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ABSTRACT

This study sought to determine how the severity of student altercations influenced teachers' self-reported judgment of whether and how they would intervene in student altercations. The study also sought to determine how specific teacher traits and characteristics influenced teachers' self-reported judgment of whether and how they would intervene in student altercations.

It was hypothesized that teacher responses to student altercations were significantly affected by the severity of the altercation and by personal teacher characteristics and traits. To investigate this relationship, teachers were asked to evaluate ten written scenarios in which different combinations of physical or psychological harm, repeated harm, or power imbalance, were present. Two scenarios with none of these characteristics were also included. Teachers were also asked to provide information about their self-efficacy, their perception of administrative support, their years of teaching experience and their participation in specific bully prevention education and training.

The principals of all fifteen year round middle public schools on the island of Oahu were invited to participate. Seven of the fifteen schools agreed to participate with 174 of approximately 300 middle school teachers completing questionnaires. Hierarchical cluster analysis and multinomial and ordinal regressions were performed to analyze
categorical and numerical data.

The findings were that the teachers' perceptions of the severity of each scenario influenced their responses systematically across 9 of the 10 scenarios. The teachers were not significantly influenced by their personal traits and characteristics. The teachers' perceptions of the scenario's severity were a better predictor of their likelihood to intervene than were their personal teacher characteristics.

As measured by this study, teacher intervention preferences do not reflect individual teacher "traits" but rather reflect "states" of teacher perception. The implication is that like all states of perception, teacher perception of severity can be sensitized by increased education and training. If there was referral and intervention in all of the incidents of bullying and harassment identified by students, our school administrations would become over burdened. Therefore, teachers must share the burden of identifying and effectively intervening in these student altercations. They cannot accomplish this without adequate education, training and support.
LIST OF TABLES

Table 1  Description of Variables.................................................................44
Table 2  Descriptive Statistics.................................................................50
Table 3  Teacher Preference for Intervention by Specific Situation........52
Table 4  Odds Ratios Representing the Likelihood of Intervention, Given a Unit Increase in Severity ........................................58
Table 5  Odds-Ratio Coefficients Representing the Influence of Teacher Characteristics and Perceptions of Severity on Teacher Preference for Intervention.........................................................60
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Figure 1</td>
<td>A Continuum of Aggressive Interactions</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 2</td>
<td>Hierarchical Cluster Analysis: Dendrogram Teacher Responses</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 3</td>
<td>Hierarchical Cluster Analysis: Dendrogram Severity</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 4</td>
<td>Teaching Experience</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 5</td>
<td>Teacher Perception of Administrative Support</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 6</td>
<td>Specific Bully Education</td>
<td>72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Figure 7</td>
<td>Teacher Self Efficacy</td>
<td>74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix A  Teacher Sense of Efficacy Scale.................................93
Appendix B  Student Altercation Survey.................................94
Appendix C  Letter to Principals...........................................99
Appendix D  Letter to Teachers...........................................101
Appendix E  Description of Bullying Elements Depicted in each
Scenario.................................................................102
Appendix F  Pilot Survey..................................................103
Appendix G  Proximity Matrix Teacher Responses..................107
Appendix H  Clusters Proximity of Teacher Responses..........108
Appendix I  Proximity Matrix Teacher Perception of Severity......109
# TABLE OF CONTENTS

Acknowledgements .................................................................................. iv
Abstracts ................................................................................................. v
List of Tables ............................................................................................ vi
List of Figures ............................................................................................ vii
List of Appendixes ..................................................................................... viii

Chapter 1: Introduction ........................................................................... 1
  1. Statement of the Problem ................................................................. 2
  2. Prevalence of the Problem ............................................................... 4
  3. Overview of the Study ...................................................................... 7
  4. Hypotheses ....................................................................................... 8
  5. Definition of Terms ......................................................................... 9

Chapter 2: Review of Literature .............................................................. 11
  1. Environmental Influences: Situational Characteristics ................. 12
     a. Student Altercations and Bullying ............................................. 12
     b. Defining Bullying ..................................................................... 13
     c. Distinguishing Between Bullying and Harassment ................. 16
  2. Personal Influences: Teacher Characteristics ................................. 22
     a. Bully Prevention Education and Training ............................... 23
     b. Teaching Experience ............................................................... 24
     c. Teacher Perception of Administrative support ....................... 24
     d. Teachers Perceived Self Efficacy ............................................. 24
     e. Assessing Teacher Perceived Self Efficacy ............................. 27
     f. Teacher Perception of Severity ................................................ 29
  3. Behavioral Outcomes: Teacher Preference for Intervention ............ 30
     a. No Intervention ........................................................................ 31
     b. Punishment ............................................................................... 32
     c. Educate ................................................................................... 34
     d. Contact Parents ........................................................................ 34
     e. Involve Other School Personnel ............................................ 35
Twelve-year-old Christopher, a 7th grader, has not been to school in four weeks. He is a bright, bookish but nervous boy. His mother reported that eight weeks prior to Christopher's refusal to attend school, she observed that he had become increasingly passive, tearful, irritable and insecure. Christopher had dropped two grade points, citing difficulty concentrating and illness as his primary reasons. Christopher's pediatrician identified no physiological origin for the head and stomach aches and suggested psychotherapy. Christopher's mother brought him to therapy where he first reported the daily school-based altercations that included frequent name calling, threats, intimidation and put-downs. Christopher reported the majority of these offenses occurred in or near the classroom by the same students whom Christopher described as "popular and smart." He reported sitting in the front near the teacher whom he believed heard the taunts and jeers but did not seem to intervene. Christopher reported feeling that his teachers should have intervened.

Christopher's tale is not uncommon. Safety continues to be a problem for 10% to 15% of students, who like Christopher tell a story of being bullied in school (National Center for Educational Statistics, 2000). Although these percentages may seem low to some, the impact on our school systems can be devastating. For example, the perpetrators of the rampage shootings that occurred at Columbine, Colorado, Edinboro, Pennsylvania, and Jonesboro, Arkansas, reported that prior to their rampage shootings they had been the targets of what is identified as "bullying behavior" (Dejong, Epstein & Hart, 2003; Fox, Roth & Newman, 2003). Bullying is generally defined as student altercations that involve repeated unwanted verbal or physical harassment, threats and intimidation by a more powerful other person (Olweus, 1991). These
altercations can produce anxiety (Beidel, 1991) and depression (Rigby, 1998). They can provoke hostility (Hoover, Oliver, & Hazler, 1992) and retaliatory violence as in the rampage (Hazler & Carney, 2000; Lockwood, 1997). At times, they can result in suicide (Rigby, 1998).

Despite the visibility and the discussion prompted by more than two dozen lethal incidents of school violence reported during the past ten years, the United States has no nationalized curriculum regarding violence prevention like those found in many European countries. Schools in the United States continue to approach intervention and prevention differently between and within individual states, individual school districts, individual schools and individual teachers (Stein, 2003). Different prevention, intervention and training approaches contribute to this researcher's expectation to find high variability among teachers' self-reported judgment of the severity of student altercations and how they would respond to the student altercations.

Statement of the Problem

Students report feeling that teachers do not recognize bullying, that teachers do not respond effectively to bullying and that students do not report these altercations for fear it will be ignored or improperly handled. Data gathered from the School Quality Survey (SQS), published in 2003 by the Hawaii Department of Education indicate a difference between
teacher and student perceptions of school safety. To assess student and teacher perceptions of student safety and well being at school, the SQS posed five questions for students and three questions for teachers. The questions relate to whether the students and the teachers agreed that, "the school environment is orderly, pleasant, and conducive to learning. Students are generally well behaved in school. Students and teachers feel safe in school. There is no serious problem with illegal drugs, weapons, harassment, or gangs, etc. at the school." Participants were given multiple choices ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree or don't know.

Twenty-two percent of the students from the seven schools who participated in the study discussed in this paper reported that they either disagreed or strongly disagreed with the above statement of student safety and well-being. The students' belief is in sharp contrast to the perceptions of teachers. Seven percent of the teachers reported that they disagreed or strongly disagreed with the state of student safety and well-being. The disparity between teachers and students in perceptions of student safety is consistent with other research findings that students feel teachers are unaware (Crothers, 2001), or under-respond to student altercations. In another study conducted by Pepler and Craig (2000) 25% of students reported feeling that teachers adequately intervened in incidents of altercations involving bullying.
Students generally prefer teacher or adult intervention in bullying types of altercations (Crothers, 2001). When there is an imbalance of power between the students involved in the altercation, it is difficult for targets of bullying to intervene on their own behalf. Bullying is therefore deemed by many to be a situation that warrants and requires adult intervention. Pepler and Craig (2000) found that a teacher's failure to intervene effectively when it is warranted may be interpreted by perpetrators as implied consent. This lack of action by teachers alienates victims and empowers perpetrators (Pepler & Craig, 2000), thereby inadvertently creating or maintaining a cycle of school-based victimization and abuse.

Prevalence of the Problem

One of the largest studies in the U. S. looking at school-based views of bullying was conducted by Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt (2001). In 1998 Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001 surveyed 15,686 students from grades 6 through 10. They found that 30% of the students reported that they had experiences with bullying. Although the State of Hawaii has no similar survey of students, the findings can be cautiously applied to Hawaii. In the State of Hawaii, during the 2002-2003 school year, the incident rate of harassment and violent Chapter 19 offenses increased. Harassment
comprised 9% and assault comprised 7% of all chapter 19 offenses reported in Hawaii schools (DOE, 2003). In 2003, the Department of Education reported that there were 3,412 incidents of harassment and assault committed by 2,837 students. This means some of the 2,837 students were repeat offenders and the interventions were had not been effective. If the findings from research conducted on the continental U.S., where approximately 30% of students reported involvement with bullying, were applied to Hawaii’s total enrollment of 183,000 students, then the referral numbers in Hawaii would look more like an estimated 45,000 incidents of harassment and bullying.

There are a variety of factors that contribute to teachers’ varied intervention patterns. In their landmark study of prosocial helping behavior, Piliavin, Rodin and Piliavin (1969) found that intervening in an altercation was not an automatic behavior but that situational factors contribute to a choice to intervene. Darley and Batson (1973) found that in situations where individuals felt rushed or a heightened sense of “hurriness,” they were less inclined to intervene. The Hazler, Miller, Carney, and Green (2001) study of 251 teachers further emphasized the role of situational or environmental characteristics. They found that teachers most often identified situations that involved physical harm as severe but underestimated the severity of situations involving repeated psychological
and social abuse or power imbalance (Hazler, Miller, Carney, & Green, 2001). The Hazler et al (2001) findings are significant because identifying a problem is the first step toward behavioral intervention (Latane & Darley, 1968).

In addition to situational factors that contribute to intervention patterns, studies also indicated that personal factors might contribute to intervention behaviors. For example Huston, Ruggiero, Connor and Geis (1981) argued that people with expertise or relevant skills in the area perceived to be required by the situation were more likely than others to intervene or render aid. Eagly and Crowley (1986) found that men were more likely than women to intervene when the situation was perceived to involve danger. Bandura (1997) suggested that personal factors such as perceived self-efficacy influence behavior and that teachers with high perceptions of self-efficacy respond to difficult students and difficult situations differently than teachers with low self-efficacy (Bandura, 1997).

This relationship between the situational and personal factors is addressed in detail by Bandura's concept of triadic reciprocity (Bandura, 1986, 1997). Bandura's tri-directional model of the relative influence of personal, environmental and behavioral factors and their relevance to this study will be further discussed in the literature review.
Overview of the Study

This study sought to understand the relative influence of specific teacher characteristics and specific situational characteristics on teachers' self-reported judgments of the likelihood of their intervention in various student altercations. Teacher responses were hypothesized to be significantly affected by teacher characteristics. To answer the question, teachers were asked to evaluate ten brief scenarios depicting altercations that had different combinations of three situational characteristics: a) physical or psychological harm, b) repeated harm, and c) power imbalance. Scenarios with none of these characteristics were also included.

There were two components to the judgments that teachers made. One was the type of response the teachers believed they would make. The second was the teachers' perception of the severity depicted by each scenario. Teacher structured response options were: a) no intervention; b) punishment such as verbal reprimand, time-out, or imposed classroom service; c) education or counseling such as teaching the targets and perpetrating students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management; d) involve other school personnel such as a counselor, vice principal or security staff member; e) contact parents of the students involved, or f) any response not included
in the previous five. Teacher perception of the severity of the student alteration portrayed in each scenario was identified by self-reported judgment of the severity of the situation on a five-point Likert scale.

The first independent variable "situation characteristics" referred to the particular constellations of bullying characteristics that appeared in the ten student altercation scenarios. These constellations constituted the first set of variables hypothesized to predict teacher response to student altercation. The second independent variable, a set of "teacher characteristics" was hypothesized to predict teacher responses. These teacher characteristics were: a) teacher efficacy; b) teacher perception of administrative support; c) years of teaching experience; and d) hours of specific bully-prevention education received by the teacher.

