

1706534

Empirical Project in Psychology

2020

Self-reported Handling of Bullying Among
Teachers in Primary and Secondary Schools

DECLARATION

This work has not previously been accepted in substance for any degrees and is not being concurrently submitted in candidature for any degrees.

Signed

Date

STATEMENT 1

This dissertation is being submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of BSc Applied Psychology/BSc Psychology/BSc Psychology and Counselling

Signed

Date

STATEMENT 2

This dissertation is the result of my own independent work/investigation, except where otherwise stated.

Other sources are acknowledged by giving explicit references. A reference list is appended.

Signed

Date

STATEMENT 3

I hereby give consent for my dissertation, if accepted, to be available for photocopying and for inter-library loan, and for the title and summary to be made available to outside organisations.

Signed

Date

Acknowledgements

In appreciation of her continued support and encouragement, my largest thank you goes to my dissertation supervisor, Dr Charlotte Greenway. Her guidance and support throughout the last three years has been invaluable and I truly believe I would not be where I am today without her and for that, I will remain truly grateful.

I would also like to thank my UWTSD Applied Psychology lecturers, particularly Karen Eaton-Thomas and Stuart Jones, who have helped me throughout my studies and encouraged me to reach my full potential.

I am also very appreciative of my family and friends as they have supported me and encouraged me to keep going, when I didn't think I could. Without them, I would not be writing my dissertation today.

Lastly, I would like to thank all the teachers who took the time to participate, in order to help me complete my dissertation. Without you, my dissertation would not be possible, so for that, I will always be truly grateful.

Contents

Title page	
Declarations	i
Acknowledgments	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Abstract	iv
Chapter 1 – Introduction	1
Chapter 2 – Methodology	12
2.1. Design	12
2.2. Participants	12
2.2.1. Table 1	13
2.3. Materials	13
2.4. Procedure	14
Chapter 3 – Results	16
3.1. Table 2	16
3.2. Table 3	17
Chapter 4 – Discussion	21
Reference List	30
Appendices	32

Abstract

The aim was to explore the extent to which a hypothetical bullying scenario is handled using the 'Handling Bullying Questionnaire' (HBQ) (Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa, 2008). The hypothesis predicts that there will be a difference in how a hypothetical bullying scenario is handled according to the type of school and length of teaching experience. An opportunity sample of 130 participants was conducted (40 males and 90 females). A between subjects design was used. All participants answered all twenty-two statements on the handling bullying survey (Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa, 2008). Five separate two-way ANOVAs and four separate one-way ANOVAs were conducted, and the results partially supported the hypothesis. This proposes implications for the educational sector; therefore, more research is needed.

Chapter 1 – Introduction

A considerable number of children and adolescents have been a victim of or are currently a victim of bullying as it is a common problem among youth (Burk, DiRenzo and Fuller, 2019). Different from aggression, bullying is often defined as a subcategory of aggressive behaviour that can be significantly related to social isolation or as noticeable as physical violence (Davis, 2015). Within schools, bullying is still a prominent problem and presents a threat to the safe learning environment that schools try and provide for their pupils. Bullying has now been recognised as a global problem among schools and is associated with psychological and financial costs to schools, victims, bullies and bystanders across the UK (Kennedy, Russom and Kevorkain, 2012). The UN Convention on the Rights of the Child recognises a child's right to be kept safe from harm and protected against violence, including school bullying and that children must be given adequate care from those looking after them. Where necessary, this can include the responsibility of the school and teachers making sure that children are safe from violence in the classroom (Assembly, 1989).

On a large scale, bullying has caused public concern due to its compelling effect on the development of children and adolescents (Davis, 2015). Bullying is defined as a prolonged negative interaction on both physical and verbal levels among young people that results from a perceived imbalance of power (Burk et al., 2019). Due to this negative interaction, it has produced much concern for the wellbeing of young people and the problems they may face, such as involvement in crime, experiencing suicidal thoughts and physical and mental health (Burk et al., 2019).

