THE IDENTIFICATION OF BEHAVIORS PERCEIVED AS RESPECTFUL AND

DISRESPECTFUL BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS EVALUATING PEER

INTERACTIONS

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE UNIVERSITY OF
HAWAIʻI AT MĀNOA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR
THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF EDUCATION

IN

EDUCATIONAL PSYCHOLOGY

AUGUST 2013

By

Daniel Zimbra

Thesis Committee:

Michael Salzman, Chairperson
Lois Yamauchi
Seongah Im

ABSTRACT

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

Table of Contents

List of Tables

THE IDENTIFICATION OF BEHAVIORS PERCEIVED AS RESPECTFUL AND DISRESPECTFUL BY HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS EVALUATING PEER INTERACTIONS

Statement of the Problem

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

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

Woods (2007) explained that students define supportive and caring learning environments as those in which their administrators, teachers, and other students and

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

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

evident, but need to be fostered as much as possible through the creation of nurturing environments.

Inter-cultural Sensitizer

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

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

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

According to Albert (1983), the ICS has been the most extensively evaluated cross-cultural training method. Many evaluation studies have shown it effective in reaching the method's goals, including: enabling participants to make attributions, imparting knowledge of the subjective culture of the target group, helping participants interact more effectively with persons from the other cultures, improving knowledge and

application of cross-cultural communication concepts, increasing inter-cultural sensitivity (For reviews of the studies, see Albert 1983; see also Cushner 1989, and Pollard 1989). Albert (1983) explained that despite a few inconsistencies, the overall consistency and strengths of the findings are impressive, especially when taking into consideration various ICS techniques used, populations involved, and approach of the research. Therefore, the ICS was shown to be a useful and versatile method that has been effectively applied to various populations and situations.

Critical Incident Technique

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

Research Questions

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

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

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

Literature Review

Problem Behaviors Affect School Cultures

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

appropriately designed and implemented school-based prevention programs can prevent

or reduce negative behaviors (Beets et al., 2009). Thus, prevention programs that can

reduce the incidence of such behaviors should provide clear public health benefits, and an

appropriate program must be implemented in order to facilitate a healthy and optimal

school culture and environment.

Respect in Social Context

Cultural and universal respect have been defined in various ways, such as quality

of treatment based on individuals' status in the group, the degree to which they are liked

by the group, and or how fairly they are treated in interactions with group members

(Mayseless et al., 2011). To support these ideas, Goodman (2009) explained that respect

includes universal human dignity, autonomy, and equality. Ausch (2010) explored the

development of concepts of respect and disrespect and suggested it has an affective

component. Highlighted affective states like pride, honor, and admiration are related to

gaining respect from others, and avoiding disrespectful interactions. Building on

conceptualizations from social psychology, a conceptual framework for the study of

respect in developmental contexts was established. Mayseless et al., (2011) explained

two kinds of respect, unconditional and contingent, and distinguished between four

related but distinct ways in which respect and disrespect are involved in preventing or

fostering aggression: (a) respecting others, (b) being respected, (c) being disrespected or

humiliated, and (d) respecting oneself. With similar ideas, Huo et al., (2010) explained

that these different conceptions are integrated in a dual pathway model of respect. The

model's prediction was that fair treatment from group members shaped attitudes toward

the group and self via two distinct pathways: status and inclusion. Huo et al., (2010)

continued to discuss when and to what extent members of a common group respected and

valued one's ethnicity, explaining that it encouraged social engagement and well-being.

Also, respect was linked to more positive evaluations of both school and students as well

as lower levels of school disengagement. After reviewing the premises of respect,

Goodman (2009) found that there was a blend between minimal and full respect, by

separating "respect-due" from "respect-earned." While the former should be granted

unconditionally to all, the latter was contingent upon qualities that one possesses or

acquires over time.

Deutsch and Jones (2008) described authority as an important component of

youth relations, and explained that respect emerged as an important construct which

influences youths' perceptions of their relationships. Lance (2010) contended that the

commitment of the students respect for each other was identified as being a key factor to

learning. Also, Talmy (2009) explained that local constructions of respect in class served

as a powerful socializing resources, working to produce order in the form of classroom

control, as well as hierarchies, along lines of expertise and status. Howard (2010)

explained that respect was implicitly tied to certain ways of speaking in situated

classroom interactions. With this evidence, therefore, respect can play an important role

in creating an optimal learning environment.