Hypotheses

a) Teachers' projected intervention to student altercations is affected by teachers' perception of situational severity. For example, teachers who perceive situations to be severe may involve other personnel or contact parents at higher rates.

b) Teachers' projected intervention response to student altercations (behavioral outcomes) is affected by teacher characteristics (efficacy, experience, training and perception of support). For example, it is probable that teachers with higher efficacy scores will
engage in non-punitive education such as teaching the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.

Definition of Terms

 Altercation is any conflict leading to physical or psychosocial harm, in this study refers to both skirmishes and bullying.
 Bullying refers to student altercations that contain the three elements, (1) physical or psychosocial harm that is (2) repeatedly performed by a (3) more powerful other.
 Direct bullying is aggressive, deliberate, overt behavior that is carried out repeatedly and over time by a more powerful other.
 Direct verbal aggression includes name-calling, teasing, threatening and intimidating.
 Indirect bullying (referred to in this study as psycho-social harm) is the act of deliberately socially isolating, excluding or defaming.
 Skirmishes in this study refer to altercations that do not depict all three but only one or two of the elements of bullying.
 Target is the term used in this paper in lieu of the term “victim.” It is one desirable outcome of prevention and intervention practices that individuals who are targeted by bullies possess the requisite skills and resiliency that enable them to avoid becoming the victims of bullies.
In summary, students' and teachers' perception of school-based bullying differ. A larger percentage of students than teachers identify their schools as being unsafe. Bullying affects an estimated 30% of American youth. Students report that in bullying situations they prefer adult intervention yet students feel as though teachers are generally unaware of bullying and that teachers are ineffectual in their responses. In this study it is hypothesized that situational and personal teacher characteristics influence teachers' responses and their preference for intervention.
Chapter 2

Review of the Literature

The purpose of this study was to examine the influence of specific teacher characteristics and specific situational characteristics on teachers' self-reported judgments of the likelihood of their intervention in various student altercations. Beginning with environmental factors, this chapter examines aspects of the triadic reciprocality between environmental influences, personal influences and teachers' self-reported preference for intervention. The review will acquaint the reader with the body of literature relating to environmental factors, personal factors and behavioral interventions.

Environmental influences or factors, which are in this dissertation referred to as situational characteristics, are presented as a continuum of student interactions. They include situations that depict a) no bullying, b) skirmishes, and c) bullying. In this paper all conflicts are referred to as altercations.

In addition to environmental influences, personal factors are also examined as mediators in teacher preference for intervention. Personal influences or factors, which are also referred to in this paper as teacher characteristics, include: a) specific bully prevention education and training, b) perception of administrative support, c) teaching experience,
and d) teacher perceived self-efficacy. Both environmental and personal factors are believed to influence teacher preference for intervention during student altercations. Finally, teacher perception of the severity of each situation and their preference for intervention is discussed.

Environmental Influences:

Situational Characteristics

Classical behaviorist theory presents the environment as the primary influence on behavior. Psychoanalytic theory posits that behavior is primarily influenced by unconscious internal drives. Social cognitive theory introduces conscious human agency as being equally likely to influence the environment and behavioral outcomes (Pajares, 2002; Bandura, 1986). Factors related to the environment make up one leg of Bandura’s triad of reciprocal determinism which holds that behavior influences the environment and the environment influences the individual’s behavior, their cognition, their biology and their affect. In this study, the researcher is interested in examining the specific influence that environmental conditions, here identified as student altercations, have on teacher preference for intervention.

Student Altercations and Bullying

The altercations that occur between students are often viewed as normal functions of social development and are seen as learning
opportunities for those involved (Chen & Smith, 2001). However bullying should be distinguished from playful teasing because in mutually agreed upon teasing, there is no harm perceived by either party. In bullying situations, targets report having hurt feelings, feeling embarrassed, humiliated, or afraid.

In studies conducted by Hazler, Carney, Green, Powell, and Jolly (1997) teachers were found to have difficulty discriminating between playful teasing and the potentially dangerous bullying. Lockwood (1997) further found that teachers have difficulty recognizing “opening-moves” – the behaviors that indicate the beginning of a potentially quarrelsome exchange. Pepler, Craig, Ziegler and Charach (1994) also indicated that verbal and other less direct forms of bullying went largely undetected by teachers. Because situations involving student altercations can be confusing, clear definitions and understanding are important to effective teacher intervention (Furlong, 2000). The following section will define bullying and harassment and discuss the relationship between the two.

Defining Bullying

Olweus (1999) felt that the altercations that occurred between children were normal functions of social development but he viewed bullying as a form of abuse which he defined as: “(1) It is aggressive behavior or intentional “harm doing” (2) which is carried out “repeatedly
and over time" (3) in an interpersonal relationship characterized by an imbalance of power" (Olweus, 1999, p.13). Olweus (1993) further defined different types of bullying. Direct bullying is identified as an overt, deliberate physical confrontation or attack or physically aggressive gestures whereas indirect bullying is the deliberate act of socially excluding, isolating, spreading rumors, or manipulation. Direct verbal aggression is bullying by name-calling, teasing, threatening, or falsely accusing (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992; Olweus, 1993).

Bullying is further identified by its repetitive nature (Hazler et al, 2001; Limber & Nation, 1998). Isolated peer conflicts that occur only once may warrant intervention, but are not considered bullying. Lastly, in “bullying” altercations, there is a power imbalance between the victim and the perpetrator. Although most obvious examples of power imbalances may derive from physical size, bullies may instead possess a more aggressive social presence (Apfel, 1995; Batsche, 1994). The imbalance of power makes it difficult for targets of bullying to intervene on their own behalf and is deemed by many to be a situation that warrants and requires adult intervention.

According to this definition, altercations containing physical aggression alone do not constitute bullying, nor do altercations that have a power imbalance or one-time offenses that do not reflect a pattern of aggression.
A graphic of a continuum of aggressive interactions developed by Doll, Song, and Siemers (2004) (See Figure 1) illustrates the relationship between power imbalance and intention to harm. As malice or the intention to harm escalates, the imbalance of power becomes greater. As malice and the power imbalance escalate the target's ability to resolve the conflict independently decreases. This continuum illustrates the gray area between jostling student altercations that can be resolved independently by the children involved and the gray area where conflicts cannot be resolved and eventually constitute bullying.

In the present study, scenarios that depict student conflicts involving two but not all three elements of bullying are referred to as "skirmishes" as opposed to jostling. A skirmish is defined as "a minor or
preliminary conflict or dispute" (American Heritage Dictionary, 1985). An example of such a conflict could show evidence of social or psychological harm where students are socially isolated, ostracized, and humiliated. Another example could involve physical aggression. Yet another example could depict students who subjectively assess themselves as having limited power or ability to stop the abusive behavior. All of these examples are considered skirmishes instead of bullying, unless the other elements for bullying are present. A physical altercation, without all three elements, is not a sufficient situation to be defined as bullying.

Distinguishing Between Bullying and Harassment

In the United States, bullying has been an evolving concept. In the 1970s, during the overarching discourse on civil rights, bullying was often associated with racial harassment, and domination by the racial majority. In the mid-to-late 1980s, the epidemic of youth gang violence spawned research that focused on examining gang culture. Studies found that youth involved in this type of violence often lived in academic, social, cultural, and financial poverty. Many were angry and disenfranchised. Aggressive behaviors were studied and treated in the context of psychology. The behaviors became pathologized as opposed to being treated as legal issues of rights violations (Stein, 2001a). School-based
intervention programs that focused on conflict resolution and anger-management proliferated (Larson, Smith & Furlong, 2001).

In the 1990s, school-based violence spread to suburban neighborhoods and rampage shootings were committed by youth who did not fit the profile of the 1980s "gang-banger." These students tended to be Caucasian, with above average grades, two parents, and did not belong to a gang (Moore, 2003). This spawned another wave of research that began to look specifically at bullying as defined by Olweus.

The concept of bullying evolved again in the 2000s when laws were enacted to include bullying terminology where previously only harassment terminology existed (Stein, 2003, Hamamoto, 2003). The relationship between bullying and harassment has implications for intervention and prevention efforts.

Recently, bullying and harassment have become reassigned. For example, in the definition of harassment provided by the State of Hawaii Department of Education Administrative Rules (Chapter 19), the term bullying is couched in the following context:

"Harassment" means a person acts with intent to harass, bully, annoy or alarm if he or she:

- Strikes, shoves, kicks, or otherwise touches a person in an offensive manner or subjecting such person to offensive physical contact;
- Insults, taunts, or challenges another person in a manner likely to provoke a violent response;
-Makes verbal or non-verbal expressions for reasons of, including but not limited to, race, color, national origin, ancestry, sex, religion, disability, or sexual orientation which create an intimidating, hostile or offensive school environment, or interfere with the education of a student, or otherwise adversely affect the educational opportunity of a student' 
-Name calls, makes rude gestures, insults, or constantly teases another person who feels humiliated, intimidated, threatened and/or embarrassed;
-Makes a telephone call without purpose of legitimate communication;
-Makes repeated communications anonymously, or at extremely inconvenient hours, or in offensively coarse language;
-Causes fear as to prevent others from gaining legitimate access to or use of school buildings, facilitates or grounds such as, but not limited to, restroom facilities;
-Causes others to feel uncomfortable, pressured, threatened, or in danger as a result of sexually-related verbal or physical activity (sexual harassment); or
-Displays or possesses a "look-alike" gun or weapon.

Bullying was not specifically mentioned in the definition of harassment until 2001 when the term "bullying" was added to address concerns about school-based bullying (Hamamoto, 2001). Also added in the definition was language that made direct verbal aggression a class B offense punishable by detention, suspension, disciplinary transfer or dismissal (DOE, 2001).

In discussing the distinction between bullying and harassment it is important to point out that some would argue that the widespread use of the term "bullying" undermines the term "harassment" when the latter is viewed as a legal issue (Carter & Osler, 2000; Stein, 2003). For example,
the term "bullying," until recently, connoted little more than schoolyard altercations while the term "harassment" have had more serious implications. When behavior that is legally defined as harassment is misidentified as bullying, perpetrators are more likely to receive in-school suspension than legal sanction.

The confusion comes when one considers that harassment has either a physical component, such as unwanted touch, intrusion into personal space, stalking, property damage, or a component of unwanted verbal taunting and threats by a more powerful other. These behaviors are an integral part of situations described as bullying. Nan Stein (2003) argued that what is referred to as bullying is indeed a series of harassment behaviors that are punishable by law. She wrote that the use of the term bullying belies the gravity of the offenses and perpetuates inappropriate intervention practices (Stein, 2003).

Part of what makes identification of both bullying and harassment a particularly important issue for educators is that, at least in Hawaii, bullying in the public schools is a Class B offense that has a maximum consequence of expulsion. Harassment, especially the virulent form of sexual harassment, carries with it much broader legal implications such as those resulting from the 1999 Davis harassment case (Stein, 2003). In that case, a boy repeatedly taunted, verbally abused, and repeatedly
attempted to touch LaShonda Davis' breasts and made frequent sexual comments. LaShonda and her parents asked for the school's assistance but the harassment continued. LaShonda became suicidal and her parents launched a criminal complaint against the perpetrator and the school. Their complaint eventually resulted in the Supreme Court ruling that schools are liable for sexual harassment if the school knew about it and took no action. The abuses experienced by LaShonda Davis are very much like what is commonly referred to as bullying. The difference is that her perpetrator used sexual words and gestures.

Understanding the difference between bullying and harassment is integral to teachers' accurate identification, which in turn is integral to teacher intervention (Darley & Latane, 1970). However, as evidenced by the lack of clear distinction made in the literature, educators are likely to continue to encounter situations that can be considered both bullying and harassment. Degree and severity of abuse may be pivotal in discerning the difference. For example, harassment literature expressly indicates that targets are powerless and the abuse is unprovoked and continues despite the targets' attempts to stop perpetrators (Stein, 2003). In bullying, Olweus and others make note that some targets are antagonistic and seem to provoke abuse and in some cases perpetrate abuse as well (Olweus, 1993). One important difference between bullying
and harassment are the subjects involved. In 1985 bullying was associated with the characteristics of a person and not defined as an action or a verb. Harassment, however, is more commonly associated as an action and is not often used to define a person (American Heritage Dictionary, 1985). The perception was that the bully was the one that did the harassing. Currently, "bullying" is associated with both the action or behavior (verb) and the individual (noun), whereas, harassment is still generally referred to as a set of behaviors.

The social-ecological framework of bullying is a useful framework from which to view the different conceptualizations and approaches to research in the area of violence and bullying. The social-ecological approach is comprised of interlocking systems that include: a) the bullies, targets and bystanders, b) the family, c) the school and peers, d) the community, and e) the culture at-large. The social-ecological perspective sees bullying as the reciprocal interplay between these ecological systems (Swearer & Espelage, 2004). Interventions are often multisystemic involving child, family, school and community members.

Other researchers prefer to focus their studies on specific systems. For example, Furlong, Morrison, Austin, Huh-Kim and Skager (2001) are among those who at least in part view bullying in the context of individual differences between the bully and the target or the bystander. Their
recommendations generally include individual anger-management and skills training. Nan Stein (2003) and colleagues view bullying in the context of sexual harassment and civil rights. Their recommendations generally involve school-wide education, remediation and cultural change (Stein, 2003). Continued social-ecological research will contribute to understanding the concept of bullying as it is viewed and experienced by different groups of people.

