the first stage of factor analysis, SPSS extracted six factors. Factor analysis is an exploratory tool, so it should be used as a guide and not a decision maker. One important decision was the number of factors to extract. By Kaiser's (1974) criterion, we should extract six factors. However, this criterion is accurate when there are less than 30 variables and communalities after extraction are greater than 0.7 or when the sample size exceeds 250 and the average communality is greater than 0.6. From the initial communalities, two exceeded 0.7 (items V5R and E3DR). The average of the communalities can be found by adding them up and dividing by the number of communalities (10.898/18 = 0.605, sample size=149). On both grounds, therefore, Kaiser's rule may not be accurate.

However, considering the smaller sample size for the data, we can also use the scree plot to determine the point of inflexion on the curve where factors start to account
for the same amount of variance in the data (plateau on the scree plot). The curve was
difficult to interpret because it tailed off after two factors, but there was another drop
after factors three and four, before a relatively stable plateau was reached. Therefore,
there was justification for retaining either two, three, or four factors. Given the small
sample, it was probably safe to assume Kaiser’s criterion; however, I reran the analysis
specifying that SPSS extract only two factors and compared the results.

**Factor Extraction**

When extracting with two factors, there was a list of eigenvalues associated with
each linear component before extraction, after extraction, and after rotation. Before
extraction, SPSS identified 18 linear components within the data set. The eigenvalues
associated with each factor represented the variance explained by that particular linear
component and SPSS also displayed the eigenvalue in terms of the percentage of variance
explained. For example, Factor 1 explained 23.921% of the total variance. The first few
factors explained relatively large amounts of variance (especially Factor 1), whereas
subsequent factors explained smaller amounts of variance. In the final part of the table
(labeled Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings), the eigenvalues of the factors after rotation
were displayed. The benefit of rotation was its effect of optimizing the factor structure.
It was important that the two factors were equalized. Before rotation, Factor 1 accounted
for considerably more variance than the other factor (23.921% compared to 9%).
However, after extraction it accounted for only 17.644% of variance (compared to
15.277%).

Table 3 shows the communalities before and after extraction. Principal
component analysis works on the initial assumption that all variance is common; before extraction the communalities are all 1. The communalities in the column labeled Extraction reflect the common variance in the data structure. For example, only 0.4% of the variance associated with item E1R is common, or shared, variance. Another way to look at these communalities was in terms of the variance proportions explained by underlying factors. After extraction, some factors were discarded; and therefore, information was lost. The amount of variance in each variable that can be explained by the retained factors was represented by the communalities after extraction.

Table 3

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Initial</th>
<th>Extraction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E1R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.399</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V4R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.447</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.337</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6R</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.318</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.527</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6DR</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.427</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Factor Rotation

Table 4 shows the rotated component matrix of the factor loadings for each
variable onto each factor. There are several things to consider about the format of this matrix. First, factor loadings less than 0.4 have not been displayed because I asked for these loadings to be suppressed. The suppression of loadings less than 0.4 and ordering variables by loading size also made interpretation considerably easier. Second, the variables are listed in the order of size of their factor loadings because I asked for the output to be sorted by size. Before rotation, most variables loaded highly onto the first factor and the remaining factor was not influential. However, the rotation of the factor structure clarified things considerably: there were 9 variables that loaded onto one factor, and 5 variables that loaded on a second factor.

Table 4

*Rotated Component Matrix*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V4R</td>
<td>0.711</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V1R</td>
<td>0.677</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A3R</td>
<td>0.628</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V6R</td>
<td>0.583</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V3R</td>
<td>0.525</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A5R</td>
<td>0.483</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A6R</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V2DR</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E2DR</td>
<td>0.404</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E1R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A4DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.724</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E4DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E6DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E3DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.520</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A1DR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E5DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>V5R</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A2DR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Interpretation**

Next, I looked at the content of questions that loaded onto the same factor to identify common themes. If the mathematical factor produced by the analysis represented some construct then common themes among highly loaded questions could help identify what the construct might be. The questions that loaded highly on Factor 1 seemed to all relate to respectful interactions. Therefore, we might label this factor respect. The questions that loaded highly on Factor 2 all seemed to relate to disrespectful interactions; therefore, we might label this factor disrespect. There are 4 questions that did not load higher that 0.4 on either factor, and may only slightly relate to each factor. This analysis revealed that the initial survey was composed of two sub-scales, respectful interaction scenarios, and disrespectful interaction scenarios.