Previous research and bullying literature have shown that there are many types of bullying that young people can face, and some of these can include physical, verbal and relational. Physical bullying involves behaviours such as hitting, tripping and chocking, behaviours such as taunting and name-calling and verbal threats are all categorised as verbal bullying. As bullying can also be indirect and covert, it can include behaviours such as social exclusion and rejection and this type of bullying is more commonly known as relational (Davis, 2015).

Moreover, research has indicated that bullying can impact an individual's mental and physical health and if not dealt with effectively, the issues caused can last into adulthood. In a

school setting where bullying is present, if children and young people feel unsafe, their academic performance and emotional health can be greatly impacted. Glew, Fan, Katon, Rivara and Kernic, (2005), conducted a cross-sectional study which looked at bullying and its association with school performance. Three-thousand five-hundred and thirty pupils took part in the study and the results indicated that 22 percent of the children surveyed were involved in bullying, either as the victim, bully or both and they were more likely to have poor academic achievement (Glew et al., 2005).

Similarly, Juvonen, Wang and Espinoza, (2011), looked at the impact of bullying on academic performance. Eleven middle schools were surveyed at six different time points and the results indicated that higher levels of bullying were associated with disengagement in classroom activities and poor grades. This suggests that bullying is not a matter that can be ignored when trying to improve educational outcomes in schools (Juvonen et al., 2011).

As well as the educational outcomes of bullying, bullying can impact the mental health of children and young people. Research has shown that children and adolescents who have experienced bullying will show signs of stress and problems with their developing minds. Arseneault, Bowes and Shakoor, (2010), conducted a meta-analysis to determine whether bullying poses as a risk factor to mental health and explained how this should be the main reason for intervention. The results of this study indicated that being a victim of bullying can cause mental health problems including self-harm, unacceptable behaviour, as well as depression and anxiety (Arseneault et al., 2010).

Likewise, Kim et al. (2009) conducted a study which also looked at bullying and whether it affects mental health and the results of this study also showed that bullying increased the development of suicidal thoughts and increased self-harm in individuals who were victims of bullying. Although, there were many limitations of this study as the sample used was only compromised of one type of ethnicity (Davis, 2005).

School bullying is often present in the classroom and occurs when ‘a student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly or overtime, to negative actions on the part of one or more others students.’ (Mattioni, 2012, p. 2). Often divided into two categories, researchers that have focused on bullying in schools have identified several types of bullying. The first category refers to traditional or overt bullying and this can happen face-

to-face and can involve physical or verbal aggression. The second category refers to non-traditional or covert bullying. This type of bullying is indirect and uses a third party, is a type of relational aggression and is also often not seen by adults (Mattioni, 2012).

Recent research that has focused on the prevalence of school bullying has shown that bullying is a common phenomenon among schools. According to Kshirsagar, Agarwal and Bavdekar, (2007), 31.4 percent of children reported that they had experienced bullying at least once during their time in school. Also, in the UK, Smith et al., (2008), found that 19 percent of pupils aged 11-16 were being bullied during the year of research (Kshirsagar et al., 2007).

To provide individuals such as teachers and healthcare professionals with an improved understanding of bullying and the situations that may arise, many studies involving children and adolescents have been produced and much of this research has focused on bullying that occurs in schools and other youth settings, with particular focus on out-of-school settings. Bullying is a significant societal problem in today's society (Davis, 2015). Staff in schools need to be prepared to deal with bullying situations and act when these situations occur. Additionally, school staff can influence young people, either positively or negatively, upon the interactions young people have with each other. Due to this, teachers and other school staff must understand that they have a very important role when it comes to bullying in schools, as well as outside of schools (Mattioni, 2012).