Role of Respect

Woods (2007) explained that students' perception of a learning environment they

deem to be supportive and caring promotes their sense of belongingness and commitment

to learning, which in turn improves their academic achievement. Mayer (1995)

demonstrated that schools with high levels of victimization and frequent punishment have

higher rates of aggressive social behavior; the aversive ways people treat each other in

these settings was a major reason for the high levels of aggression. Therefore, respect for

one another may be the first step in minimizing aggression, creating a more nurturing

environment for promotion of well-being, and optimal learning scenarios. The role of

respect in reducing aggression and violence has been discussed and examined primarily

by social psychologists who study relationship dynamics. In intergroup conflicts,

Mayseless et al., (2011) explained that respect has been recognized as an important form

of positive regard that helps diffuse aggressive impulses. Respect, therefore, may play a

role in mitigating aggression in the developmental context of school as well. Woods

(2007) contended that at-risk high school students perform at higher levels socially,

emotionally, and academically when they perceive that they are in a supportive caring

learning environment and regarded as respected members of the school community.

Meraviglia, Becker, Rosenbluth, Sanchez, and Robertson (2003) discussed the

importance of a positive school climate in which inappropriate behaviors are not tolerated

and staff members respond consistently to incidents to reduce bullying and sexual

harassment. Also, Perkins and Mebert (2005) explained that efforts to form pro-social

attitudes or to redirect discriminatory behaviors were more likely to succeed if they are

informed by an understanding of the developmental processes that give rise to stigma,

social exclusion, and devaluing of difference on the one hand, and pro-social responses of

social acceptance and respect for diversity on the other.

To understand the role and importance respect plays in school culture, Ausch (2010) explained that respect was a key ingredient in positive social relationships as well as a foundation for just societies. Respect was also an important social lubricant that preserves face and enhances one's self esteem. In more detail, Huo, Binning, and Molina (2010) described that feelings of respect affect important aspects of group functioning and members' psychological well-being. Goodman (2009) discussed respect as foundational to common ethical beliefs and described it as a cardinal virtue in schools. Also, increased amounts of violence are experienced when there is lack of mutual respect within the school culture. With the evidence provided, to prevent violence and aggression, a culture of mutual respect must be achieved.

Attribution and Inter-cultural Relations

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

with the best of intentions, the development of mutually respectful and cooperative inter-cultural relations can be difficult due to attributional differences.

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

Also, with regard to bias and errors in attribution, Gilbert (1995) explained the fundamental attribution error as a tendency to overvalue dispositional or personality-based explanations for behavior while undervaluing situational explanations. The

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

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

According to Triandis (1972), the occurrence, form and meaning of a particular behavior in a particular situation may differ across cultures due to differences in norms,

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

Summary

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

Method

Participants

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

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

Table 1

Demographics

Primary Ethnic Identification	Frequency	Percent
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	34	22.8
African-American	7	4.7
European-American	11	7.4
Asian-American	72	48.3
Hispanic/Latino	11	7.4
Other	14	9.4
Primary Cultural Influence		
Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander	31	20.8
African-American	6	4.0
European-American	16	10.7
Asian-American	72	48.3
Hispanic/Latino	11	7.4
Other	13	8.7
First Language Learned		
English	112	75.2
Spanish	3	2.0
Chinese	1	0.7
Japanese	0	0.0
Korean	1	0.7
Filipino	26	17.4
Hawaiian	0	0.0
Other	6	4.0
Age		
14	6	4.0
15	7	4.7
16	8	5.4
17	69	46.3
18	56	37.6
19	3	2.0

Research Design and Procedure

This study was divided into two parts. For the first part of the study, the Critical

Incident (Episode Generation) Student/Student Form (Appendix A) was used as a

preliminary identifier of themes of respectful behavior or disrespectful behavior. This

form was administered by Dr. Michael Salzman to 53 students from one high school site

on Oʻahu. As stated above, this high school had a predominantly Asian student

population, with many foreign students as well. The form asked participants to describe

incidents of feeling respected or disrespected, and each incident in the questionnaire was

then interpreted for students experiencing either respect or disrespect. These incidents

were then grouped by themes of respectful or disrespectful behaviors or interaction,

initially identified by Dr. Michael Salzman. Flanagan's (1954) critical incident technique

was used as a model for data collection, acting as the structure for the Critical Incident

(Episode Generation) Student/Student Form (Appendix A). Critical incidents can be

gathered in various ways, but for the Critical Incident (Episode Generation)

Student/Student Form (Appendix A) , critical incidents were gathered through

respondents sharing respectful or disrespectful incidents they experienced.