**MANOVA with Primary Cultural Influence**

The first important element of information gathered from the MANOVA was the descriptive statistics. This table was very useful as it provided the mean and standard deviation for the two different dependent variables, which were split by the independent variable. In addition, the table provided total rows, which allowed means and standard deviations for groups only split by the dependent variable to be known.

The Multivariate Tests table gave the actual result of the one-way MANOVA for all the items in the survey with Primary Cultural Influence (PCI) as the independent variable. There was a significance value of 0.638, which meant $p > .05$. Therefore, participant ratings of a scenario as respectful or disrespectful was not significantly dependent on their primary cultural influence ($p > .05$). There was a statistically
insignificant difference in participant ratings based on participants’ PCI, \( F (90, 615.774) = 0.939, p > .05; \) Wilk's \( \Lambda = 0.536, \) partial \( \eta^2 = .117. \)

I also performed a one-way MANOVA for just the respectful scenario items in the survey, again with Primary Cultural Influence (PCI) as the independent variable. There was a significance value of 0.637, which means \( p > .05. \) Therefore, participant ratings of a scenario as respectful was not significantly dependent on their primary cultural influence \( (p > .05). \) There was a statistically insignificant difference in participant ratings of respectful scenarios based on participants' primary cultural influence, \( F (45, 606.991) = 0.913, p > .05; \) Wilk's \( \Lambda = 0.746, \) partial \( \eta^2 = .057. \)

To follow that analysis, I performed a one-way MANOVA, this time for just the disrespectful scenario items in the survey, again with Primary Cultural Influence (PCI) as the independent variable. There was a significance value of 0.316, which means \( p > .05. \) Therefore, participant ratings of a scenario as disrespectful was not significantly dependent on their primary cultural influence \( (p > .05). \) There was a statistically insignificant difference in participant ratings of disrespectful scenarios based on participants' primary cultural influence, \( F (45, 606.991) = 1.094, p > .05; \) Wilk's \( \Lambda = 0.706, \) partial \( \eta^2 = .067. \) Because the results were not statistically significant, I did not perform any further follow-up tests.
Discussion

The purpose of this study was to more clearly define behaviors or interactions between high school students as either respectful or disrespectful. Regardless of cultural background of the student, all of the students had comparable ratings of respectful or disrespectful scenarios. Examining both respectful and disrespectful scenarios, as well as comparing the rating of these between cultures resulted in a more refined description of respectful and disrespectful behavioral interactions, with a better understanding of why knowledge of respect is valuable. Also, analyses of the data sources gave insight to possible determinants of respectful or disrespectful behavior or interaction.

From the surveys, participants rated scenarios of respectful or disrespectful interactions between high school students, identifying what behaviors were important for participants to feel respected or disrespected, and how they could promote respect themselves through acting in certain ways. Respectful behaviors can happen every day, across different ages, genders, ethnicities, and various cultural groups. However, there needs to be sufficient knowledge and understanding of respect for it to occur.