As well as bullying that occurs in the classroom, teachers can also intervene when bullying occurs outside of the school environment. According to the Department of Education, (2017), sections 90 and 91 of the Education and Inspections Act 2006, state that schools can use their disciplinary powers to address a pupil's conduct when they are not in school and are not under the control of a member of the school staff. School staff can help tackle bullying scenarios anywhere off the school premises, such as in the local town centre, in local shops or on public transport (Department of Education, 2017).

In addition to this, in the last decade, it has become apparent that bullying occurs in most, if not all schools and happens more often than most teachers and parents realise as so many children and young people who have been a victim of bullying remain quiet. Bullying in schools can occur quite frequently and can have tragic consequences. From this,

reasonable evidence has been produced which support the notion that schools can do a considerable amount to reduce the problem of bullying (Wijtenburg, 2015).

Research conducted by Glover, Gough, Johnson and Cartwright, (2010) has shown that schools have begun to deal with bullying in various ways, such as implementing crisis intervention following actual bullying incidences and implementing anti-bullying strategies and policies, teachers taking action with bullies and victims over a longer time period to ensure bullying tendencies are completely eradicated, by sanctioning pupils and rewarding them where necessary, producing a change in whole school attitudes through personal and social education and assemblies and by sharing a positive school ethos (Glover et al., 2010).

Empirical research has shown that teachers can influence pupils in many different ways through their interactions, in particular, the way they handle bullying situations. Research has also shown that teachers vary in how they respond to bullying scenarios, although how they respond is not clear, as well as taking into account the factors that can influence their decisions (Yoon and Bauman, 2014). Many theoretical perspectives are used to explain how a teacher acts during a bullying incident and one of these can include Ajzen's (1987) theory of planned behaviours (Yoon and Bauman, 2014).

The theory of planned behaviours explains that human behaviour is navigated by intentions and explains that these intentions are altered by attitudes toward the behaviour, perceived behavioural control and perceived norms (Ajzen, 1991). Based on the hypothesis of this theory, it is thought that teacher responses to bullying situations are a result of realistic teacher responses to bullying, perceived behavioural control, normative beliefs about bullying and teacher attitudes regarding bullying (Yoon and Bauman, 2014).

Many researchers have used the hypothesis of the theory of planned behaviour as a framework for their studies and one of these can include that of McCabe, Robinson, Dragowski and Elizalde-Utnick, (2013). The aim of this study was to identify the attitudes, beliefs, school culture and perceived barriers that would predict whether teachers would intervene to stop bullying directed at lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender and questioning (LGBTQ) pupils in schools. Nine-hundred and sixty-eight teachers took part in the study and all completed a questionnaire which was organised according to the theory of planned behaviour which included questions tailored to attitudes, subjective norm and perceived

behavioural control. The results of this study showed that perceived norms and perceived behavioural control influenced how teachers intervened during harassment incidences among pupils. Although this study produced reliable results, this study also produced many limitations and one of these can include the chance of report-bias. Many of the participants could have been dishonest when completing the questionnaire, and therefore confounding the results. Despite the limitations, this study has supported that there is a positive link between attitudes and perceived norms when witnessing bullying behaviour and also supports the hypothesis of the theory of planned behaviour (McCabe et al., 2013).

Much previous research has shown that factors such as attitudes can influence how a teacher will intervene during bullying incidences and research by Bauman and Del Rio, (2006) has shown that a teacher's level of empathy towards the victim influences the likelihood of intervention. When looking at teacher responses to bullying incidences, researchers should use the theory of planned behaviour to provide a better understanding of the factors that can influence a teacher's response to bullying. Also, the findings of many studies provide an important direction for teacher training to tackle how bullying incidences are handled in schools (Yoon and Bauman, 2014).

Most of the research which has looked into school climate has been conducted with teachers and many researchers hold a strong belief that teachers play an important role in preventing the causes of bullying. As stated by Yoon and Barton, (2008), teachers are the main individuals that interact with children and young people daily through giving discipline, managing the classroom and by engaging pupils in school activities. During these interactions, teachers have the responsibility to make sure that these activities are teaching children and young people behaviours that are socially acceptable where children and young people can regulate their behaviours and positively interact with other pupils. As teachers can greatly influence pupils, their attitudes, perceptions and how they conduct themselves in the classroom are factors that contribute to the school climate and need to be considered to prevent bullying in the classroom (Yoon and Barton, 2008).