Then, for the second part of the study, a review of the themes of respectful or

disrespectful behavior from Appendix A was performed by reading each incident,

identifying a theme of respect or disrespect, and then tallying the amount each theme

occurred in the incidents. When this process was finished, a comparison between themes

previously identified by Dr. Salzman and themes identified during the review was made.

In comparing the themes, I was in full agreement with the themes of respectful and

disrespectful behaviors previously identified by Dr. Salzman. After all incidents were

analyzed, themes of respectful and disrespectful behavior or interactions were identified

based upon their frequency within the incidents. The three themes regarding respectful or

disrespectful interaction most frequently found in the incidents were Attention (A),

Equality (E), and Value (V). In other words, in most of the interactions or scenarios described by participants in Appendix A, for a student to feel respected or disrespected, they felt either attention, or a lack thereof, equality, or inequality, or felt valued, or not. This was determined based upon each participants' descriptions of their experiences of respectful and disrespectful interactions in high school in the Critical Incident (Episode Generation) Student/Student Form. Following the analysis, comparison, and the identification of theme-based exemplar incidents of respectful or disrespectful behaviors or interactions, a Likert scale, The Respect Survey (Appendix B) were developed based upon these themes. Each of the created scenarios for The Respect Survey, therefore, encompassed one or more of these three themes of respect of disrespect. The new scale (Appendix B) depicted scenarios of interacting high school students and measured students' views or perceptions of what behaviors tended to be viewed as respectful or disrespectful. A new set of 149 student participants from two high schools on Oʻahu were conveniently selected and administered The Respect Survey (Appendix B). As described above, of the participating high school sites, both had students from low socio-economic status, and were of various ethnic and cultural backgrounds. One of the schools was a predominantly Asian and foreign population. The other high school had many students from Oʻahu, intermixed with students from families that serve in the military. The Respect Survey was made up of 9 respectful interaction scenarios, and 9 disrespectful interaction scenarios. It was judged on a Likert scale, from 1-6, 1 being very disrespectful, and 6 being very respectful. When the scenarios were created, special attention was given to the most important themes (Attention, Equality, and Value) coming

from the described incidents of respectful interaction and disrespectful interaction from

Appendix A. Items were given a letter (A, E, or V) based upon which of the three themes

of respect or disrespect they came under (Attention, Equality, and Value). Then, they

were given a number based upon what order they came in for each of the themes.

Finally, they were labeled with an "R" for a respectful interaction, or a "DR" for a

disrespectful interaction. For example, the first question on the survey was a

disrespectful scenario with attention as its theme, so it was named A1DR. The goal of the

new scale (Appendix B) was to provide a more specific definition as to what behaviors

are interpreted as respectful or disrespectful between interacting high school students.

After each scenario rating, there was space left for participants to comment on the

scenario if they chose to do so. This allowed for further investigation and understanding

of possible student reactions to each respectful or disrespectful scenario, as well as an

opportunity for general feedback. During the data gathering sessions, I introduced

myself, explained to the participants the goal of the study, and gave directions for

completing the survey. I also gave participants the opportunity to ask questions.

For data analysis, I analyzed the data for reliability, as well as completed an

exploratory factor analysis. Also, I explored commonalities and comparisons across

culture using MANOVA statistical analyses.

Data Analysis

After collecting the data, an analysis was accomplished to identify respectful and

disrespectful behaviors or interactions using frequencies, reliability measures, exploratory

factor analyses, and MANOVA. All analyses were done using the Statistical Product and

Service Solutions (SPSS) statistical package.

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

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

Role of the Researcher

My role as the researcher was that of a theme analyzer and creator, scale constructor, survey facilitator, data collector, statistical analyzer, and writer. When implementing and drawing conclusions from this research, it was important to consider the effect of my background. Academically, I am trained in psychology and education. However, I have no formal experience creating data collection tools or using critical incident methodology. This may have led to the creation of a tool with mediocre reliability and validity, and to my misinterpretation of participants beliefs of respectful or

disrespectful interactions or behaviors. This also affected my analyses of the surveys in judging variables that influenced respect or disrespect, and may have led to incorrect assumptions and interpretations of the data. For clarification purposes and to minimize misinterpretations, I allowed for student questions before each data collection session, although not many questions were asked.