Personal Factors:

Teacher Characteristics

Social cognitive theory hypothesizes that personal factors, such as how people feel physically and emotionally, or what they believe about themselves, affects their behavior, which in turn affects their environment (Pajares, 2002; Bandura, 1993; Bandura, 1986). Bandura (1986) identified perceived self-efficacy as a particularly important personal cognitive factor. In this study, teachers' perceived self-efficacy is one of four variables referred to as teacher characteristics. Beginning with bully specific education and training, this section provides a rationale for the importance of certain teacher characteristics in teacher preference for intervention in student altercations.
Bully Prevention Education and Training

Chen and Smith (2001) found that specialized training changed teachers' views about student altercations in that teachers were more likely to view equal peer-to-peer altercation as a normal and useful part of development. They reported that teachers' use of mediation strategies increased while their punitive discipline practices decreased (Chen & Smith, 2001). Similarly Sawka, McCurdy, and Mannella (2002) found that teachers who had participated in specialized training had improved coping skills when dealing with students with emotional behavior disorders. Bystander theory holds that people who feel expertise or competence in the skills they deem are required by the situation are more likely to intervene than those with no expertise (Huston, Ruggiero, Conner, & Geis, 1981).

More specifically, given research in the area of teacher experience versus specialized training, it is a reasonable inference that specialized training may be at least as good a predictor of teacher preference for intervention as years of teaching experience or teacher efficacy (Kontos & Wilcox-Herzog, 2001). Bully education and training is a particularly important factor because despite the visibility of school-based bullying, specific teacher training is not approached in a uniform or universal
manner. Teachers continue to report greatly varying degrees of education and training in this area.

Teaching experience

Teacher self-efficacy is not synonymous with teaching experience. Studies have shown that levels of teacher self-efficacy, which is defined in the next section, changes over the course of teachers' professional development. For example, Hoy & Woolfolk (1990) found that teacher efficacy increases during student teaching experiences but decreases after the first year of on-the-job teaching. Teaching experience is included as a separate variable because it can be independent of efficacy and, like specialized training, may effectively influence behavior. Another variable that is associated with but not identical to efficacy is teacher perception of support.

Teacher perception of Administrative support

Teacher perception of administrative support is positively correlated with teacher confidence to independently manage various student situations (Hall, Burley, Villerme, & Brockmeier, 1992). Sawka, McCurdy, and Mannella (2002) found that post-training support and consultation helps teacher skills improve and generalize. In addition to competence, bystanders in general who are in this case teachers are influenced to
respond by their perception of assistance or personal support (Darley & Latane, 1970).

Administrative support includes aspects of a school-wide continuum of procedures where school-wide discipline, classroom management, and preventative instructional practices are emphasized (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Chase, Germundsen, Brownstein, and Distad (2001) reported that teachers with low perceptions of support are likely to intervene using punitive discipline rather than more educative measures. In addition to affecting teachers' behavioral choices, limited administrative support or unclear school policies and procedures affect the environmental condition of school-based bullying by failing to establish and enforce prevention and intervention practices (Gottfredson & Gottfredson, 1985).

Additionally, where there is little positive behavior support from school administration, teacher initiated prevention practices fail within two or three years (Sugai & Horner, 2002). Therefore, teacher perception of support may influence teacher-initiated prevention and intervention practices. Though perception of support may be associated with perceived self-efficacy it is not equivalent to it.

**Teachers Perceived Self Efficacy**

In his book, entitled *Self-efficacy: The Exercise of Control*, Bandura (1997) described a teacher's perceived efficacy as the teacher's belief in
his or her own individual ability to positively affect students. Bandura (1994) felt that teachers with high perceptions of efficacy persevered even in the face of adversity and discomfort and were likely to tackle difficult situations (Bandura, 1994; Gibson & Dembo, 1984).

Self-efficacy has emerged as one of the strongest teacher characteristics associated with student outcomes (Henson, 2001). It is assumed that behavior is at least partially determined by beliefs about capabilities, namely self-efficacy beliefs (Pajares, 2002; Bandura, 1989; Bandura, 1986). Perceived self-efficacy is correlated with independent and democratic behavior. For example, teachers with high perceived self-efficacy may be more likely to indicate that they will use the incident to teach the students involved rather than choosing not to intervene, giving a verbal reprimand or time-out, using a service or involving other personnel.

Bandura (1997) further stated that teachers with high perceptions of their efficacy tended to believe that difficult students could be reached with effort and perseverance. Teachers who possess strong positive perceptions of their efficacy are likely to have more positive influence, be more democratic in decision making, experience fewer student behavior problems, and have more positive expectations for student behavior and academic achievement (Ashton & Webb, 1986, Soodak & Podell, 1998).
Ashton and Webb (1986) wrote that teachers with lower perceived efficacy responded to difficult students with anger and adopted punitive discipline practices (Ashton & Webb, 1986). Similarly, Dovidio, Piliavin, Gaertner, Schroeder, and Clark (1991) found that other-oriented people, identified as sociable, warm-hearted and conscientious, were slightly more likely to intervene in a non-emergency conflict than self-oriented people, identified as unsociable, reserved or expedient.

Assessing Teacher Perceived Self-Efficacy

Bandura wrote that perceived self-efficacy has some degree of generality, especially if different tasks require similar skill sets. Yet, despite this admission Bandura maintains domain-linked perceived self-efficacy is more predictive an assessment of behavior than omnibus assessments of global efficacy. There have been several measures developed to assess domain-linked efficacy, which refers to efficacy in a specific domain (i.e., classroom management). Omnibus assessments evaluate perceptions about ones global overall self-efficacy.

The Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) (Appendix A), used to assess teachers' self-efficacy, is considered to be a valid and reliable measure of teacher efficacy (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001). There are two forms. One form contains 24 items and the other contains 12 items. The reliability coefficients of the short form are nearly identical to those of
the long form. In one study, the short form yielded four satisfactory reliability coefficients: the overall efficacy score \( r = .90 \); the subscale efficacy for instructional strategies score \( r = .86 \); the subscale efficacy for classroom management score \( r = .86 \) and, the subscale efficacy for student engagement score \( r = .81 \) (Tschannen-Moran & Hoy, 2001).

Another instrument, the *Teacher Efficacy Scale: Long Form* (Gibson & Dembo, 1984), uses 22 items to measure efficacy (Tschannen-Moran, Hoy, & Hoy, 1998) and has two subscales: personal teacher efficacy (PTE) and general teacher efficacy (GTE). The reliability coefficient for the PTE subscale was found to be \( r = .77 \) and that for the GTE subscale to be \( r = .69 \) (Henson, Kogan, & Vacha-Hasse, 2001).

A fourth scale considered for this study was Bandura's (1997) *Teacher Efficacy Scale* which has 7 subscales: influence on decision making, influence on school resources, instructional efficacy, disciplinary efficacy, enlisting parental involvement, enlisting community involvement, and creating a positive school climate. One of the limitations of the scale is that the reliabilities of the more domain-linked subscales were not reported although Woolfolk-Hoy and Burke-Spero, (2000) found a reliability coefficient of \( r = .94 \) for the entire scale.
Considerations of conceptual congruence with the present study, reliability, and length argue for selecting the Teacher’s Sense of Efficacy Scale (TSES) to assess teacher’s perception of self-efficacy.

**Teacher Perception of Severity**

There are certain aspects of altercations that are perceived as dire and severe. For example, Hazler, Miller, Carney, and Green (2001) found that teachers perceived situations involving physical harm as severe whereas situations depicting psychosocial harm and power imbalances as less severe. They found that teachers were likely to rate scenarios depicting physical aggression more severely than other scenarios. Teachers were also found to identify physical aggression with bullying. They underestimated the severity of the scenarios containing no physical aggression (Hazler et al, 2001). Teachers were more likely to intervene in situations where there was a one-time physical altercation. They were less likely to intervene where there was chronic psychological altercations or abuse (Hazler, Miller, Carney, & Green, 2001). Further, many childhood altercations are perceived as being normal and not requiring intervention. This suggests that there is a continuum of severity that influences a teacher’s decision to intervene in student altercations.

Darley and Latane (1970) espoused a five-stage model to explore bystander decisions concerning whether to intervene during altercations.
The first step was identification of "something being wrong"; the second step was to determine if "help is required"; the third step was to determine "Will I be the one to help?"; the fourth step was "Can I help?"; and the last step was "Should I help?" Assessing the severity of a given situation is related to the first steps in determining whether something is wrong and whether intervention is required.

Presumably then, teachers' judgment of the severity of the altercation would be predominantly affected by the depiction of physical aggression and perhaps less so by the depiction of the other elements of bullying.

Behavioral Outcomes:

Teacher Preference for Intervention

This section will discuss behavioral outcomes, also referred to in this paper as teacher preferences for intervention or teacher responses. There are five response choices for a teacher in an altercation situation. They are: no intervention, discipline, educate, contact parents and involve other school personnel. These responses can be viewed along a continuum with take no action being the least intense. Disciplining, educating and contacting parents can be considered the next most intense and is viewed in the paper as being an independent teacher
activity. Involving other school personnel can be viewed as the most intense teacher response.

As behavior represents one of the three legs in the triad of reciprocal determinism, the behavioral choices made by teachers given the environment and their personal factors will be discussed in this next section, beginning with teachers' preference to take no action.

No Intervention

Student altercations where all three elements of bullying are present are difficult for victims to handle on their own. Figures of authority, teachers and other school personnel, whose positions often afford them sufficient power, must be the primary interveners. However, students continue to complain that teachers don't intervene "effectively." When asked what their preference for adult intervention might be, students seemed most concerned that teachers at least possess an awareness that a bullying behavior has occurred (Crother, 2001).

Hazler and Carney (2000) and Lockwood (1997) suggested that teachers do not respond to most bullying behavior because teachers may not be aware of altercations or recognize that they require adult intervention. Without being able to identify bullying behavior, teachers cannot intervene appropriately. When teachers refer only the most egregious offenders, and fail to recognize the perpetrators of more subtle
abuse, services tend to predominantly be provided for students with behavior disorders like Oppositional Defiant Disorder and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (Smith, Larson, DeBaryshe, & Salzman, 2000). Students who engage in physically non-violent, but psychologically abusive behavior, on the other hand, are often not referred for school-based services (Furlong, Morrison, & Pavelski, 2000).

This lack of recognition of altercations involving bullying but with no physical aggression may explain why students feel that school officials fail to effectively respond. The present study does not ask teachers to identify bullying but does ask teachers to choose what they might do in situations that include the various elements of bullying.

**Punishment**

Bandura (1997) and others hold that a relationship exists between punitive responses and low teacher self-efficacy. Punishment is indeed still commonly practiced at schools (Stein, 2001b; Hyman & Snook, 1999). It is presumed that low teacher self-efficacy abounds. Verbal reprimands, time-outs and classroom service represent punitive rather than educative intervention responses. While student altercations may in fact warrant disciplinary intervention it should be noted that although punishment and discipline are often used interchangeably, they differ significantly.
Punishment aims to stop undesirable behavior, whereas discipline aims to facilitate desirable behavior.

Punishment is thought by many to in some cases exacerbate student conflicts by stopping the altercation for the moment but not addressing, via education or counseling, deeper interpersonal dynamics (Stein, 2001b). Therefore, because both the terms discipline and punishment are sensitive to interpretation, this dissertation avoided using either term. Instead three examples of common classroom administered punishment practices were presented. These practices are viewed here as punishment because they impose a sanction but do not provide corrective instruction. Providing corrective instruction is referred to here as educative intervention and is discussed below.

Because punishment may be interpreted negatively, it is appropriate to discuss Erickson's (1989) notion of interpretive validity in relation to this response choice. Interpretive validity refers to the extent to which we understand what the specific phenomenon or behaviors mean to the people who are engaged in the phenomenon or behavior. Maxwell (1992) pointed out that while interpretative validity provided us with a constructed version of the participants' point of view, it might not be a conscious point of view. The participants' beliefs about their responses are the subject matter of this study, and beliefs are not
necessarily a conscious phenomenon. Maxwell (1992) referred to this kind of phenomena as *theory-in-use* as opposed to *theory espoused*. In other words, people may have practices that are used and not necessarily described or consciously acknowledged. For example, teachers may not view a verbal reprimand as punitive.

*Educate*

Bandura connected educative responses to difficult students with high teacher self-efficacy (Bandura, 1995). Students sampled in the Crothers' (2001) study recommended education and training for both the targets and perpetrators of bullying as a desirable teacher response to student altercations. Therefore this item is included and like the previous item considers theory-in-use versus theory espoused. Because the term "education" is sensitive to interpretation this term was avoided and examples of commonly considered non-punitive educative intervention methods (Cotton, 2001) were offered. The option reads: "Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management."