Within schools, teachers have a very important role to play when it comes to anti-bullying and are most likely to be the first to witness a bullying incident. In addition, teachers are likely to be individuals who identify and respond to a bullying situation. Although, how teachers intervene and handle a bullying incident can be influenced by how they perceive the

situation and research has shown that teachers are more likely to intervene with certain forms of bullying than others (Tucker and Maunder, 2015).

Many studies conducted in different countries have shown that teacher intervention during bullying incidences have been inconsistent and infrequent and one explanation for this can include how teachers are often unaware of the occurrence of bullying or may confuse it with general child's play (Sairanen and Pfeffer, 2011). Moreover, teachers may not be aware of effective interventions that they can use in their classrooms, and they may not be confident in their ability to handle bullying (Sairanen and Pfeffer, 2011).

Teachers need to recognise bullying effectively due to how many victims do not tell anyone about their experiences. Due to this, teachers should incorporate bullying discussions with their pupils in the classroom and encourage them to tell someone when it occurs. This should remain paramount as victims often do not have someone to confide in (Tucker and Maunder, 2015).

Many previous studies have looked at how teachers handle bullying situations in primary and secondary schools and one of these can include that of Tucker and Maunder, (2015). The primary aim of this study was to explore the perceptions of bullying and strategies used to prevent and manage it among primary school teachers in England. This study consisted of six teachers from two primary schools and all took part in interviews. The interviews included the topics of definitions of bullying, strategies used to prevent bullying and management and identification of bullying and analysis was conducted via thematic analysis. The results of this study showed that teachers viewed bullying as circumstantial and dependent on many factors. Moreover, the results also showed that the teachers made their intervening decisions based on the type of bullying and how serious an incident appears to be. Although this study showed significant results, it also provided many limitations and one of these can include the relatively small sample size. Due to this, the results of this study cannot be applied to the general population of teachers. Overall, the results of this study show that there are many factors which indicate why teachers will not choose to intervene and handle bullying scenarios in the classroom in primary schools (Tucker and Maunder, 2015).

As well as primary schools, many researchers have also looked at how teachers handle bullying situations in secondary schools and one of these can include that of Sairanen

and Pfeffer, (2011). This study aimed to explore teacher views on the extent of bullying and how they would intervene in bullying situations. This study consisted of 136 teachers from junior high schools in Finland and all participants completed the Handling Bullying Questionnaire. The results of this study indicated that teachers were more likely to discipline the bully, before working with the victims. The results also showed that teachers would not ignore the incident. Although this study produced compelling results, it also produced many limitations and one of these can include the single use of Finnish pupils. Due to this, it would be difficult to apply the results of this study to British school pupils, due to the study only using pupils of Finnish backgrounds. Although the study has shown that in contrast to the study by Tucker and Maunder, (2015), primary school teachers will not intervene in bullying situations due to several factors, secondary school teachers will intervene confidently, although they will discipline the bully first, before helping the victim (Sairanen and Pfeffer, 2011).

As well as the type of school and the differences they show in how teachers handle bullying scenarios, the length of experience that an individual hold can affect how teachers handle incidences of bullying and according to Oldenburg et al. (2014), teachers who are new to their careers need to develop a teaching routine and have less experience in handling bullying than teachers who are more experienced.