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

Results

Reliability

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

The Cronbach's alpha level for the respectful scenario items was 0.661, indicating a somewhat satisfactory34.99 level of internal consistency. According to the Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted statistics, if items E1R and V5R were deleted from the survey, Cronbach's alpha level would increase to 0.738. Therefore, these items weakened the internal consistency, and could be removed to improve reliability of the scale.

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

Both Cronbach's alpha levels for respectful scenario items and disrespectful scenario items were lower than when all of the items were combined. Therefore, to exemplify the strongest internal consistency, the items from both respectful scenarios and disrespectful scenarios were combined to provide the reliability measure. The Cronbach's alpha level of all the items (respectful scenarios and disrespectful scenarios) in the survey was 0.789, indicating an acceptable level of internal consistency. According to the Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted statistics, if item E1R or item V5R were deleted,

internal consistency would increase to 0.801, or a higher level of internal consistency.

The Corrected Item-Total Correlation value were low (0.028 and 0.140) for these items as

well, so removal of E1R and V5R would lead to only a small improvement in Cronbach's

alpha, and the reliability of the scale.

Overall, a Cronbach's alpha level of 0.789 for both respectful scenario items and

disrespectful scenario items indicated an acceptable level of internal consistency,

allowing for the survey to be a reliable measure of respectful and disrespectful scenarios

of interacting high school students.

Frequencies of Ratings for Disrespectful Scenario Items

The scenario item A1DR (See Appendix B) dealt with one high school student

directly insulting another high school student, and was rated by participants as

disrespectful (M=1.30, $S.D.$=0.542), and very disrespectful by 73.8% of the participants.

However, scenario item E2DR was not as clear, with only 23.5% of participants

rating the scenario as very disrespectful. Yet, it still received a rating of disrespectful

(M=2.13, $S.D.$=0.765). This scenario depicted a girl being bumped and not receiving an

apology.

The group rejection scenario, item V2DR, was rated as very disrespectful by

75.2% of the participants, and received a rating of disrespectful by participants (M=1.29,

$S.D.$=0.536).

The next disrespectful scenario, item A2DR involved inattentive and

inappropriate student interaction during a class presentation. This scenario was rated as

very disrespectful by only 47% of the participants, but still received, on average, a

disrespectful rating (*M*=1.71, *S.D.*=0.756).

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

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

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

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

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

Frequencies of Ratings for Respectful Scenario Items

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

The next scenario, Item V1R, exemplified one student valuing and encouraging another. This scenario was given an overall respectful rating by participants (*M*=5.40,

S.D.=0.666), and was rated as very respectful by 49.7% of the participants.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Table 2

Frequencies of Ratings

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

Factor Analysis

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

First, I checked to see if the all item factor analysis was appropriate, using several very important parts of the output: the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity. The KMO statistic varies between 0 and 1, and a value of 0 indicates that the sum of partial correlations is large relative to the sum of

correlations. This represents diffusion in the pattern of correlations, making factor analysis likely to be appropriate. A value close to 1 indicates that patterns of correlations are relatively compact, and so factor analysis should yield distinct and reliable factors. Kaiser (1974) recommends accepting values greater than 0.5 as acceptable, values between 0.7 and 0.8 are good, values between 0.8 and 0.9 are great and values above 0.9 are superb. For this data, the value was 0.725, which falls into the range of being good. Therefore, we should be confident that factor analysis was appropriate for the data. Bartlett's measure tested the null hypothesis that the original correlation matrix was an identity matrix. For the data, Bartlett's test was highly significant ($p < 0.001$), and therefore factor analysis was appropriate.

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

However, considering the smaller sample size for the data, we can also use the scree plot to determine the point of inflexion on the curve where factors start to account

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

Factor Extraction

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

Table 3 shows the communalities before and after extraction. Principal

component analysis works on the initial assumption that all variance is common; before

extraction the communalities are all 1. The communalities in the column labeled

Extraction reflect the common variance in the data structure. For example, only 0.4% of

the variance associated with item E1R is common, or shared, variance. Another way to

look at these communalities was in terms of the variance proportions explained by

underlying factors. After extraction, some factors were discarded; and therefore,

information was lost. The amount of variance in each variable that can be explained by

the retained factors was represented by the communalities after extraction.