*Contact Parents*

Family systems theory, attachment theory, and social learning theory all emphasize the role of the family as the initial environment in which children learn coping and resiliency skills that allow them to
navigate successfully through social relationships (Duncan, 2004). Social ecological theories investigating bullying strongly recommend families, and in some cases siblings be involved in supporting both perpetrators and targets of bullying. Students studied by Crothers (2001) cited informing the parents of perpetrators as a desirable teacher response (Crothers, 2001). Contacting and involving parents is considered to be a proactive and valuable approach (Phelan, Davidson, & Cao, 1991). Unfortunately this type of teacher involvement declines significantly after elementary school.

Involve Other School Personnel

For practical reasons, teachers refer students to the administrative office as a means of managing and monitoring student problem behavior (Nelson, Benner, Reid, Epstein & Currin, 2002). Sugai, Sprague, Horner, and Walker (2000) indicated that teachers' use of office referrals is influenced by variables such as the teacher's tolerance level, their classroom management skills, or personal discipline policies. Additionally, referral patterns vary across and within schools (Stein, 2003). The behaviors that are most likely to trigger a referral are tardiness, disruption, defiance, and physical contact (Nelson et al, 2002). Teachers are often mandated to report and refer students who engage in physical altercations to the office. Altercations that contain repeated psycho-social harm may not be
sent. Teachers may instead choose to directly discipline or instruct students involved in these behaviors. Teachers may also refer students to the office to access specific services such as assessment or counseling.

In summary, the triadic reciprocality model emphasized the relationship between the environment, personal characteristics, and behavioral outcomes. Students report that they do not feel that their teachers recognize or respond effectively to bullying. Therefore, this study asked: “what is it about the environment and what is it about teachers’ personal characteristics that influences teachers’ behavioral preference for intervening during bullying situations?”

In previous studies teachers have been most likely to identify environments that depict physical aggression as bullying and as being the most severe. Personal teacher characteristics such as expertise and perception of support were found to be predictive of bystander intervention in emergency situations. Teacher responses to bullying have not been widely researched. Therefore this study included educative, punitive, passive and aggressive intervention options.
Chapter 3

Method

Students report feeling that teachers do not recognize bullying and that teachers do not respond effectively to bullying. This study sought to understand the relative influence of specific teacher characteristics and specific situational characteristics on teachers' self-reported judgments of the likelihood of their intervention in various student altercations. This chapter describes the participants, instrument development, procedure and data analyses used in this study.

Participants

Because middle school students report experiencing bullying altercations more than do students in lower or higher grades (National Center for Education Statistics, 2000), it was expected that public middle school teachers may have had more opportunity to witness student altercations than either primary or secondary education teachers. Because of the research schedule year-round middle schools on the island of Oahu were selected and of these eleven schools seven agreed to participate. Of the 340 surveys distributed, 174 teachers completed and returned surveys. Teachers who agreed to participate were from the Honolulu school district (N=81), the Windward school district (N=61) and the Central school district (N=32).
Instrumentation and Development

There are few published instruments that purport to measure teachers’ perceptions of the severity of student altercations or teachers’ potential responses to student altercations. Hazler, Miller, Carney, & Green (2001) developed the Bullying Situations Identification Instrument (BSII) to measure teachers’ ability to accurately identify bullying situations from non-bullying situations and to assess teachers’ perceptions of the situation’s severity. The BSII was useful in that it depicted 21 actual student altercations that contained some or all of the elements of bullying as defined in the literature as bullying, namely physical or psychological harm, repeated harm and power imbalances.

To capture teachers’ self-reported judgment of their responses to student altercations in this study eight of the original twenty-one items were selected and modified as a result of the pilot studies explained in this chapter. Additionally, two scenarios that depict none of the three elements of bullying were constructed and added. The new instrument of 10 items is the Student Altercation Survey (SAS) (see Appendix B). This new questionnaire was constructed to reflect a balanced number of item characteristics. The final questionnaire contained the two new scenarios (scenario 2 and 9) that contain none of the three elements that define bullying, four original scenarios (scenario 3, 6, 7, and 10) that contain one
or two of the three elements that define bullying and four scenarios
(scenario 1, 4, 5, and 8) that contain all three of the elements that define
bullying.

To answer the general question posed by this dissertation, the
structured response choices of the original instrument, the BSII was
modified. In its original form the BSII used the following response format:

1a. In your opinion, is this situation an example of bullying?
YES ___ NO ___ DON'T KNOW ___

1b. Circle the number that best represents the severity of the problem
described here:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extreme Problem</th>
<th>No Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The structured response choices of the SAS, the modified instrument used
in the present study were:

1A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict
      management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice
      principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other ________________________________

1B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity
    of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3</td>
<td>4 5</td>
<td>6 7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The six multiple-choice options listed in the SAS survey were derived
from responses discussed in the literature review. They were supported by pilot studies conducted to test participants’ response to the instrument.

Pilot Studies

Two pilot studies were conducted to assure that participants responded as instructed, to anticipate unforeseen problems, to check the adequacy of the survey instructions, to assess teacher engagement and to validate the structured response choices.

During the first pilot study (N=17) the original 21-item survey was administered and cluster analyses were performed. Cluster analyses found that three distinct clusters emerged on the dependent variable, teacher perception of severity. Two of the clusters roughly corresponded to scenarios that involved all of the elements of bullying and scenarios that involved student altercations. The third cluster of scenarios was a combination of both altercation and bullying scenarios, which indicated possible lack of clarity within scenarios. These results prompted the second pilot study, which is discussed below. Additionally, a vast majority of the 17 teachers who participated in the first pilot study complained that the instrument was too long. Teacher complaints resulted in the shortening of the instrument.

Some participants in the first pilot study marked several intervention options for a given scenario. As a result, instructions were made more
explicit on the instrument used in the second pilot study, where teachers were asked to choose only one response. One reason for requesting only one response was to better reflect their classroom reality. Teachers typically will not have the opportunity to exercise more than one option. A 20-year veteran teacher of an Oahu middle school reported that in her school teachers easily see up to 150 students a day. She believes this makes educative or independent interventions difficult as they are often time consuming (Narimasu, personal communicae, June, 2004).

A forced-choice option was used to help reduce teachers' ability to make socially desirable responses. Additionally, each response had temporal qualifiers like "in my current teaching position" and "primarily." These qualifying statements acknowledged that respondents might choose differently at different points in time. The six response choices represented nominal categories because interventions were viewed as discrete responses that could not be ranked on any meaningful continuum of intervention.

The second pilot study (N=20) was conducted two weeks later to ensure that the content of the modified survey items were recognizable to teachers. A second group of teachers were given definitions of the terms and then asked to indicate whether they recognized the presence of specific behaviors in the scenarios. Teachers were also given open-
ended questions that asked how they would respond to each scenario (see Appendix F). The respondents were asked to circle the behaviors they believed to be depicted by the scenario (physically harmful, repeated, or fair power balance between participants). They were then asked to give a written explanation of what they believe they would do in the given scenario. The teacher responses to the open-ended question of what they believed they would do given a student altercation were used to create the choices provided in the final survey. Items with the most accurate teacher recognition were retained and included in the final survey. Additionally, as a result of the pilot study, changes were made to clarify ambiguous situations and names were changed to reduce possible ethnic inferences. Because the five teacher response choices were not exhaustive, the response choice “other” was included on the teacher survey.

Procedure

Upon approval from the University of Hawaii Committee on Human Subjects, the principals from all 15 of the year-round public middle schools on the Island of Oahu, State of Hawaii, were asked in writing for permission to survey teachers employed at their school. Follow-up telephone calls were placed one week later. A letter (Appendix C) informed principals of approval from the University of Hawaii Committee on Human Studies, and
assured anonymity for both their teachers and their school. As an incentive, the principals were offered a one-time, one-hour presentation for teachers on the subject of bullying, anger-management, classroom management or communication skills.

The letter and phone conversations further provided principals with the options concerning administering the survey. The primary investigator offered to attend a weekly staff meeting to administer the Student Altercation Survey and the Teachers' Sense of Efficacy Scale. To accommodate the individual requests of three of the schools, surveys were mailed directly to school principals who agreed to distribute the surveys to individual teachers by placing surveys in each teacher's box. Then they were collected in an anonymous box located in the office. The principal investigator then collected the surveys from the principals. Each survey contained a letter addressed directly to teachers (Appendix D) explaining informed consent, anonymity, the voluntary nature of their participation and an estimated completion time of 15 to 20 minutes.

Seven schools agreed to participate, representing a population of approximately 300 teachers. The principals who declined either failed to respond to both written and telephone requests or cited busy schedules or existing programs. Of the seven schools that agreed, four accepted the offer of an in-service presentation and study debriefing. All
participating schools were offered a brief written report of the findings upon completion of the study.

Data Analysis

The purpose of this study was to observe and explain the influence that certain personal and environmental factors had on teacher preference for intervention. Beginning with a review of the hypotheses and variables, the following section provides a rationale for the use of the various statistical analyses, which include: descriptive statistics, cluster analysis and finally, logistic and ordinal regression (See Table 1).

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description of Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Personal factors: Teacher Characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GENDER</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXPERIENCE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BULLYED</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUPPORT</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EFFICACY</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Environmental Factors: Situational Characteristics</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCENESEV 2 &amp; 9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCENESEV 3, 6, 7, &amp; 10</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SCENESEV 1, 4, 5, &amp; 8</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Teacher Response</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TAKE NO ACTION</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>DISCIPLINE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EDUCATE</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INVOLVE OTHER SCHOOL PERSONNEL</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CONTACT PARENTS</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The first hypothesis was that teachers’ self-reported judgment of their response to student altercations would be affected by teachers’ perception of the severity depicted in each scenario. The second hypothesis was that teachers’ self-reported judgment of their response to student altercations would be affected by teacher characteristics (teacher efficacy, teacher experience, teacher training and teacher perception of support). The dependent variable teacher response (see Table 1) is a categorical variable with 5 categories. The independent variable situation characteristics was initially perceived and treated as a categorical variable. The set of independent variables in the second hypothesis were teacher characteristics. This set too was perceived and treated as a set of unorderable categorical variables.

To first analyze the data, descriptive statistics were used to examine the various teacher responses to each scenario. Then cluster analyses were used to validate the groupings of scenarios and to justify the use of the three constructs: bullying, skirmishes and non-bullying. Multinomial and ordinal logistic regressions were performed to examine teacher preference for intervention responses given the severity depicted by each scenario and given teacher characteristics.
Hierarchical cluster analysis.

Hierarchical cluster analysis was used to validate the use of the theoretical constructs depicted in the modified survey. Hierarchical cluster analysis is used to identify groups of individuals who have similar views or abilities and can be used with both categorical and continuous variables. The cluster analysis statistic chooses cluster membership that minimizes variability within each cluster while maximizing the differences between the clusters (Clark, 2003). Cluster analysis provides a horizontal hierarchical tree plot or dendrogram that visually represents a proximity matrix. In this case the proximity matrix describes the distance between the participants' responses to each of the scenarios. Smaller numbers represent closer proximity between responses. Teacher responses that are the most closely linked become distinct clusters (Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994).

Multinomial logistic regression.

Multinomial logistic regression is a type of statistical analysis designed to handle the case of dependent variables with two or more classes. When these categorical variables can be ranked, ordinal regression is preferred over multinomial logistic regression. Multinomial logistic regression was used to examine the influence that the situational severity and teacher characteristics had on teacher response to student
altercations. Multinomial logistic regression allowed the simultaneous examination of five categorical dependent variables and four continuous independent variables.

While linear regression has been widely used and many are familiar with the terminology and interpretation of linear regression models, logit models are relatively new. Logit models extend the principles of the general linear model, but better address non-linear dichotomous and polytomous dependent variables (Menard, 1995). Performing multinomial regressions using the NOMREG command on SPSS, nominal regressions produce statistics regarding a) the significance of the overall model (model chi-square), b) determine the percent of variance in the dependent variable (pseudo R-square), and c) rank the relative importance of each independent variable (Exp(B)) (SPSS, 2003).

The results of the multinomial regression are expressed in logit coefficients and odds ratios, both of which express the strength of the relationship between variables. A positive logit means the independent variable has the effect of increasing the odds that the dependent variable is a member of the reference category and a negative logit coefficient means the independent variable has the effect of decreasing the odds that the dependent variable equals the reference category (Jaccard, 2001). Similarly, an odds ratio of 1.0 suggests the variable has no
effect on the odds (i.e., both events are equally likely). Odds ratios greater than 1.0 increase the odds of the event being compared to the reference category occurring. For example, Table 4, Scenario 6 illustrates that as severity increases by 1 unit (e.g., from 1 to 2 on the scale), teachers are about 1.48 times more likely to involve other school personnel than to educate (which is the reference category). In contrast, odds ratio smaller than 1.0 increase the odds of the reference category occurring as opposed to the other event. So, in Scenario 6, an odds ratio of .45 suggests individuals are more likely to educate (the reference category) than to discipline. Therefore, an odds ratio of .45 is the equivalent to an odds ratio of 2.22 favoring the other event (i.e., 1/.45).