Many researchers have looked into teacher characteristics and one of these can include that of Oldenburg et al. (2014). This study aimed to explore whether teacher characteristics and peer victimisation in elementary schools are associated and one of these characteristics included a teacher's length of work experience. This study consisted of 139 teachers and all participants completed the Olweus Bully/Victim questionnaire. The results of this study suggested that teachers who are new to their careers are less likely to intervene during bullying incidences when compared to teachers who are more experienced in their role. Although the results of this study are positive, it has also produced many limitations and one of these can include how the study was cross-sectional, and due to this, conclusions on causal directions cannot be drawn. Although, this study has shown that teachers who have less experience will be less likely to intervene during bullying incidences when compared to teachers with a long experience in teaching (Oldenburg et al., 2014).

An important aspect to consider when looking at how teachers handle bullying in schools can include factors that can influence how they choose to handle bullying scenarios and one of these can include how serious they believe the incident is. Perception of seriousness refers to a teacher's own perceptions about a specific incident. Concerning bullying, the perceptions that teachers have about whether they think an incident is serious has been found to relate to how involved a teacher may get with bullying situations (Mattioni, 2012).

Furthermore, a teacher's perceived seriousness of a bullying incident can pose an impact on whether the teacher will intervene or the type of response a teacher may take. Rigby, (2002), stated that some schools may implement an approach to bullying that is more disciplinary as bullying behaviour is recognised to be more serious. Although, Yoon, (2004), explained that teacher perceptions of seriousness were corresponding with the likelihood of intervention and empathy towards bullying victims. Moreover, Yoon and Kerber, (2003), found that teachers are less likely to intervene in situations that they feel are not as serious as others and when they do intervene, they are more lenient in situations that they feel are less serious (Ellis et al, 2007).

Ellis and Shute, (2007), conducted a study which looked at teacher responses to bullying. Their study aimed to examine the role of perceived seriousness of bullying incidences and the study consisted of 127 teachers from a range of primary and secondary schools. All participants completed a questionnaire and the results of this study indicated that a teacher's perceived seriousness of bullying was an important factor for intervention. This shows that an increased understanding of the seriousness of bullying is needed (Ellis and Shute, 2007).

In addition to perceived seriousness, another factor that can influence how teachers handle bullying in schools can include their beliefs of self-efficacy. Beliefs of self-efficacy in teachers are related to how bullying scenarios are dealt with, as well as perceived control. Self-efficacy also refers to an individual's beliefs about their ability to carry out a particular course of action effectively (Skinner, Babinski and Gifford, 2014).

One study which has looked at the self-efficacy of teachers can include that of Bauman and Del Rio, (2006). This study consisted of 82 undergraduate students in a teacher

education programme and they all responded to six written vignettes on bullying scenarios. The results of this study indicated that when assessing teacher beliefs about classroom management of bullying, teachers believed that they should implement anti-bullying strategies into the classroom that they feel they could implement effectively, although they were unsure of which interventions would be the most effective (Bauman and Del Rio, 2006).

In addition, Kahn, Jones and Weiland, (2012), conducted a study which looked at teacher coping styles as a predictor of their bullying responses. Ninety-seven teachers participated and completed a survey that consisted of eight bullying vignettes. Results indicated that overt aggression was viewed as more severe than relational and teachers who use more active intervention and less self-blame had an improved response to bullying than the teachers who have lower self-efficacy (Kahn et al., 2012).

Many studies and much previous research has shown that children and young people are aware of the expectations of teachers and this could, in turn, influence an individual's perceptions of themselves and influence future behaviour. A teacher's self-efficacy in addressing bullying situations could affect how they choose to manage their classroom and how they collaborate with pupils. Additionally, as research suggests, teachers who have higher levels of self-efficacy in handling bullying situations were more likely to resolve them (Skinner et al., 2014).