Respectful Environment for Optimal Achievement

If schools have the task to create a culture of mutual respect so that students learn to their highest potential in an optimally nurturing environment, then knowledge and understanding of respect can help foster successful development and prevent psychological and behavioral problems, thus helping to create nurturing environments for promotion of human well-being (Biglan, Flay, Embry, & Sandler, 2012). In this study,
knowledge regarding what behaviors were viewed as respectful or disrespectful was attained, and can be used to help build these nurturing environments. Continuing to explore the idea of environments, Peterson and Skiba (2000) defined school climate as the feelings that the students have about the school environment. With the understanding students have regarding respect and disrespect, they have the power to behave in ways to change school climate in a positive way, creating an optimal learning environment. The commitment of the students' respect for each other, according to Lance (2010), was identified as being a key factor to learning. Woods (2007) explained that educators have an urgent need to learn more about the role of behavior, emotion, values, character, and social skills in improving student academic performance, wellbeing, and life success. If this is so, then we need to continue to implement more strategies to learn more about respect and behavior to benefit students. Johnson (1999) stated that learning is only possible in an environment that is free of violence and that encourages mutual respect, self-confidence, and cooperation. In order to encourage mutual respect, one must first acknowledge what behaviors are respectful or disrespectful. According to Flay and Allred (2010), schools are expected to prevent violence, substance use, bullying, and other disruptive behaviors, all of which are clearly linked to student values, character, and school performance. Therefore, identifying what behaviors tended to be viewed as respectful or disrespectful between interacting high schools students was valuable because now students may be educated about ways to act in order to promote respect. Ultimately, this would lead to a more respectful, and therefore, more nurturing environment for students to learn and develop in.
Attribution, ICS, and Critical Incident Technique in Relation to Respect

Using attributional theories to make inferences about the causes for respectful or disrespectful feelings that come from behavior, I attempted to recognize the characteristics of acts of respect or disrespect, and the resulting feeling from being respected or disrespected. I also utilized the ICS to explain behavior from a host culture perspective, as well as critical incident technique to gather incidents to develop broader psychological principles of respect. Behaviors viewed as respectful or disrespectful between interacting high school students were identified, as well as the variability in the perception of these behaviors or interactions between students due to differences in cultural background. However, there was very little evidence of variability in either participant ratings of respectful or disrespectful scenarios, nor ratings due to cultural background. The uniformity of the ratings between students and across cultures was unexpected, and exemplified students' similar attributions to behaviors or incidents.

Respectful Solutions for Problem Behaviors

According to Singh et al., (2007), and Beets et al., (2009), aggressive, violent, or disruptive behaviors occur at problematic levels among American youths. Mayseless and Scharf (2011) advocated an increased emphasis on respect in schools, and other contexts, because of its potential for reducing aggression and violence. Although we could not clearly see any reduction in aggression and violence, identifying what behaviors may lead to these negative events may help prevent them. Mayer (1995) demonstrated that the aversive ways people treat each other in school settings was a major reason for the high
levels of aggression. Therefore, by recognizing each of the respectful or disrespectful behaviors, we could increase the knowledge and emphasis on them, and reduce aggressive or violent episodes in schools. In intergroup conflicts, Mayseless et al., (2011) explained that respect has been recognized as an important form of positive regard that helps to diffuse aggressive impulses. Respect, therefore, may play a role in mitigating aggression in school settings as well. Singh et al., (2007) contended that often these behaviors are controlled or managed through behavioral or other psychosocial interventions. Therefore, an appropriately designed and implemented school-based prevention program can prevent or reduce negative behaviors (Beets et al., 2009). Education needs to be provided after respectful and disrespectful behaviors have been identified in order to increase respectful behaviors and prevent disrespectful behaviors. Thus, an appropriate program must be implemented in order to facilitate a healthy and optimal school culture and environment, and prevention programs that can reduce the incidence of such behaviors should provide clear benefits.