**Ordinal Regression.**

Ordinal regression is similar to logistic regression, in that the coefficient provides the likelihood of a participant choosing one category over the next given a unit change in the independent variable. For instance, with each added year of experience the likelihood of teachers referring to other school personnel during a non-bullying situation goes up. The coefficients are log odds (logistic) coefficients. Ordinal regression was used because teacher intervention responses were recoded from five nominal categories into responses seen as falling on an ordinal continuum of severity, as follows: a) no intervention being the least intense, b)
independent teacher intervention (educate, discipline or contact subjects' parents) being the next most intense and, c) involve other school personnel as being the most intense. By consolidating the responses in this manner, it was then possible to perform an ordinal regression with teacher experience as predictor variables.

In summary, eleven year round public schools on the island of Oahu were selected. Seven agreed to participate and 174 questionnaires were collected from middle school teachers on the island of Oahu. Two pilot studies resulted in the adaptation and shortening of the Bully Situation Identification Instrument published by Hazler, Miller, Carney, and Green (2001). Hierarchical cluster analysis and multinomial and ordinal regressions were performed to analyze categorical and numerical data.
Chapter 4

Results

This chapter presents the results of the statistical analysis of the survey to examine each of the variables and explain the influence that certain personal and environmental factors have on teacher preference for intervention. First, descriptive data for the background variables used in the empirical analysis are presented in Table 1. Second, descriptive statistic data representing teachers’ response patterns for each scenario are described in Table 2.

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>VARIABLE</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EXPERIENCE</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>11.32</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FEMALE</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.70</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BULLYED</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>5.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPPORT</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EFFICACY</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>85.96</td>
<td>12.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Bullying</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>16.17</td>
<td>2.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of Non-Bully</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.66</td>
<td>1.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity of skirmish</td>
<td>165</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.22</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Several analyses are presented that provide support for the validity of grouping the scenarios into three types: non-bullying, student skirmishes, and bullying situations. Finally, additional analyses are then presented to address each of the study’s hypotheses.
Teacher Descriptive Data

Initial analyses indicate that 70% of the 174 teachers who completed and returned the survey were women. Participants averaged a little over 11 years of teaching experience and fewer than three hours of specific bully prevention education. On a scale from one to five, with five being the highest level, teachers reported an average of 4.25 for administrative support. Teacher self-efficacy averaged 86 out of a possible high score of 108. Teacher average rating of the severity of non-bullying situations was 4.66; for student altercations, 14.22 and for bullying situations, 16.17. Additional analyses of teacher perception of severity were conducted and discussed in this chapter.

Patterns of Teacher Responses Across the Scenarios

Before the study’s research questions could be answered, it was necessary to establish the validity of the theoretical concepts underlying each type of scenario. More specifically, it was important to know that the scenarios produced intended differences in responses according to whether the various elements of bullying were present. However, because so few teachers (n=5) chose to use the “other” option, that option was recoded and folded into the other options. For example, teacher responses that indicated “other,” then noted that they would refer a student to the counselor, were coded as “involve other school
Teacher responses that indicated "other", then noted that they would speak privately with students involved, were coded as "educate." There were five scales where teachers chose "other" but did not complete the narrative explaining their choice. These cases were treated as missing data. Additionally, the total for each scenario does not equal 174 because some participants left some items blank. First, percentages of teacher responses were examined for response patterns (See Table 3).

Table 3
Teacher Preference for Intervention by Specific Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Take No Action</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Educate</th>
<th>Contact Parents</th>
<th>Other School Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>42.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 9</td>
<td>56.3%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (16, N = 165) = 76.86, p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (16, N = 167) = 80.85, p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Altercation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 6</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>11.5%</td>
<td>28.7%</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
<td>48.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>24.7%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>55.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
<td>65.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 10</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>16.1%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>46.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (16, N = 160) = 45.35, p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (16, N = 162) = 21.75, p &lt; .15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (12, N = 163) = 28.60, p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>47.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>51.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>2.3%</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>80.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 8</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>8.0%</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (16, N = 161) = 32.40, p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (12, N = 156) = 24.43, p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (16, N = 158) = 53.79, p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X² (12, N = 162) = 48.50, p &lt; .05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The scenarios presented in the left column of Table 3 are ordered by the severity depicted in each scenario (See Appendix E). For example, there are no elements of bullying depicted in scenario 2 and all three elements are depicted in scenario 8. In scenario 6, a skirmish situation, no physical harm is depicted, whereas physical harm is depicted in scenario 3. Therefore scenario 3 is presented after scenario 6.

As expected, the two no bullying situations (Scenarios 2 and 9) yield more “take no action, no intervention” choices than the choice of “personal resolution of the situation” (e.g., discipline, educate or call parents). Interestingly, however, even in these scenarios, a sizeable number of teachers would involve other school personnel. Student skirmishes (Scenarios 3, 6, 7, 10) yield more education and discipline responses and very few “do nothing” responses. As expected, there are also more responses favoring involving other school personnel.

In bullying situations (Scenarios 1, 4, 5, 8), teachers overwhelmingly chose to involve other school personnel. Relative to the other two groups of scenarios, there were fewer responses suggesting they would solve the problem themselves (i.e., through educating, disciplining, or calling parents). One possible explanation is that teachers are required to report incidents of physical assault to administrators. It should be noted that teachers still prefer to involve others at twice the rate they choose to
educate students in all of the altercations. They choose to involve others at three times the rate they choose to educate students during bullying situations. Teachers also choose to educate slightly more often than discipline and rarely report a willingness to take no action. They are only slightly more likely to contact parents.

Next, using cluster analysis the entire set of scenarios was examined simultaneously to validate the uniqueness of the three sets of scenarios (bullying, student skirmishes and non-bullying) in terms of teachers' response patterns. The goal of the cluster analysis was to examine which of the scenarios are most similar and which are most dissimilar. Cluster analysis proceeds from the development of a proximity matrix where variables are clustered based on their similarity (See Figure 2 and Appendix G). The scenarios that are closest in response patterns are combined first, and those that are most different (those with larger proximity coefficients) are combined last. The proximity matrix reports deviance numbers where the lower number corresponds to the lesser distance and therefore has greater proximity. For example, Appendix G shows that teacher responses to Scenario 4 (Act 4) and teacher responses to Scenario 8 (Act 8) are closest in proximity (130.00).
Appendix H provides a summary of how the scenarios were combined based on the similarity of teacher responses. First, Scenarios 4 and 8 were combined because they had the closest proximity. Next, responses to Scenario 7 and Scenario 10 (student skirmish scenarios) were clustered (See Appendix H). Then Scenario 3 is combined with the clustering of Scenarios 4 and 8. Immediately after, Scenario 5 is added to the cluster. This suggests that three of the bullying scenarios are combined very quickly (Scenario 4, 8, & 5) in terms of eliciting similar responses, but Scenario 3 also elicits a response pattern somewhat like the other bullying situations. During the middle stages, the student skirmish scenarios get combined (as being somewhat similar to the bullying scenarios). Finally Scenarios 2 and 9 (the non-bullying scenarios) are combined. The proximity between Scenario 1 and Scenario 9 had the largest gap indicating the greater distance between them. This is logical given that Scenario 9 is a non-bullying scenario whereas Scenario 1 is a bullying scenario.

The information shown in Appendix H is summarized visually with a dendrogram. The dendrogram in Figure 2 highlights that bullying Scenarios (1, 4, 5 & 8) are seen by teachers as very similar and are therefore first combined by the analysis. The skirmish Scenarios 6, 7, & 10 are clustered. However, Scenario 3, which is a non-bullying student
skirmish, elicits teacher responses similar to those elicited by bullying scenarios. As was expected, the non-bullying Scenarios 2 and 9 comprise a cluster that is least like the bullying cluster.

Figure 2

Cluster Analysis: Teacher Responses (ACT)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CASE</th>
<th>Label</th>
<th>Num</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The teachers' patterns of responses across the set of scenarios are similar to the researcher's expectations. The three sets of scenarios elicit different types of teacher response.

Teachers' Perceptions of Severity and Responses

The first hypothesis of the study is that teachers' responses to student altercations are significantly affected by their perception of situational severity. To test this hypothesis, a cluster analysis was conducted to examine teacher perceptions of severity across the ten scenarios (See Appendix I). The hierarchical cluster analysis dendrogram (Figure 3) shows bullying scenarios 1, 4, 5, and 8 clustered first, which
indicates their close relationship in terms of perceived severity. Next, student skirmishes (scenarios 3, 6, 7, and 10) were clustered and, finally, scenarios 2 and 9 depicting non-bullying altercations were clustered. This provides further support for the validity of the scenarios in that they differ in terms of what is perceived as severity. The sets of scenarios are thus validated in two different ways, response pattern and perception of severity.

Figure 3

Cluster Analysis: Teacher Perception of Scenario Severity

To examine the influence that teacher perception of severity has on teachers' preference to intervene and the type of intervention they prefer, a multinomial logistic regression was conducted (See Table 4). The odds ratios reported in Table 4 reflect the odds that the participants will behave in certain ways given a unit increase in severity. This is defined as $e^B$, where $e$ is the natural logarithm (2.718) and $B$ is the
logit coefficient. The expression represents the factor by which the odds change when the independent variable increases by one unit.

Different reference categories were chosen for each set of scenarios. For no bullying scenarios, the reference category was "no intervention" which, given the lack of conflict depicted in the scenario, was an appropriate teacher response. For skirmishes, the reference category was to provide education. The reference category "to involve other school personnel" was used in bullying scenarios.

**TABLE 4**

Odds Ratios Representing the Likelihood of Intervention, Given a Unit Increase in Severity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>No Intervention</th>
<th>Discipline</th>
<th>Educate</th>
<th>Contact Parents</th>
<th>Involve Other School Personnel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Bullying</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 2</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>5.65*</td>
<td>5.37*</td>
<td>8.05*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 9</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>6.76*</td>
<td>12.88*</td>
<td>10.51*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Altercations</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 6</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>1.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 3</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>1.48**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 7</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.14*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 10</td>
<td>.16**</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>RC</td>
<td>2.12*</td>
<td>2.65*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Bullying</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 1</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 5</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 4</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>.40*</td>
<td>.50**</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scenario 8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>.33*</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>RC</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p<.05, **p<.10; RC=Reference Category
Overall, Table 4 suggests that respondents' perceptions about the severity of the scenarios have a considerable impact on their likelihood to intervene in particular ways. This is clearly the case in the no bullying and the altercation scenarios. For example, in Scenario 2, as perception of severity increases, the odds of involving others increase considerably (10.51) as opposed to doing nothing. The teacher who perceives Scenario 2 as severe (i.e., a 5 on the scale) is many times more likely to intervene than a teacher who perceives the scenario as a 1 or 2 (not severe). In the no bullying situations, the data suggest that while there are a good number who would do nothing, as individuals perceive the scenarios are more severe (which they are less likely to do in non-bullying scenarios), then the odds are much greater that they will act themselves or involve others.

In the skirmish scenarios, the data in Table 4 suggests that individuals are considerably more likely to involve other school personnel than to educate as their perceptions of severity rise (suggested by the significant coefficients in all four skirmish scenarios). Finally, the same type of pattern also holds for the bullying situations. More specifically, individuals are generally more likely to involve other school personnel than to discipline or educate as their perceptions of severity increase (i.e., suggested by the significant odds ratios smaller than 1.0).
Teacher Characteristics and Patterns of Response

The second hypothesis was that teachers' self-reported judgment of their responses to student altercations would be significantly affected by certain teacher characteristics. Table 5 summarizes the change in log-odds coefficients associated with teachers' preference for certain types of interventions associated with a one-unit increase in each independent variable. To examine the impact of teacher demographics on teacher preferences for intervention, the interventions were recoded to create an ordinal measure (0 = no intervention; 1 = personal intervention which includes educate, discipline, and contact parents; 2 = involve other school personnel). After recoding, an ordinal regression was conducted using four teacher characteristics as predictor variables.

Table 5
Odds-Ratio Coefficients Representing the Influence of Teacher Characteristics and Perceptions of Severity on Teacher Preference for Intervention

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>NonBullying</th>
<th>Altercations</th>
<th>Bullying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Experience</td>
<td>1.04**</td>
<td>1.01</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>1.54*</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bullying Ed</td>
<td>1.06**</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>.57**</td>
<td>.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severity</td>
<td>4.18*</td>
<td>4.90*</td>
<td>1.65*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In Table 5, each scenario is considered as consisting of three ordered categories and is considered with a single independent variable or teacher characteristic. The characteristic feature of modeling ordered categories in an ordinal regression is that conditional probabilities of the categories of the dependent variable can be expressed as one set of constant odds ratios. The coefficients express the change in odds associated with a one-unit change in the independent variable. For example, in Table 5, a one-unit change in experience (i.e., number of years taught) was associated with a significant increase in odds (1.05) that the individual would intervene personally (e.g., educate, discipline or contact parents) or involve other school personnel in Scenario 7. This suggests that increased teacher experience was associated with increased odds of acting personally in the situation or involving others. There was a similar significant increase in odds of acting (as opposed to doing nothing) associated with experience also in two of the bullying scenarios (1 and 8). Interestingly, Table 5 also suggests that experience increased the odds of acting in one of the non-bullying scenarios (2), even though not intervening was the desired intervention.