Table 3

Communalities

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

Factor Rotation

Table 4 shows the rotated component matrix of the factor loadings for each

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

Table 4

Rotated Component Matrix

Item	Component	
	1	2
V4R	0.711	
V1R	0.677	
A3R	0.628	
V6R	0.583	
V3R	0.525	
A5R	0.483	
A6R	0.481	
V2DR	0.434	
E2DR	0.404	
E1R		
A4DR		0.724
E4DR		0.674
E6DR		0.643
E3DR		0.520
A1DR		0.481
E5DR		
V5R		
A2DR		

Interpretation

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

MANOVA with Primary Cultural Influence

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

The Multivariate Tests table gave the actual result of the one-way MANOVA for all the items in the survey with Primary Cultural Influence (PCI) as the independent variable. There was a significance value of 0.638, which meant $p > .05$. Therefore, participant ratings of a scenario as respectful or disrespectful was not significantly dependent on their primary cultural influence ($p > .05$). There was a statistically

insignificant difference in participant ratings based on participants' PCI, F (90, 615.774)

= 0.939, p > .05; Wilk's Λ = 0.536, partial η^2 = .117.

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

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

Discussion

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

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

Respectful Environment for Optimal Achievement

If schools have the task to create a culture of mutual respect so that students learn to their highest potential in an optimally nurturing environment, then knowledge and understanding of respect can help foster successful development and prevent psychological and behavioral problems, thus helping to create nurturing environments for promotion of human well-being (Biglan, Flay, Embry, & Sandler, 2012). In this study,

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

Attribution, ICS, and Critical Incident Technique in Relation to Respect

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

Respectful Solutions for Problem Behaviors

According to Singh et al., (2007), and Beets et al., (2009), aggressive, violent, or disruptive behaviors occur at problematic levels among American youths. Mayseless and Scharf (2011) advocated an increased emphasis on respect in schools, and other contexts, because of its potential for reducing aggression and violence. Although we could not clearly see any reduction in aggression and violence, identifying what behaviors may lead to these negative events may help prevent them. Mayer (1995) demonstrated that the aversive ways people treat each other in school settings was a major reason for the high

levels of aggression. Therefore, by recognizing each of the respectful or disrespectful behaviors, we could increase the knowledge and emphasis on them, and reduce aggressive or violent episodes in schools. In intergroup conflicts, Mayseless et al., (2011) explained that respect has been recognized as an important form of positive regard that helps to diffuse aggressive impulses. Respect, therefore, may play a role in mitigating aggression in school settings as well. Singh et al., (2007) contended that often these behaviors are controlled or managed through behavioral or other psychosocial interventions. Therefore, an appropriately designed and implemented school-based prevention program can prevent or reduce negative behaviors (Beets et al., 2009). Education needs to be provided after respectful and disrespectful behaviors have been identified in order to increase respectful behaviors and prevent disrespectful behaviors. Thus, an appropriate program must be implemented in order to facilitate a healthy and optimal school culture and environment, and prevention programs that can reduce the incidence of such behaviors should provide clear benefits.

Role of Respect in Social Context

Individuals' status in the group, the degree to which they are liked by the group, and or how fairly they are treated in interactions with group members are just some examples and definitions of cultural and universal respect (Mayseless et al., 2011). Goodman (2009) supported the universal idea of respect by saying it encompasses universal human dignity, autonomy, and equality. Definitions of cultural and universal respect were exemplified by participants of various cultures rating respectful and disrespectful scenarios in a relatively uniform fashion. Students from all cultures that

participated in the current study showed no statistically significant difference in opinion regarding behaviors or interactions that were respectful or disrespectful. One alternative explanation may be that the culture of Hawai'i and its people become a special case, where many cultures influence each other, creating a hybrid, more universal culture. This may in turn influence the attributions of respect and disrespect, and could account for the apparent "universal" nature of the attributions to particular behaviors in this study. However, Okamura (2008) challenged this "universal" view of Hawai'i culture by examining how ethnic inequality was maintained in island culture. Social relations were structured based upon ethnicity, and not race or class, and this signified the difference for Hawai'i. Residents of Hawai'i attributed greater social significance to the presumed cultural differences among ethnic groups than to more obvious physical differences.