Role of Respect in Social Context

Individuals’ status in the group, the degree to which they are liked by the group, and or how fairly they are treated in interactions with group members are just some examples and definitions of cultural and universal respect (Mayseless et al., 2011). Goodman (2009) supported the universal idea of respect by saying it encompasses universal human dignity, autonomy, and equality. Definitions of cultural and universal respect were exemplified by participants of various cultures rating respectful and disrespectful scenarios in a relatively uniform fashion. Students from all cultures that
participated in the current study showed no statistically significant difference in opinion regarding behaviors or interactions that were respectful or disrespectful. One alternative explanation may be that the culture of Hawai'i and its people become a special case, where many cultures influence each other, creating a hybrid, more universal culture. This may in turn influence the attributions of respect and disrespect, and could account for the apparent "universal" nature of the attributions to particular behaviors in this study. However, Okamura (2008) challenged this “universal” view of Hawai'i culture by examining how ethnic inequality was maintained in island culture. Social relations were structured based upon ethnicity, and not race or class, and this signified the difference for Hawai'i. Residents of Hawai'i attributed greater social significance to the presumed cultural differences among ethnic groups than to more obvious physical differences.

Based upon the evidence from this research, and supported by previous research, respect can play an important role in creating an optimal learning environment. Students' perception of a learning environment they deem to be supportive and caring, according to Woods (2007), promotes their sense of belongingness and commitment to learning, which in turn improves their academic achievement.

**Attribution and Inter-cultural Relations**

The occurrence, form and meaning of a particular behavior in a particular situation, according to Triandis (1972), may differ across cultures due to differences in norms, values, role perceptions and experiences. However, in this study, the form and meaning of respectful and disrespectful behaviors were not different between cultures. In order to make our worlds more predictable and understandable, Heider (1958) indicated
that we are constantly engaged in the process of making inferences about causes and motives of behaviors. Because of this, it was easy to decipher what participants thought about behaviors, allowing them to rate scenarios based upon their inferences. Salzman (1990) explained attributions as the answer to the vital "why" questions about a behavior, and Albert and Triandis (1979) contended that it was the interpretations we give to these behavior that were critical. In this study, it was not possible to conclude why participants rated certain scenarios like they did; it was only possible to identify what behaviors were viewed as respectful or disrespectful. Conflict, rejection, and misunderstandings may result from discrepancies in attributions, thus creating a poor learning environment. Attributions, therefore, become key to explaining behavior, and must be guided through understanding of respectful and disrespectful behavioral interactions.

**Implications**

There are several implications based on the findings of this study. Students have to be attentive to one another, treat each other equally, and value each other. Students should also encourage respectful behavior in order to create a safe and optimal learning environment, and to promote inter-cultural unity.

**Be attentive.** Students should pay attention to one another, especially while working and communicating in groups, and during class presentations. Respect, Howard (2010) explained, was implicitly tied to certain ways of speaking in situated classroom interactions. Also, students should avoid giving negative attention, such as insults, laughing at other students, and harassment. Students consistently rated scenarios dealing
with attention, or lack thereof, as respectful or disrespectful, therefore emphasizing the fact that attentive behavior could enhance respectful feelings, and inattentive behavior could be disrespectful. The attentive behaviors possibly tie into the idea of being valued, so first students may be encouraged to enhance value for one another.

**Value one another.** Students should be encouraged to value one another. Respectful behaviors deemed to encourage valuing one another included giving encouragement, reassurance, trust, and help in any form. On the other hand, devaluing another student was seen as disrespectful behavior, especially when there was rejection from group projects or activities. Acceptance, therefore, can be a way to prevent rejection and subsequent feelings of disrespect. As a result, students can feel respected, improving their experience in school.

**Equal treatment for all.** Students who treat each other with equality may help increase each others’ feelings of respect. When there is reciprocity in actions between students, or the idea to treat someone as you want to be treated, then respectful behavior was achieved. This can also, unfortunately, be true for disrespectful behavior. Also, in scenarios regarding attentiveness and value, the theme of equality seemed to become an overarching principle guiding the respectful or disrespectful feelings associated. In other words, students should treat each other equally and how they would want to be treated, to optimize feelings of respect, and provide a nurturing learning environment.

**Conclusion**

If students acknowledge and understand what behaviors are viewed as respectful or disrespectful, it will result in positive interaction and emotion, and benefit the school
environment and experience. Students will learn how to behave in respectful ways, and educating them about what behaviors are appropriate may foster this learning. Through positive attention, equal treatment, and valuing one another, students can build respectful relationships, creating a nurturing environment to optimally learn in. This, in turn, leads to future successes in all aspects of life.