Table 5 suggests that gender significantly affected respondents' likelihood of intervening in two of the scenarios (9 and 8). In both cases, the change-in-odds coefficients suggest that females are more likely not
to intervene (i.e., with odds ratios smaller than 1.0) than males are. The results may suggest that males and females perceive these scenarios in different ways. In general, however, gender was not related to responses in the majority of scenarios. Similarly, respondents' perceptions of administrator support at the school and their participation in bullying education did not seem to affect their responses in any systematic way.

Finally, as in Table 4, respondents' perceptions of the severity of each scenario affected their perceived responses in a systematic way across 9 of the 10 scenarios. The pattern of findings summarized in Table 5 suggested that teacher perceptions of the severity of each situation was a more consistent predictor of their likelihood to intervene than were particular teacher characteristics such as gender, experience, teacher perceptions of administrator support, or teacher participation in education aimed at increasing their understanding of bullying. As measured in this study, teacher characteristics had little influence on a teacher's preference for intervention.
Chapter 5

Discussion

This chapter will discuss the results of the data analyses that found that the severity of the altercation influenced the teachers' response to student altercations where teacher characteristics did not. Additionally, this chapter will discuss the limitations of the study, explore the implications for intervention and conclude with suggestions for future research.

The Influence of Situational Severity on Teacher Preference for Intervention

As expected, teacher perception of severity and projected responses differed across the ten scenarios. Teacher projected responses were associated with their perception of the severity depicted in each scenario. Cluster analyses reflected teacher perception that non-bullying is the least severe situation, and that student skirmishes are more severe than non-bullying, but less severe than bullying.

Teacher responses to each of the scenarios were as expected, in that the two non-bullying situations (Scenarios 2 and 9) yielded more “take no action” or “non intervention” choices than teacher personal actions to resolve the situation (discipline, educate and counsel, call parents). Interestingly, however, even in these situations, a considerable number of teachers indicate they would involve other school personnel.
Teacher responses to student skirmishes (Scenarios 3, 6, 7, 10) tended to choose more education and discipline responses with very few “do nothing” responses. As with the no bullying scenarios, there were also more responses favoring involving other school personnel.

In bullying situations, (Scenarios 1, 4, 5, 8), teachers overwhelmingly chose to involve other school personnel. Relative to the other two groups of scenarios, there were fewer responses suggesting they would attempt to solve the problem themselves (through educating and counseling, disciplining, or calling parents). One possible explanation is that suspensions for Class A and Class B offenses require that a police report be filed (DOE, 2004). It should be noted that teachers still prefer to involve others even when presented with non-bullying student altercations that depict no physical aggression.

When further examining the scenarios that were clustered according to teacher projected responses, Scenario 3 seemed to be an anomaly, as it was clustered with the bullying scenarios. Scenario 3 depicted physical aggression where two boys of equal power engaged in an altercation in which one became physically abusive and pushed the other against the wall. Yet, Scenarios 7 and 10, like Scenario 3, were non-bullying student skirmishes that depicted physical aggression, clustered with Scenario 6, the non-bullying skirmish cluster. Scenario 7
depicted physical aggression and a power imbalance and Scenario 10 depicted repeated physical aggression. However, when viewed from the teacher perspective of severity, Scenario 3 clustered with other non-bullying student skirmishes.

These findings suggested that teachers do perceive bullying, student skirmishes and non-bullying differently and they act slightly differently in each situation. However, despite the ability to discern the severity between the situations teachers still continue to report a preference to refer or transfer most students in these or similar situations to other school personnel. Very few teachers reported that they would choose to take no action. Referrals to the office comprised the largest preference for intervention implying that when teachers perceive a situation as severe enough to warrant intervention they do act, they act to refer students to the office.

Student perceptions that teachers don’t respond may be due to students not being aware of teacher actions to refer, or that referrals to the office themselves are ineffective. Further, students' threshold for what constitutes a severe enough situation to refer may differ from teachers' threshold. There is some evidence of this in that teachers tend to perceive situations that are physically violent as the most severe. Students
tend to perceive psychological, social, emotional, harm as more severe and problematic than physical aggression (Hazler et al., 2000).

The Superintendent’s Annual Report on School Performance and Improvement in Hawaii indicated that incidents involving harassment and assault have increased. The report credits “increased attention to dealing with student behavior that threatens others, especially hazing or bullying” with the increase in disciplinary suspensions (DOE, 2003). The teacher preference to refer students to other school personnel evidenced in this study may in part be related to the “increased attention to dealing with student behavior” that is referred to by the Superintendent.

The teachers in this study reported having an average of 2.6 hours of training in bully education. This minimal training may indicate that Hawaii teachers are not adequately prepared to intervene when altercations occur or they are confused by what constitutes a referable situation. To be safe, they may tend to err on the side of referral. The presence of physical aggression is a clear indicator to refer which may account for teachers’ overwhelming preference to involve other school personnel in such situations as demonstrated by Scenario 3.

During the 2002-2003 school year, the incident rate of harassment and violent Chapter 19 offenses increased. Harassment comprised 9% and assault comprised 7% of all chapter 19 offenses reported in Hawaii.
schools (DOE, 2003). As seen in the section defining bullying, both harassment and assault occur in some cases of student altercations including those referred to as bullying. In 2003, the Department of Education reported that there were 3,412 incidents of harassment and assault committed by 2,837 students. This means some of the 2,837 students were repeat offenders. These are students for whom the disciplinary practice of suspension did not effectively deter inappropriate behavior.

Additionally, students continue to report feeling that teachers do not recognize student skirmishes and bullying, that teachers do not respond effectively to the skirmishes and bullying and that they, the students themselves, do not report these altercations for fear it will be ignored or improperly handled. If the findings from research conducted on the continental U.S., where approximately 30% of students reported involvement with bullying, were applied to Hawaii’s total enrollment of 183,000 students, then the referral numbers in Hawaii would look more like an estimated 45,000 incidents of harassment and bullying. One possible reason for the discrepancy may be that there remains confusion about what offenses consist of bullying and which are legally reportable behaviors of assault and harassment.
These numbers are quite large and could represent a significant impact on school and personnel resources. Given teachers' proclivity to refer all three types of student altercations to other school personnel, 45,000 harassment and bullying referrals would undoubtedly place a strain on the system resulting in ignored or improperly handled incidents.

The Influence of Teacher Characteristics on Teacher Preference for Intervention

The second hypothesis was that the teachers' self-reported judgment of their responses to student altercations would be affected by certain teacher characteristics. Data analyses yielded little meaningful or conclusive evidence to confirm this hypothesis. Although there is no overall effect, teacher characteristics do have some effect when examined scenario-by-scenario. This section will discuss three possibilities: a) the teacher characteristics were measured well but are not influential, b) teacher characteristics are influential but the wrong teacher characteristics were measured and c) the limitations to the study may have compromised the accurate measurement of the present teacher characteristics.

There are four specific teacher characteristics chosen in this dissertation. They are teacher experience, teacher perception of support
from school administration, teacher education in the recognition and handling of student altercations, and teacher self-efficacy.

Experience.

Participants in this study averaged 11 years of teaching experience (See Figure 4). Experience was found to significantly influence teacher responses in Scenarios 1 and 8 (bullying), Scenarios 7 (student skirmishes), and Scenario 2 (non-bullying).

Figure 4
Teaching Experience
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The survey showed that in 50% of the non-bullying situations and in 50% of the bullying situations as the number of years of teaching experience increased, so did the likelihood of teachers intervening independently. Teaching experience, however, had little or no effect on teacher preference for intervention in student skirmishes. While experience was found to have significant influence during certain
situations there is no meaningful pattern of influence across the ten scenarios. Therefore, no support can be made for a claim that experience affects teacher response to student altercations.

Support.

Only one-half of the schools approached agreed to participate in the survey. One-half of the teachers from the schools who did agree to participate in the study returned the survey.

Figure 5
Teacher Perception of Administrative Support

Of those who did participate, the vast majority rated administrative support highly (See Figure 5). This variable was highly skewed, with the average teacher rating being 4.25 out of 5 for administrative support. It can be reasoned that schools where principals agreed to participate in the study were also highly supportive principals and that teachers who
agreed to participate were those who felt positive administrative support.

It is possible that had teachers who felt less administrative support
been surveyed, there might have been more variability in teacher
preference to respond and in teacher perception of severity. For
example, teachers with low perceptions of support may more often
choose to “take no action” to student conflict situations. If teachers’
feelings of low administrative support are related to teacher apathy,
these same teachers may underestimate the level of severity. If teachers
feel little administrative support because they receive little administrative
support, then their responses may reflect more desire to act
independently.

One limitation of this study might be the failure to gain access to
teachers who might feel less administrative support. Another possible
limitation might be the difficulty in surveying apathetic teachers. Perhaps
even the variable “perception of administrative support” is too broad.
Perhaps more revealing teacher characteristics might include teacher
“apathy” or teacher “satisfaction.”

Bully education and training.

In the current study, teacher preference to refer students to other school
personnel may in part be related to limited specialized training in bullying
prevention (See Figure 6). Teachers reported an average of 2.6 hours of training.
Sawka, McCurdy, and Mannella (2002) conducted a study examining training teachers to intervene with students with emotional behavior disorders. They found that, like altercations involving students, emotional behavior disorders presented a challenge for teachers who reported feeling poorly equipped to effectively handle these students. Common teacher responses to emotional-behavior-disordered students involved punishment and exclusion (verbal reprimand, time-out) as opposed to educative skill enhancing methods. Sawka, McCurdy, and Mannella (2002) reported that teachers' lack of an effective response is largely due to a lack of training. Only five per cent of the teachers in the study credited their college coursework as a source of their instructional and behavioral management strategies. Rather, they reported that other teachers were more helpful in influencing their use of specific teaching
strategies.

The standards for staff development prescribed by The National Staff Development Council (2001) include: a) context standards that address learning communities and resources, b) process standards that address collaboration and design and, c) content standards that address equity among students, quality teaching and family involvement. The content standard specifically states that adequate standards include those that "Prepares educators to understand and appreciate all students, create safe, orderly and supportive learning environments, and hold high expectations for their academic achievement".

In further support of education and training, Sawka, McCurdy, and Mannella (2002) found that approximately 32 of specific education and training improved teachers' core knowledge of intervention practices. Additionally, on-going and on-site consultation and support over three months helped teachers implement the new knowledge into the classroom. The 2.6 average hours of specific bully education reported by participants in this study pales in comparison.
Teacher self-efficacy.

The TSES scale was chosen for this study specifically for its reliability in measuring omnibus self-efficacy and domain specific efficacy (efficacy in classroom management, efficacy in instructional strategies and efficacy in student engagement). It was projected that this scale would allow an examination of the teachers' overall efficacy and of efficacy in specific domains. There are no scales that assess teacher self-efficacy in intervening in bullying situations. Analyses were performed using classroom management and student engagement as separate variables. As separate variables, neither influenced teacher preference for intervention. The teachers' reported overall efficacy averaged 86 of a possible 108 in this study (See Figure 7).

Figure 7

Teacher Self Efficacy

Despite this fairly high score, neither the overall efficacy nor the specific domains measured by the subscales were found to influence teacher
preference for intervention. A teacher’s belief in his or her classroom
strategies or the belief in his or her ability to engage in adequate
classroom management and student engagement does not, in this study,
influence a teachers preference for intervention in student altercations.

Limitations of the Study

In addition to the lack of variability in some teacher characteristic
variables, there may also be reactivity, fatigue, artificiality and history
effects that threaten the validity of this study. Teachers’ reactivity to being
studied may affect their responses especially to questions regarding their
abilities as evidenced by their self-reported high efficacy scores. Further,
despite assurances of anonymity, teachers may display reactivity to being
asked to comment about their administration’s support or lack thereof.
Reactivity combined with fatigue may have affected teacher responses
to the survey as evidenced by the fact that 18% failed to complete the
final page of the survey. The final page consisted of the teacher self-
efficacy scale. The reduced number of completed self-efficacy surveys
may also have contributed to the study’s inability to identify self-efficacy
as an influential teacher characteristic.

Although the scenarios were developed from actual incidents,
teachers may perceive that the events depicted in the scenarios were
artificial or unrealistic. Related to this might be the fact that the situations
were developed on the continental U.S. and did not depict situations familiar to regional teachers. Another threat might be the effect of history or events that occur during the experimental process. Teachers are experiencing intense scrutiny with the No Child Left Behind legislation. Further, the incidents of school-based bullying that occurred in the 1990s were tragic and salient. Desire to appear vigilant may be present.

Suggestions for Further Research

Additional studies might continue to focus on teacher characteristics by choosing other variables that are likely to influence teacher responses such as teacher personal experience with bullying. Additionally, future research should examine global teacher efficacy (GTE), which is a teachers' belief about the ability of the profession of teachers as a whole to influence or intervene effectively in student altercations. It is possible that teachers view their role as other than intervener especially in situations where teachers perceive discipline rather than education is being required.

Regional research should be conducted to incorporate the unique contributions of the social-ecosystem of the child. Research examining the relative influence of teacher and situational characteristics on teachers' preference for intervention contributes to the continued understanding of the school ecology and bullying.
Conclusion

Teacher intervention preferences do not seem to reflect individual teacher "traits" but rather reflect a "state" of teacher perception. Teacher perception of severity can be sensitized by increased education and training as evidenced by the Sawka, McCurdy, & Mannella (2002) study.