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

Attribution and Inter-cultural Relations

The occurrence, form and meaning of a particular behavior in a particular situation, according to Triandis (1972), may differ across cultures due to differences in norms, values, role perceptions and experiences. However, in this study, the form and meaning of respectful and disrespectful behaviors were not different between cultures. In order to make our worlds more predictable and understandable, Heider (1958) indicated

that we are constantly engaged in the process of making inferences about causes and motives of behaviors. Because of this, it was easy to decipher what participants thought about behaviors, allowing them to rate scenarios based upon their inferences. Salzman (1990) explained attributions as the answer to the vital "why" questions about a behavior, and Albert and Triandis (1979) contended that it was the interpretations we give to these behavior that were critical. In this study, it was not possible to conclude why participants rated certain scenarios like they did; it was only possible to identify what behaviors were viewed as respectful or disrespectful. Conflict, rejection, and misunderstandings may result from discrepancies in attributions, thus creating a poor learning environment. Attributions, therefore, become key to explaining behavior, and must be guided through understanding of respectful and disrespectful behavioral interactions.

Implications

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

Be attentive. Students should pay attention to one another, especially while working and communicating in groups, and during class presentations. Respect, Howard (2010) explained, was implicitly tied to certain ways of speaking in situated classroom interactions. Also, students should avoid giving negative attention, such as insults, laughing at other students, and harassment. Students consistently rated scenarios dealing

with attention, or lack thereof, as respectful or disrespectful, therefore emphasizing the fact that attentive behavior could enhance respectful feelings, and inattentive behavior could be disrespectful. The attentive behaviors possibly tie into the idea of being valued, so first students may be encouraged to enhance value for one another.

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

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

Conclusion

If students acknowledge and understand what behaviors are viewed as respectful or disrespectful, it will result in positive interaction and emotion, and benefit the school

environment and experience. Students will learn how to behave in respectful ways, and

educating them about what behaviors are appropriate may foster this learning. Through

positive attention, equal treatment, and valuing one another, students can build respectful

relationships, creating a nurturing environment to optimally learn in. This, in turn, leads

to future successes in all aspects of life.

The primary analysis supported the prediction that participants would rate certain

behaviors as respectful, and others as disrespectful in response to critical incidents

identified according to procedures described in the construction of the ICS. The factor

analysis offered further support for these findings, where two factors, respectful behavior,

and disrespectful behavior, were identified. These similar attributional frameworks

between participants have regular identifications of either respectful or disrespectful

behaviors in these interactions. The findings suggest that between cultures, participants

tended to view the same behaviors or interactions as respectful or disrespectful. These

findings, therefore, exemplified a universal idea of respectful and disrespectful behavior

or interactions between cultures. It remains to be determined if these results indicated the

development of a "universal culture", with a consistent and coherent attributional

framework that serves the essential function for social behavior and prescribes behavioral

action.

Limitations

There are several limitations to this study. The findings are specific to the setting,

time, and population from which this research transpired. As such, this research study

did not gather a representative sample of all high school settings.

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

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

Future Directions

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

References

Aronson, E. (2003). *The social animal*. Worth Pub.

Ausch, R. (2010). Respect and Disrespect: Cultural and Developmental Origins. David W. Shwalb and Barbara J. Shwalb,(eds.) San Francisco: Wiley Periodicals, Inc. 2006. *Ethos*, *38*(1), 1-3.

Albert, R.A., & Triandis, H.C. (1979). Cross cultural training: A theoretical framework and observations. In H. Trueba and C. Barnett-Mizrahi (Eds.), *Bilingual Multicultural Education and the Professional from Theory to Practice*. MA: Newbury House.

Albert, R. D. (1983). The inter-cultural sensitizer or culture assimilator: A cognitive approach. *Handbook of inter-cultural training*, *2*, 186-217.

Beets, M. W., Flay, B. R., Vuchinich, S., Snyder, F. J., Acock, A., Li, K. K., Durlak, J. (2009). Use of a social and character development program to prevent substance use, violent behaviors, and sexual activity among elementary-school students in Hawaii. *American Journal of Public Health, 99*(8), 1438-1445. Doi: 10.2105/AJPH.2008.142919

Biglan, A., Flay, B., Embry, D., & Sandler, I (2012). The critical role of nurturing environments for promoting human well-being. *American Psychologist*, *67*(4), 257-271.

Brislin, R. W., Landis, D., & Brandt, M. E. (1983). Conceptualizations of inter-cultural behavior and training. *Handbook of inter-cultural training, 1*, 1-35.

Cushner, K. (1989). Assessing the impact of a culture-general assimilator. *International Journal of Inter-cultural Relations, 13*(2), 125-146.