The primary analysis supported the prediction that participants would rate certain behaviors as respectful, and others as disrespectful in response to critical incidents identified according to procedures described in the construction of the ICS. The factor analysis offered further support for these findings, where two factors, respectful behavior, and disrespectful behavior, were identified. These similar attributional frameworks between participants have regular identifications of either respectful or disrespectful behaviors in these interactions. The findings suggest that between cultures, participants tended to view the same behaviors or interactions as respectful or disrespectful. These findings, therefore, exemplified a universal idea of respectful and disrespectful behavior or interactions between cultures. It remains to be determined if these results indicated the development of a “universal culture”, with a consistent and coherent attributional framework that serves the essential function for social behavior and prescribes behavioral action.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The findings are specific to the setting, time, and population from which this research transpired. As such, this research study
did not gather a representative sample of all high school settings.

Further, the exploratory nature of the study only allowed for a clearer understanding of what respectful interactions may be, and speculated behaviors that can encourage it. It, however, does not give a definite formula for attaining respectful and avoiding disrespectful interaction.

Other limitations may exist within the survey and or participants. Reading comprehension, as well as clarity of the scenarios, posed difficulty for some participants, and may likely need to be revised. This may have affected the accuracy of participant ratings of certain scenarios. Also, another problem participants faced was confusing what side of the Likert scale was representative of respect or disrespect. For an example of the problems stated above, a participant rated a scenario as “Very Disrespectful” on the Likert scale, but then commented on it as being a positive interaction. Questions relating to statistical conclusion, internal and external validity exist and need to be examined in subsequent papers.

**Future Directions**

For future research, larger and more representative samples of participants and school settings should be considered. Different contexts (i.e., varying types of high schools) with different populations (e.g., more males, people from other cultures, etc.) should be used as well. Furthermore, data gathered from various sources and methods, and across time could capture more information on respectful and disrespectful behavior, and monitor its development and benefits.
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Appendix A

Critical Incident Form

Critical Incident (Episode Generation) Questionnaire

Student/Student Form

I. Personal Information:
   A. Primary Cultural Identification (i.e., Hawaiian, African American, Euro-American, Filipino-American, Japanese American)

   B. Other Significant Cultural Influences (in order of significance)

   C. First Language Learned:

   D. Gender:

   E. Age:

II. Critical Incident Question #1:

   Can you think of a situation or incident when you were interacting with another student when you felt respected by that student?

   A. What happened?

   B. How did the student behave towards you that lead you to feel respected?

   C. What thoughts did you have as a result of that interaction?

   D. What feelings did you have as a result of that interaction?

   E. How did the student's behavior affect your behavior?

   F. Culture/Ethnicity of the other participant/s (student/s)

   G. Why do you think that the other student or students behaved the way they did?

III. Critical Incident Question #2:
Can you think of a situation or incident when you were interacting with another student when you felt disrespected by that student?

A. What happened?

B. How did the student behave towards you that lead you to feel disrespected?

C. What thoughts did you have as a result of that interaction?

D. What feelings did you have as a result of that interaction?

E. How did the student's behavior affect your behavior?

F. Culture/Ethnicity of the other participant/s (student/s)

G. Why do you think that the other student or students behaved the way they did?

IV. Question:

If a fellow student wanted to demonstrate respect for you, as a student and human how would that student demonstrate respect?

V. Question:

What student behaviors would you experience or have you experienced as being disrespectful to you as a student and human being?