It is not known how many hours of specific bully prevention education and training the teachers received in the school districts prior to the rampage shootings in Colorado, Pennsylvania and Arkansas. At best they have had the recommended 30 hours or more of training. At worst, they would have had a minimal number like Hawaii. It is clear that this type of training is essential in order for teachers to recognize bullying and to know when and how to intervene. Today’s target of student bullying can become tomorrow’s perpetrator and a member of that exclusive club of rampage shooters in our schools.

In 1999 The Hawaii State Department of Education added to its academic curriculum the Hawaii Content and Performance Standards. These standards were formulated to help students learn to identify and analyze problems, find information and to make decisions that promote and maintain their physical and psychosocial health. To teach students these skills, elementary and early childhood education students at the
University of Hawaii are required to complete a course in teaching entitled “Personal and Social k-6 Health Skills.” Collaborations between various colleges at the University of Hawaii and the Department of Education have resulted in spring and summer graduate level institutes addressing violence prevention, substance abuse, building resiliency and healthy sex education (Pateman, Sileo, & Serna, 2001). These courses and institutes are essential to equipping teachers with the requisite skills to intervene effectively in student altercations. However, to adequately train teachers to intervene safely and effectively to bullying, it may be beneficial to require the same course aimed at middle school and above. The course should be required and combined with school-based consultation and support specific to bullying similar to that suggested by Sawka, McCurdy, and Mannella (2002).

The school administrations are over burdened with referrals of student altercations. Teachers must share the burden of identifying these student altercations and addressing them. Teachers cannot accomplish this without the appropriate education, training and support.

Even with the limitations of this study, the data supports the underlying hypotheses that a) teachers must be able to identify the types of student altercations that warrant authoritative intervention and, b) there must be a formal mechanism for addressing student altercations.
other than it being referred to an overburdened administration who will either ineffectively address it or who may inadvertently ignore it.
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Appendix A

Teachers’ Sense of Efficacy Scale (short form)

Teacher Beliefs
Directions: This questionnaire is designed to help us gain a better understanding of the kinds of things that create difficulties for teachers in their school activities. Please indicate your opinion about each of the statements below. Your answers are confidential.

How much can you do?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How much can you do?</th>
<th>Nothing</th>
<th>Very Little</th>
<th>Some</th>
<th>Quite Influence</th>
<th>A Bit A Great Deal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>(3)</td>
<td>(4)</td>
<td>(5) (6) (7) (8) (9)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. How much can you do to control disruptive behavior in the classroom? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
2. How much can you do to motivate students who show low interest in schoolwork? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
3. How much can you do to get students to believe they can do well in schoolwork? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
4. How much can you do to help your students value learning? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
5. To what extent can you craft good questions for your students? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
6. How much can you do to get children to follow classroom rules? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
7. How much can you do to calm a student who is disruptive or noisy? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
8. How well can you establish a classroom management system with each group of students? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
9. How much can you use a variety of assessment strategies? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
10. To what extent can you provide an alternative explanation or example when students are confused? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
11. How much can you assist families in helping their children do well in school? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
12. How well can you implement alternative strategies in your classroom? (1) (2) (3) (4) (5) (6) (7) (8) (9)
Do not put your name on this survey. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary. You may choose to stop at any time. Completing this survey will serve as your agreement to participate in this study. Please respond to all the portions of the survey. Note: This study is interested in your honest judgment of what you would do not what you believe you should do given the scenarios depicted below. This study is anonymous. Neither you, nor your school will be identified.

PART I: Please read each scenario and answer the questions that follow.

1) Many days Jerry and his friends pass Darrel on the way to math class. Jerry's group always humiliates Darrel, alternately ignoring him and commenting on how he has no friends. Darrel walks ahead, knowing they are right and fighting back his tears.

1A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other __________________________

1B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Brandy was alone in the restroom at school when Lila walked in. They didn't know each other. When Brandy has a rough day she usually retreats to a corner in the bathroom to get away from the crowd. Lila noticed Brandy in the corner but didn't make eye contact. Lila washed her hands then left the bathroom.

2A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other __________________________

2B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
3) Clayton and Andy have been talking at lunch time about Andy's problems at home, where his mom frequently gets angry and yells at Andy. Clayton has problems at home too. One day Clayton decided he was sick of Andy "dumping" his problems on him, so he shoved Andy into a wall. Clayton told him: "you're creeping me out, get away!"

3A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other

3B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4) Steve is described by students as a big boy who doesn't know how to fit in. Lee comes over to Steve, as he is having a cigarette before school. With others watching, Lee says, "Hand over the smokes." "Go to hell," says Steve. Lee, who is smaller, slaps Steve across the face and twists his arm in back of him. "What did you say?" Lee asks. Steve then says, "Here, take them," as he pushes them in Lee's face. Every time this happens, Steve gets hurt, but is too afraid of Lee to fight back.

4A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other

4B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5) Undo is right up in Maria's face. "Show everybody your books, girl!" "No," Maria meekly says as a crowd gathers around them near the school library. Maria is mortified. Undo keeps talking with her arms in the air, "Hey, everyone. Did you know that Maria here is doing third grade work in high school? See her book here...this is for dummies!" Maria just looks at the ground. The crowd giggles and Maria slinks silently away to her friends, once again without knowing what words to say.

5A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
e) Contact parents of the students involved.
f) Other

5B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6) Lisa hurries out the cafeteria. She doesn't want to run into Pam, who is in the "In group". Lisa, also very popular, but was kicked out of this group because she was accused of ratting on a member. Now, Pam confronts Lisa, calls her names and makes further accusations. Lisa engages in the argument with accusations and name calling of her own.

6A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other

6B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Pete was late for class as he ran quickly down the hallway. Nick extended his leg in front of Pete, who lands flat on his face. Books and papers fly everywhere and he scrapes his face. "Oops, you should watch where you're going. This is a no running zone. What did you trip over? Poor thing." Nick went on and on talking in a sarcastic tone. Pete couldn't get a word in.

7A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other

7B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8) David called Blaze on the phone before school. "The fight is on in the back of the school at 3:30. This time, you're dead meat." Blaze is scared of yet another fight with David. He tells Mark, "Would you try to convince David I'm not going to fight with
him. Why is he always after me to fight him? I can never get him to listen to me. Blaze comes to school the next day with bruises from the fight.

8A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other

8B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9) Devon is quite and mild mannered, no one really notices him. He likes to follow Bill around school since no one ever messes with Bill. Devon isn’t really noticed by Bill and Devon is content to just hang around nearby.

9A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other

9B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10) Brenda and Sue both perform equally well on the track team. But before every meet, Brenda tells Sue: “You are a screw up and a loser. Don’t let your stupidity cause the team to lose. These taunts frequently lead to a shoving match between Brenda and Sue. Their teammates break up the fights.

10A. In my current teaching situation, I would primarily? (Choose one)
   a) Take no action.
   b) Give a verbal reprimand, time-out, or classroom service.
   c) Teach the students involved a skill such as mediation, conflict management, or anger management.
   d) Involve other school personnel such as counselor, vice principal or security.
   e) Contact parents of the students involved.
   f) Other

10B. Circle the number that best represents your perception of the severity of the problem described here.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Problem</th>
<th>Moderate Problem</th>
<th>Severe Problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
PART II. Please answer the following general questions.

1. Gender:  Male______  Female______

2. How much professional teaching experience have you had in grades K through 12 (Include student teaching and substitute teaching)?  
   Years:_____  Months:_____ 

3. How many hours of education and training have you had specific to the topic of bullying?  
   Hours:______

4. How supportive is your school administration of your efforts to intervene on occurrences of bullying?  
   Not supportive  Somewhat supportive  Completely supportive  
   1  2  3  4  5

Thank you very much for your time!  
Please complete the attached page, Mahalo.
Appendix C

Allana Wade Coffee
4068 Round Top Drive
Honolulu, Hawaii  96822
(808) 949-0101
e-mail allana@hawaii.edu

Dear (Principal's name)

I am presently conducting research in the area of teachers' response to student altercations and bullying in Hawaii's middle schools. As you know the subject of bullying receives a great deal of attention and has been well researched. However, most of the research to-date focuses on student participants. Little is know about the teachers' experiences or their perception of these altercations. I would like to invite your teachers to participate in this study, which specifically seeks to understand the teacher's response. I am aware of the time constraints experienced by many educators and have therefore purposefully limited their involvement to 20-25 minutes. There will be no cost for your participation.

This study is part of the requirement necessary for my dissertation in Educational Psychology at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Your anonymity and that of the teachers will be preserved, as the results will be presented as a group as opposed to individual schools. No personal information is requested that will identify you, your school or your district.

I would like to thank you for taking the time to assist me and the University of Hawaii in this important study on teachers' responses to student altercations and bullying. The results will hopefully commence a larger discussion on the effects of bullying on the staff and students of some of Hawaii's middle schools. It is hoped that this increase awareness will translate into more effective resource allocation that will assist educators in their task of ensuring that staff and students thrive in a safe learning environment.

For further inquiry or to request the research summary, I can be reached at 949-0101 or 258-2287.

Very truly yours,
Allana Wade Coffee
Doctoral Candidate, Educational Psychology
University of Hawaii
Dear Teacher

I am presently conducting research in the area of teachers’ response to student altercations and bullying in Hawaii’s middle schools. As you know the subject of bullying receives a great deal of attention and has been well researched. However, most of the research to-date focuses on student participants. Little is known about the teachers’ experiences or their perception of these altercations. I would like to invite you to participate in this study, which specifically seeks to understand the teacher’s response. As a participant in this study you will be asked to complete 2 short surveys. I am aware of the time constraints experienced by many educators and have therefore purposefully limited your involvement to 20-25 minutes. There will be no cost for your participation. Approximately 250 teachers will be surveyed.

This study is part of the requirement necessary for my dissertation in Educational Psychology at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. Your anonymity and that of your school will be preserved. No personal identifying information will be included with the research results. Participation in this research project is completely voluntary. You are free to withdraw from participation at any time with no penalty, or loss of benefit.

I would like to thank you for taking the time to assist the University of Hawaii and me in this important study on teachers’ responses to student altercations and bullying. Participating in this research may be of no direct benefit to you. It is believed, however, that the results will commence a larger discussion on the effects of bullying on the staff and students of some of Hawaii’s middle schools. It is hoped that this increased awareness will translate into more effective resource allocation that will assist educators in their task of ensuring that staff and students thrive in a safe learning environment.

To compensate you and your school for your time and participation, I am offering to provide via my company Open Minds Hawaii a free staff development workshop on anger management, bullying or aligning difficult parents. Please review the enclosed packet for details. For further inquiry or to request the research summary, I can be reached at (808) 949-0101 or (808) 258-2287. If you have any questions about your rights as a research participant please call the University of Hawaii Committee on Human Studies at (808) 956-5007. All research records will be stored in a locked file in the primary investigators office for the duration of the research project. Audiotapes will be destroyed immediately following transcription. All other research records will be destroyed upon completion of the project.

Aloha,

Allana Wade Coffee, Doctoral Candidate, Educational Psychology, University of Hawaii
Appendix E

Description of Bullying Elements Depicted in Each Scenario

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No Elements of bullying</th>
<th>1-2 Elements of Bullying</th>
<th>3 Elements of Bullying</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2, 9</td>
<td>3, 6, 7, 10</td>
<td>1, 4, 5, 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No elements of bullying 2, 9

→ 2 = Be
→ 9 = Be

One or two elements of bullying 3, 6, 7, 10

→ 3 = PH
→ 6 = PSH
→ 7 = UF, PH
→ 10 = R, PH

Elements of bullying 1, 4, 5, 8

→ 1 = R, UF, PSH
→ 4 = R, UF, PH
→ 5 = R, UF, PSH
→ 8 = R, UF, PH

B=Benign
PH=Physical harm
PSH=Psycho/Social harm
UF=Unfair
R=Repeated

The above, is a matrix that identifies survey items that contain specific elements, repeated harm, physical harm, power imbalance and interactions between the three.
APPENDIX F

SBS pilot 2

Student Altercation Survey

Do not put your name on this survey. Your participation in this study is strictly voluntary. You may choose to stop at any time. Completing this survey will serve as your agreement to participate in this study. Please respond to all the portions of the survey.

Note: This study is interested in your honest judgment of what you would do not what you believe you should do given the scenarios depicted below. This study is anonymous. Neither you, nor your school will be identified.

The terms:

Physical harm
Includes hitting, pushing, shoving etc.

Repeated

Refers to reoccurring altercations
Fair power balance between participants
Describes participants that have an equal ability to start or stop the altercation.

PART I: Please answer the following general questions (fill in the blank or circle a letter).

1. Age:_______ 2. Gender: Male_______ Female_______

3. How much professional teaching experience have you had in grades K through 12 (Include student teaching and substitute teaching)?