Exploring how teachers handle bullying scenarios in the classroom is important because of the implications to education. From this research, educational settings can ensure that teachers and other school staff are receiving the relevant training needed to provide them with a better understanding of how their attitudes and perceptions can impact how they handle bullying incidences in the classroom. This training can educate individuals on how factors such as their empathy towards pupils, perceived seriousness of the problem and likeliness to intervene during bullying incidents can impact how bullying is dealt with in the classroom and how this can increase the current problem of bullying within their classrooms. Previous research has suggested that teachers are not completely satisfied with their initial training concerning effectively managing a classroom and this could relate to how well teachers feel they can deal with and intervene during bullying incidences. In turn, research has shown that when teachers are given the relevant training, they provide a positive learning environment for children. Due to this, training concerning bullying in the classroom should be paramount for teachers who are new to their careers (Nicolaidis, Toda and Smith, 2002).

Moreover, this research and previous research into teacher attitudes of bullying and how bullying scenarios are handled in the classroom can facilitate schools with an improved understanding of the importance of implementing anti-bullying interventions into the classroom. To develop effective anti-bullying interventions in the classroom, educators, school counsellors, teachers and school psychologists need to be made aware of the educational implications associated with bullying. From this research, teachers and other school staff will be made aware of the impact of bullying and how this provides importance for bullying prevention in the classroom. Training can provide teachers with an understanding that they are responsible for implementing effective anti-bullying interventions and to do this, educators and schools can ensure that teachers and other school staff are properly trained to recognise the bullying dynamic (Davis, 2015).

From this research, educational settings can ensure that teachers and other school staff are being facilitated with an improved understanding of the importance of teacher attitudes and perceptions and how these can influence how they handle bullying in the classroom. Also, by looking at the research surrounding the topic of bullying, teachers and other school staff will be able to understand the factors which can affect school climate to improve current bullying policy, improve learning processes in the classroom and to promote the safety of all children and young people (Davis, 2015).

Therefore, based on the above research, the aim of this study was to explore the extent to which a hypothetical bullying scenario is handled using the 'Handling Bullying Questionnaire' (HBQ) (Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa, 2008). This study also aims to establish whether primary and secondary school teachers differ in their handling of a bullying scenario and aims to establish any differences in the handling of bullying scenarios dependent on years of teaching experience. It is predicted that teachers would be more inclined to handle bullying situations rather than ignore them. Also, due to the relatively little research that compares primary and secondary schools and the differences in how they handle bullying scenarios, it is predicted that primary school teachers and secondary school teachers will differ in how they handle bullying scenarios. It is also predicted that secondary school teachers will be more likely to handle bullying scenarios by disciplining the bully, confirming the findings of Sairanen and Pfeffer, (2011). Moreover, due to the limited research that compares the length of teaching experience of teachers and the differences in how bullying scenarios are handled, it is also predicted that teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and

teachers with 5+ years teaching experience will differ in how they handle bullying scenarios. It is also predicted that teachers with 5+ years teaching experience will be more likely to handle bullying scenarios, confirming the findings of Oldenburg et al., (2014). Lastly, it is predicted that primary school teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and secondary school teachers with 5+ years teaching experience will differ in how they handle bullying scenarios.

Chapter 2 – Methodology

2.1 Design:

A between subject's design was used. There are two independent variables with two conditions in each. The first variable was the type of school (primary and secondary) and the second variable was the length of teaching experience (1-4 years and 5+years). The dependent variable in this study is the score across the five subscales on the Handling Bullying Questionnaire (Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa, 2008) across five levels; Working with the victim, Working with the bully, Ignore the incident, Enlist other adults and Discipline the bully. In order to answer Research Question One, "Will there be a difference in how teachers handle a hypothetical bullying scenario according to the school-type (primary or secondary) and length of experience in the classroom?", five separate two-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) 2 (school type: primary or secondary) x 2 (teaching experience: 1-4 years or 5+ years) were calculated for each of the five handling subscales using SPSS version 26. In order to find out whether the scores on the five handling subscales were significant between the four groups, four separate one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) were calculated for each of the groups (primary and secondary and 1-4 years and 5+ years teaching experience).