VI. Other Comments:
Appendix B

The Respect Survey

**Demographical Information**

A. **Primary Ethnic Identification** (circle one):
   - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: ________________________________
   - African-American: ___________________________
   - European-American: ________________________________
   - Asian-American: ________________________________
   - Hispanic/Latino: ________________________________
   - Other (Please Specify): ________________________________

B. **Primary Cultural Influence** (circle one):
   - Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: ________________________________
   - African-American: ___________________________
   - European-American: ________________________________
   - Asian-American: ________________________________
   - Hispanic/Latino: ________________________________
   - Other (Please Specify): ________________________________

C. **First Language Learned** (circle one):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>English</th>
<th>Spanish</th>
<th>Chinese</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Korean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Filipino</td>
<td>Hawaiian</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. **Gender** (please circle):
   - Male
   - Female

E. **Age**: _________
**Respect Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A1DR: When Natasha walked into class with a new dress her mom bought for her, her classmate said, “look at that ugly dress”. How did Natasha view the girl’s remark?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E1R: Joey was always there to defend Peter from the bullies at school. When Joey was being bullied, Peter was always there to defend him. What do you think they thought of each others’ behavior?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>E2DR: Britney was walking down the hall when a girl bumped into her and did not say sorry. What did Britney think about the girl’s actions?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>V1R: Katie’s friend Angela encouraged her to run for prom queen. Angela nominated Katie and told her that she believed she could win. What did Katie think of Angela’s behavior?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
V2DR: Melissa wanted to join a group for a project, but the group rejected her. She then overheard the group saying they were happy they had avoided her being a part of their group. How did Melissa view the group's behavior?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

V3R: Tina was walking down the stairs when she accidentally fell to her knees. A classmate nearby immediately asked if she was okay and helped her up. What did Tina think of her classmate’s behavior?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

A2DR: Cammie was giving a presentation to her class when some of her classmates began laughing. What did Cammie think her classmates' behavior?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:

A3R: While Matt talked with his friend about the terrible weekend he had, his friend reassured him that everything would improve. How did Matt view his friend's behavior?

<p>| | | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment:
E3DR: Mary raised her hand to answer a question, and the teacher called on her. As she began to answer the question, one of her classmates yelled out the answer. How did Mary view her classmate's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6
Very Disrespectful Very Respectful

Comment:

V4R: Ben always helped his classmate with her math assignments. When Ben had difficulty in science class, she volunteered to help Ben with his assignments. How did Ben view his classmate's behavior?

1 2 3 4 5 6
Very Disrespectful Very Respectful

Comment:

E4DR: Sarah listened to each one of her classmates give their science presentations. When Sarah gave her presentation, no one was listening to her. How did Sarah view her classmates' behaviors?

1 2 3 4 5 6
Very Disrespectful Very Respectful

Comment:

V5R: Catherine and Jenny have been getting to know each other better. Recently, Catherine told Jenny some of her personal secrets. How did Jenny view Catherine's sharing of secrets?

1 2 3 4 5 6
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A4DR:</strong> Sharon was walking down the hall when a group of boys began shouting inappropriate things at her. What did Sharon think of the boys’ behavior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1___________2___________3____________4___________5____     __6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>V6R:</strong> After Stan's project presentation, many of his classmates clapped for him and told him he did a great job. How did Stan view his classmates behavior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1___________2___________3____________4___________5____     __6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>E5DR:</strong> Crystal was waiting in line to get her lunch when Tony cut in line in front of her. What did Crystal think of Tony’s behavior?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1___________2___________3____________4___________5____     __6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Disrespectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Respectful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Comment:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A5R:</strong> During class presentations, Alan watched each of his classmates present. When it was his turn to present, his classmates all watched carefully. What did Alan think of the behavior of his class?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1___________2___________3____________4___________5____     __6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Comment:**

| A6R: While in class, Janet was talking with a partner about ideas she had for an upcoming project. Her partner was responsive to her, and shared her ideas for the project as well. How did Janet view her partner's behavior? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Very Disrespectful | Very Respectful |
| **Comment:** |

| E6DR: Josh wanted to play basketball on his lunch break. When the teams were made by his classmates, he was the only one not picked for a team, and therefore could not play. How did Josh view his classmates' behaviors? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| Very Disrespectful | Very Respectful |
| **Comment:** |
Appendix C

Parental Consent Form

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN

The R.E.S.P.E.C.T. Project
Daniel Zimbra and Michael Salzman, Ph.D., Wist Hall Rm. 210, Honolulu Hawaii, 96822, #956-4300

My name is Daniel Zimbra and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawaii at Manoa in the College of Education, in the Department of Educational Psychology. I am working with Dr. Michael Salzman, a Professor in the Department of Educational Psychology to conduct a research study on building more respectful school environments. Students from various high schools in Oahu will be surveyed in order to assess what behaviors they tend to experience as respectful and disrespectful and how those behaviors might affect their behaviors and thoughts.