   Years:______ Months:______

4. How many hours of education and training have you had specific to the topic of bullying?

   Years:______ Months:______

5. How much behavior support do you experience at your current teaching institution?

   (Behavior support refers to a system-wide continuum of procedures where school-wide discipline, classroom management, and preventative instructional practices are implemented)

   1-no support 2 3 4 5 6 7-total support

PART II: Please read each scenario and answer the questions that follow.

#1.3 Sherry had her hand up, “I know the answer!” Gabriella also raised her hand. Sherry told Gabriella to put her hand down, because she was “too dumb and ugly” to give the right answer. Gabriella, feeling shocked and angry, retorted back “So, you’re ugly too!”

PQ1.1 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:

   a) physically harmful  b) repeated  c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.1 As the teacher, I believe I would __________________________

#2.4 Valerie and Elena were in the cafeteria when Valerie points out an attractive boy and says, “He’s hot. Too bad you’re so ugly he’ll never look our way.” Elena is quiet. It tears her up
when Valerie starts this kind of crap, which is all too often. Valerie sees Elena's discomfort and goes to rub it in a little more, "That ugly boy there is your type. Don't you agree?" Elena talks trash back, "You're so ugly, you couldn't get the hot one or the ugly one! Look at the weird clothes you wear!" The comment hits hard and anger takes over as Valerie's primary emotion rather than humor. A few more angry comments back and forth and the girls are in a full-fledged shouting match.

PQ1.2 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  
   b) repeated  
   c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.2 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________

#3.5 A group of boys from the computer club are huddled around the computer, watching Matt play a game. There is only 10 minutes left of the class break, and Matt is trying for level 57 to beat the high score. Pete currently holds the highest score and watches from a distance. The crowd leaves before Matt is done. Matt turns to Pete and says, "Shit. I almost had it. Everyone was depending on me to win and I let them down because you had to get that high score. I don't want to be your friend anymore..." Pete tries to talk, but can't get a word in. "...and consider yourself out of the computer club." Pete looked down, saying nothing.

PQ1.3 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  
   b) repeated  
   c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.3 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________

#4.6 Tara was about to step onto the school bus when Diana came bolting in ahead of her. Diana sat in the front seat next to a boy, Tara's boyfriend. When Tara got on the bus, Diana stood up and blocked the entrance to the seat. Tara tried to look around Diana's large build to her boyfriend, but could not see him. As she walked past the seat, she saw all her friends staring at her and felt ashamed. The front seat had always been where the two of them sat together.

PQ1.4 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  
   b) repeated  
   c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.4 As the teacher, I believe I would_______________________________

#5.7 Frank catches Jeff on the sidewalk outside the school gym in the morning. "Hey you, how much money did momma give you today?" "None. Leave me alone". Frank gets in Jeff's face and grabs his arm, "Let's go over here and talk about sharing." Jeff replies, "I said I don't have any money! Damn it! Let go, that hurts!" Around the corner, Frank pounds Jeff in the stomach and reaches into Jeff's pants pocket to take his money. They have been through this several times before but sometimes the roles are reversed and it is Jeff who grabs and pounds Frank and takes his money.

PQ1.5 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  
   b) repeated  
   c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.5 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________

#6.8 Brenda and Sue both perform equally well on the track team. But before every meet, Brenda tells Sue: "You are a screw up and a loser. Don't let your stupidity cause the team to lose. These taunts frequently lead to a shoving match between Brenda and Sue. Their teammates break up the fights.

PQ1.6 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  
   b) repeated  
   c) fair power balance between participants.
As the teacher, I believe I would

David called Blaze on the phone before school. "The fight is on in the back of the school at 3:30. This time, you're dead meat." Blaze is scared of yet another fight with David. He tells Mark, "Would you try to convince David I'm not going to fight with him. Why is he always after me to fight him? I can never get him to listen to me". David comes to school the next day with bruises from the fight with David.

Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
- physically harmful
- repeated
- fair power balance between participants.

As the teacher, I believe I would

Antoine and Tim are walking home from school. They live near each other and sit by each other in homeroom. Antoine says, "Do you like Jamie? You know she's mine and I saw you pass her a note." Tim replies, "It's a free country." Antoine says, "Don't start. You don't have a chance with her, you pimple face." Tim is hurt by the comment, but he goes on. "Fuck you," he says. "Fuck you, too" Antoine replies in his frustration. They continue to call each other names until Tim shuts down and says nothing. As Tim walks into his house, he thinks to himself, "This has happened too many times. No making up. He is not my friend."

Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
- physically harmful
- repeated
- fair power balance between participants.

As the teacher, I believe I would

Steve is described by students as a big boy who doesn't know how to fit in. Lee, who has many friends, comes over to Steve, as he is having a cigarette before school. With others watching, Lee says, "Hand over the smokes." "Go to hell." says Steve. Lee, who is smaller, slaps Steve across the face and twists his arm in back of him. "What did you say?" Lee asks. Steve then says, "Here, take them," as he pushes them in Lee's face. Every time this happens, Steve gets hurt, but is too embarrassed to fight back.

Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
- physically harmful
- repeated
- fair power balance between participants.

As the teacher, I believe I would

Linda is right up in Maria's face, "Show everybody your books, girl!" "No," Maria meekly says as a crowd gathers around them near the school library. Maria is mortified. Linda keeps talking with her arms in the air, "Hey, everyone. Did you know that Maria here is doing third grade work in high school? See her book here...this is for dummies!" Maria just looks at the ground. The crowd giggles and Maria slinks silently away to her friends, once again without knowing what words to say.

Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
- physically harmful
- repeated
- fair power balance between participants.

As the teacher, I believe I would

Many days Jerry and his friends pass Darrel on the way to math class. Jerry's group always humiliates Darrel, alternately ignoring him and commenting on how he has no friends. Darrel walks ahead, knowing they are right and fighting back his tears.

Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
- physically harmful
- repeated
- fair power balance between participants.
PQ2.11 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________________

#12.16 Lisa rushes out of the cafeteria. She doesn’t want to run into Pam, whose in the “in group”. Lisa, also popular, was kicked out of this group because she was accused of ratting on a member. Today, Pam confronts Lisa, calls her names and makes further accusations. Lisa engages in the argument with accusation and name calling of her own.

PQ1.12 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  b) repeated  c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.12 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________________

#13.17 Chen was late for class as he ran quickly down the hallway. Nick extended his leg in front of Chen, who lands flat on his face. Books and papers fly everywhere and he scrapes his face. “Oops, you should watch where you’re going. This is no running zone. What did you trip over? Fool thing.” Nick went on and on talking in a sarcastic tone. Chen couldn’t get a word in. “Who was that?” a friend said to Nick. “I don’t know. Never met him, but lets get out of here before he realizes what happened.” Nick said.

PQ1.13 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  b) repeated  c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.13 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________________

#14.19 Clayton and Andy have been talking at lunch time about Andy’s problems at home, where Andy’s mom frequently gets angry and yells at him. Clayton has problems at home too. One day Clayton decided he was sick of Andy “dumping” his problems on him and shoved Andy towards a wall. Clayton told Andy: “you’re creeping me out, get way!”

PQ1.14 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  b) repeated  c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.14 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________________

#15.20 Jackie came into class with a ripped shirt, a bruised cheek, and scrapes on her arms. Jackie explained that a bigger kid she hardly knew punched her, “for no reason. I bumped into her on the playground and she said I did it on purpose. Then she hit me, threw me down, and stood over me.”

PQ1.15 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  b) repeated  c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.15 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________________

#16.21 Gloria takes a step forward, hungry for lunch. When Lori cuts in line in front of her, Gloria says, “excuse me, you need to go to the end of the line.” Lori responds with: I can go where I want, when I want, got that! It is assholes like you that should go to the end of the line. Or better yet, just eat the shit from that garbage can over there.”

PQ1.16 Please circle the behaviors you believe to be depicted by the scenario:
   a) physically harmful  b) repeated  c) fair power balance between participants.

PQ2.16 As the teacher, I believe I would ________________________________________

Thank you for completing this questionnaire.
Feedback and suggestions ____________________________________________
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## Appendix G

Proximity Matrix Teacher Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>ACT1</th>
<th>ACT2</th>
<th>ACT3</th>
<th>ACT4</th>
<th>ACT5</th>
<th>ACT6</th>
<th>ACT7</th>
<th>ACT8</th>
<th>ACT9</th>
<th>ACT10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACT1</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>628.00</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>491.00</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>443.00</td>
<td>447.00</td>
<td>425.00</td>
<td>828.00</td>
<td>370.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT2</td>
<td>628.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>648.00</td>
<td>835.00</td>
<td>689.00</td>
<td>641.00</td>
<td>765.00</td>
<td>809.00</td>
<td>788.00</td>
<td>694.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT3</td>
<td>390.00</td>
<td>648.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>301.00</td>
<td>341.00</td>
<td>343.00</td>
<td>415.00</td>
<td>321.00</td>
<td>974.00</td>
<td>356.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT4</td>
<td>491.00</td>
<td>835.00</td>
<td>301.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>372.00</td>
<td>368.00</td>
<td>332.00</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>1387.00</td>
<td>383.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT5</td>
<td>347.00</td>
<td>689.00</td>
<td>341.00</td>
<td>372.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>372.00</td>
<td>346.00</td>
<td>322.00</td>
<td>941.00</td>
<td>357.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT6</td>
<td>443.00</td>
<td>641.00</td>
<td>343.00</td>
<td>368.00</td>
<td>372.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>466.00</td>
<td>376.00</td>
<td>885.00</td>
<td>325.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT7</td>
<td>447.00</td>
<td>785.00</td>
<td>415.00</td>
<td>332.00</td>
<td>346.00</td>
<td>466.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>298.00</td>
<td>1171.00</td>
<td>283.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT8</td>
<td>425.00</td>
<td>809.00</td>
<td>321.00</td>
<td>130.00</td>
<td>322.00</td>
<td>376.00</td>
<td>298.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>1337.00</td>
<td>343.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT9</td>
<td>828.00</td>
<td>788.00</td>
<td>974.00</td>
<td>1387.00</td>
<td>941.00</td>
<td>885.00</td>
<td>1171.00</td>
<td>1337.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>910.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT10</td>
<td>370.00</td>
<td>694.00</td>
<td>356.00</td>
<td>383.00</td>
<td>357.00</td>
<td>325.00</td>
<td>283.00</td>
<td>343.00</td>
<td>910.00</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Appendix H

Clusters Proximity of Teacher Responses

## Agglomeration Schedule

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stage</th>
<th>Cluster Combined</th>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Stage Cluster First Appears</th>
<th>Next Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cluster 1</td>
<td>Cluster 2</td>
<td>130.000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>283.000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>311.000</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>345.000</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>353.750</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>375.000</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>416.143</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>716.125</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1024.556</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I

**Proximity Matrix Teacher Perception of Severity**

#### Proximity Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case</th>
<th>SCNSEV1</th>
<th>SCNSEV2</th>
<th>SCNSEV3</th>
<th>SCNSEV4</th>
<th>SCNSEV5</th>
<th>SCNSEV6</th>
<th>SCNSEV7</th>
<th>SCNSEV8</th>
<th>SCNSEV9</th>
<th>SCNSEV10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>348.000</td>
<td>187.000</td>
<td>206.000</td>
<td>141.000</td>
<td>164.000</td>
<td>184.000</td>
<td>238.000</td>
<td>589.000</td>
<td>152.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV2</td>
<td>348.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>311.000</td>
<td>644.000</td>
<td>487.000</td>
<td>268.000</td>
<td>448.000</td>
<td>744.000</td>
<td>245.000</td>
<td>346.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV3</td>
<td>187.000</td>
<td>311.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>229.000</td>
<td>186.000</td>
<td>177.000</td>
<td>205.000</td>
<td>303.000</td>
<td>510.000</td>
<td>151.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV4</td>
<td>206.000</td>
<td>644.000</td>
<td>229.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>133.000</td>
<td>318.000</td>
<td>180.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td>993.000</td>
<td>222.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV5</td>
<td>141.000</td>
<td>487.000</td>
<td>186.000</td>
<td>133.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>191.000</td>
<td>155.000</td>
<td>167.000</td>
<td>728.000</td>
<td>179.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV6</td>
<td>164.000</td>
<td>268.000</td>
<td>177.000</td>
<td>318.000</td>
<td>191.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>188.000</td>
<td>400.000</td>
<td>399.000</td>
<td>146.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV7</td>
<td>184.000</td>
<td>448.000</td>
<td>205.000</td>
<td>180.000</td>
<td>155.000</td>
<td>188.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>194.000</td>
<td>733.000</td>
<td>142.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV8</td>
<td>238.000</td>
<td>744.000</td>
<td>303.000</td>
<td>90.000</td>
<td>167.000</td>
<td>400.000</td>
<td>194.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1161.000</td>
<td>262.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV9</td>
<td>589.000</td>
<td>245.000</td>
<td>510.000</td>
<td>993.000</td>
<td>728.000</td>
<td>399.000</td>
<td>733.000</td>
<td>1161.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>561.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCNSEV10</td>
<td>152.000</td>
<td>346.000</td>
<td>151.000</td>
<td>222.000</td>
<td>179.000</td>
<td>146.000</td>
<td>142.000</td>
<td>262.000</td>
<td>561.000</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>