Dean, S., & Galloway, D. (2008). Teaching respect: A school- and community-based approach to improving the social and educational climate. Can experiences in Canada have implications for practice in England? *Emotional & Behavioral Difficulties, 13*(3), 217-228.

Deutsch, N. L., & Jones, J. N. (2008). "Show Me an Ounce of Respect" Respect and Authority in Adult-Youth Relationships in After-School Programs. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 23*(6), 667-688.

Ertesvag, S. K., & Vaaland, G. S. (2007). Prevention and reduction of behavioral problems: An evaluation of the Respect program. *Educational Psychology, 27*(6), 713-736.

Flanagan, J. C. (1954). *The critical incident technique* (Vol. 51, No. 4). American Psychological Association.

Flay, B. R. (2002). Positive youth development requires comprehensive health promotion programs. *American Journal of Health Behavior, 26*(6), 407-424.

Flay, B. R., & Allred, C. G. (2003). Long-term effects of the Positive Action program. American *Journal of Health Behavior, 27*(Supplement 1), S6-S21.

Flay, B. R., & Allred, C. G. (2010). The positive action program: Improving academics, behavior, and character by teaching comprehensive skills for successful learning and living. In *International research handbook on values education and student wellbeing* (pp. 471-501). Springer Netherlands.

Goodman, J. F. (2009). Respect-due and respect-earned: negotiating student–teacher relationships. *Ethics and Education, 4*(1), 3-17.

Greenberg, J., Pyszczynski, T., & Solomon, S. (1982). The self-serving attributional bias: Beyond self-presentation. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 18*(1), 56-67.

Greenberg, J., & Rosenfield, D. (1979). Whites' ethnocentrism and their attributions for the behavior of blacks: A motivational bias. *Journal of Personality, 47*(4), 643-657.

Huffman, K. (2012). Psychology in action (10th ed.).

Huo, Y. J., Binning, K. R., & Molina, L. E. (2010). Testing an integrative model of respect: Implications for social engagement and well-being. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 36*(2), 200-212.

Huo, Y. J., Molina, L. E., Binning, K. R., & Funge, S. P. (2010). Subgroup respect, social engagement, and well-being: A field study of an ethnically diverse high school. *Cultural Diversity and Ethnic Minority Psychology, 16*(3), 427.

Johnson, I. M. (1999). School violence: The effectiveness of a school resource officer program in a southern city. *Journal of Criminal Justice, 27*(2), 173-192.

Jones, E. E., & Nisbett, R. E. (1971). *The actor and the observer: Divergent perceptions of the causes of behavior* (p. 16). New York: General Learning Press.

Kaiser, H. F. (1974). An index of factorial simplicity. *Psychometrika, 39*(1), 31-36.

Kelley, H. H. (1967). Attribution theory in social psychology. In *Nebraska symposium on motivation*. University of Nebraska Press.

Lance, A. (2010). A case study of two schools: identifying core values conducive to the building of a positive school culture. *Management in Education, 24*(3), 118-123.

Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Smith, L., & Phillips, S. (2003). Teasing, rejection, and violence: Case studies of the school shootings. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*(3), 202-214.

Mayer, G. R. (1995). Preventing antisocial behavior in the schools. J*ournal of applied behavior analysis, 28*(4), 467-478.

Mayseless, O., & Scharf, M. (2011). Human aggression and violence: Causes, manifestations, and consequences. *Series on personality and social psychology*, 277-294. Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association.

Meraviglia, M. G., Becker, H., Rosenbluth, B., Sanchez, E., & Robertson, T. (2003). The Expect Respect Project Creating a Positive Elementary School Climate. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 18*(11), 1347-1360.

Okamura, J. (2008). *Ethnicity and Inequality in Hawai'i*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Peterson, R. L., & Skiba, R. (2000). Creating school climates that prevent school violence. Preventing School Failure: Alternative Education for Children and Youth, 44(3), 122-129.

Pollard, W. R. (1989). Gender stereotypes and gender roles in cross-cultural education: the cultural assimilator. *International journal of inter-cultural relations, 13*(1), 57-72.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1979). The ultimate attribution error: Extending Allport's cognitive

   analysis of prejudice. Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 5(4), 461-476.

Salzman, M.B. (1990). The construction of an inter-cultural sensitizer training non-

   Navajo personnel. Journal of American Indian Education, 30(1).