The purpose of this study is to identify behaviors experienced by students as respectful or disrespectful as they interact with each other. The broad objective of this study is to contribute to the development of respectful, inclusive school communities where all members feel respected, connected, valued and challenged to the highest level of their human potential. Once respectful behaviors have been identified, a training program will be designed to enhance the likelihood that respectful behaviors in the school will be expressed.

Your child has been selected as a potential participant for this study. He/she would be asked to complete a questionnaire that would take no longer than forty-five minutes. I would ask your child to share with me how they would rate scenarios of either respect or disrespect.

To ensure your child’s anonymity, each participant will be assigned and identified by a participant number-no names will be used.

The results of this study will be made available to you once the study is completed. Your child’s participation in this study will assist in developing school communities based on respectful behaviors that will benefit your child, yourself, and the school academically, socially, and psychologically because people will be learning how to behave respectfully.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Daniel Zimbra at danielz@hawaii.edu or call 1-808-265-2932.

“I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue my child’s participation in the project or activity at any time without prejudice.

I consent to the participation of my minor child in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the principal investigator or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence.”

___________________________
Signature of Parent or Legal Guardian

___________________________
Date

(If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: uhirb@hawaii.edu)
Appendix D

Student Consent Form

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN
The R.E.S.P.E.C.T. Project
Daniel Zimbra and Michael Salzman, Ph.D., Wist Hall Rm. 210, Honolulu Hawaii, 96822, #956-4300

My name is Daniel Zimbra and I am a graduate student at the University of Hawaii at Manoa in the College of Education, in the Department of Educational Psychology. I am working with Dr. Michael Salzman, a Professor in the Department of Educational Psychology to conduct a research study on building more respectful school environments. Students from various high schools in Oahu will be surveyed in order to assess what behaviors they tend to experience as respectful and disrespectful and how those behaviors might affect their behaviors and thoughts.

The purpose of this study is to identify behaviors experienced by students as respectful or disrespectful as they interact with each other. The broad objective of this study is to contribute to the development of respectful, inclusive school communities where all members feel respected, connected, valued and challenged to the highest level of their human potential. Once respectful behaviors have been identified, a training program will be designed to enhance the likelihood that respectful behaviors in the school will be expressed.

You have been selected as a potential participant for this study. You would be asked to complete a questionnaire that would take no longer than forty-five minutes. I would ask you to share with me how you would rate scenarios of either respect or disrespect.

To ensure your anonymity, each participant will be assigned and identified by a participant number-no names will be used.

The results of this study will be made available to you once the study is completed. Your participation in this study will assist in developing school communities based on respectful behaviors that will benefit you, and the school academically, socially, and psychologically because people will be learning how to behave respectfully.

If you have any questions regarding this study, please contact Daniel Zimbra at danielz@hawaii.edu or call 1-808-265-2932.

“I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing, that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue my participation in the project or activity at any time without prejudice.

I consent to my participation in this project with the understanding that such consent does not waive any of my legal rights, nor does it release the principal investigator or the institution or any employee or agent thereof from liability for negligence.”

“I understand that this is a research project and I agree that all of my questions have been answered to my satisfaction. I agree to participate in this study.”

____________________________  ________________________
Signature of Minor                  Date

(If you cannot obtain satisfactory answers to your questions or have comments or complaints about your treatment in this study, contact: uhirb@hawaii.edu or call 1-808-956-5007)