Singh, N. N., Lancioni, G. E., Joy, S. D. S., Winton, A. S., Sabaawi, M., Wahler, R. G., &

Singh, J. (2007). Adolescents with conduct disorder can be mindful of their aggressive

   behavior. *Journal of Emotional and Behavioral Disorders, 15*(1), 56-63.

Stojanov, K. (2009). Overcoming social pathologies in education: On the concept of

   respect in RS Peters and Axel Honneth. *Journal of Philosophy of Education,*

   43(s1), 161-172.

Talmy, S. (2009). A very important lesson: Respect and the socialization of order (s) in

   high school ESL. *Linguistics and Education, 20*(3), 235-253.

Wang, H. (1993). Introduction to the Cross-Culture Psychology, Xi'an.

Weiner, B. (1992). *Human motivation: Metaphors, theories, and research*. SAGE

   Publications, Incorporated.

Woods, Larry A. (2007). *Respect is the key: At-risk high school students' perception of a*

   supportive caring learning environment. Dissertation Abstracts International

   Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 1765.

Appendix A

Critical Incident Form

Critical Incident (Episode Generation) Questionnaire

Student/Student Form

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

     _____

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

     C. First Language Learned:

     D. Gender:

     E. Age:

II. Critical Incident Question #1:

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

     A. What happened?

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

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

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

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

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

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

III. Critical Incident Question #2:

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

    A. What happened?

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

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

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

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

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

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

IV. Question:

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

V. Question:

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

VI. Other Comments:

Appendix B

The Respect Survey

Demographical Information

A. Primary Ethnic Identification (circle one):

    Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: _____

    African-American: _____

    European-American: _____

    Asian-American: _____

    Hispanic/Latino: _____

    Other (Please Specify):   _____

B. Primary Cultural Influence (circle one):

    Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander: _____

    African-American: _____

    European-American: _____

    Asian-American: _____

    Hispanic/Latino: _____

    Other (Please Specify):   _____

C. First Language Learned (circle one):

    English   Spanish   Chinese   Japanese   Korean

    Filipino   Hawaiian   Other

D. Gender (please circle):   Male   Female

E. Age: _____

Respect Survey

A1DR: When Natasha walked into class with a new dress her mom bought for her, her classmate said, "look at that ugly dress". How did Natasha view the girl's remark?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

E1R: Joey was always there to defend Peter from the bullies at school. When Joey was being bullied, Peter was always there to defend him. What do you think they thought of each others' behavior?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

 Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

E2DR: Britney was walking down the hall when a girl bumped into her and did not say sorry. What did Britney think about the girl's actions?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

 Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

V1R: Katie's friend Angela encouraged her to run for prom queen. Angela nominated Katie and told her that she believed she could win. What did Katie think of Angela's behavior?

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

V2DR: Melissa wanted to join a group for a project, but the group rejected her. She then overheard the group saying they were happy they had avoided her being a part of their group. How did Melissa view the group's behavior?

```
  1              2            3            4            5            6
```
Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

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

```
  1              2            3            4            5            6
```
Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

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

```
  1              2            3            4            5            6
```
Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

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

```
  1              2            3            4            5            6
```
Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful
Comment:

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

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

| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

A4DR: Sharon was walking down the hall when a group of boys began shouting inappropriate things at her. What did Sharon think of the boys' behavior?

1   2   3   4   5   6
Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

V6R: After Stan's project presentation, many of his classmates clapped for him and told him he did a great job. How did Stan view his classmates behavior?

1   2   3   4   5   6
Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

E5DR: Crystal was waiting in line to get her lunch when Tony cut in line in front of her. What did Crystal think of Tony's behavior?

1   2   3   4   5   6
Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

A5R: During class presentations, Alan watched each of his classmates present. When it was his turn to present, his classmates all watched carefully.   What did Alan think of the behavior of his class?

1   2   3   4   5   6

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

A6R: While in class, Janet was talking with a partner about ideas she had for an upcoming project. Her partner was responsive to her, and shared her ideas for the project as well. How did Janet view her partner's behavior?

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

E6DR: Josh wanted to play basketball on his lunch break. When the teams were made by his classmates, he was the only one not picked for a team, and therefore could not play. How did Josh view his classmates' behaviors?

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Very Disrespectful   Very Respectful

Comment:

Appendix C

Parental Consent Form

AGREEMENT TO PARTICIPATE IN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

_____   _____

Signature of Parent or Legal Guardian   Date

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

Appendix D

Student Consent Form

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

_____   _____
Signature of Minor   Date

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