2.2 Participants

Emails explaining the nature of the study were sent to the Headteachers of approximately 300 schools in Wales; 150 primary schools and 150 secondary schools. A link to the survey was placed at the end of the email, and the Headteachers of the schools were asked to disseminate the survey to all teachers in their schools. A total of 60 (14 males and 46 females) primary school teachers and 70 (26 males and 44 females) secondary school teachers from public schools across Wales, UK, responded, taken from a sample of 150 primary schools and 150 secondary schools. All participants were aged between 18 and 60. Although, 23 questionnaires were not included in the analysis because respondents failed to complete all questions on the handling questionnaire.

Ethical approval was granted by the University of Wales Trinity Saint David. At the beginning of the survey, participants were presented with information regarding consent where they could give their full consent to participate in the study. This section also explained to participants that their participation in the study is completely voluntary and that they could withdraw from the study. The questionnaire only required the demographic information needed to ensure anonymity and confidentiality were maintained.

2.2.1 Table 1

Demographic information of respondents in frequencies and percentages.

Demographic Variables	Primary		Secondary		1-4 years teaching experience		5+ years teaching experience	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%
	60	46	70	54	48	37	82	63
Gender								
Male	14	23	26	37	15	31	25	30
Female	46	77	44	63	33	69	57	70
Age								
18-25	12	20	11	16	22	46	1	1
26-45	18	30	33	47	18	38	33	40
46-60	17	28	16	23	2	4	31	38
60+	13	22	10	14	6	12	17	21

2.3 Materials

The survey included an information section (see appendix A), a consent section (see appendix B), a demographic questionnaire (see appendix C) and a Handling Bullying Questionnaire (HBQ) (Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa, 2008) (see appendix D) and a debrief information section (see appendix E). All teachers received the same questionnaire. A demographics questionnaire was administered to gather information about age, gender, school-type and length of service. The HBQ measures teacher's responses to five key aspects of intervention and assesses the ways in which teachers respond to bullying scenarios in the classroom via a hypothetical verbal bullying scenario. Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa (2008) revised the reliability and validity of the HBQ and the Cronbach's alpha was reported at .77.

The HBQ contains a brief hypothetical scenario of a student being repeatedly bullied directly in the form of verbal aggression and indirectly in the form of social exclusion. The scenario on which participants were asked to base their answers was as follows: *A 12-year-old student is being repeatedly teased and called unpleasant names by another, more powerful, student who has successfully persuaded other students to avoid the targeted person as much as possible. As a result, the victim of this behaviour is feeling angry, miserable, and often isolated.* The scenario is followed by twenty-two items of ways of handling the scenario which allows the participants to respond on a Likert type scale ranging from 1 (I

definitely would not) to 5 (I definitely would). The mid-point rating (3) was labelled 'I'm unsure'.

The HBQ also has five subscales: (1) Working with the victim (e.g. I would suggest that the victim act more assertively) (four items). (2) Working with the bully (e.g. I would discuss with the bully options from which he or she could make a choice in order to improve the situation) (five items). (3) Ignoring the incident (e.g. I would leave it for someone else to sort out) (five items). (4) Enlisting other adults (e.g. I would discuss the matter with my colleagues at school) (five items). (5) Disciplining the bully (e.g. I would make it clear to the bully that his or her behaviour would not be tolerated) (three items). Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa (2008) revised the reliability and validity of the subscales and reported the Cronbach alpha for working with the victim at .75, working with the bully at .69, ignoring the incident at .70, enlisting other adults at .63 and disciplining the bully at .45. The HBQ that is used for the present study employed the original hypothetical bullying scenario.

Scores for each scale were calculated by summing the items on each scale and dividing by the number of items representing that scale. This method was used because the number of items among the scales varied and to determine the means for each scale to allow each scale score to be compared. For each of the scales except 'ignoring the incident', higher scores indicated stronger endorsement of the strategy. All data was analysed using SPSS version 26.

2.4 Procedure

Following ethical approval for the study, the survey items on the HBQ were entered into Qualtrics Survey Software, an online survey software format used for collecting survey data. An email explaining the nature of the study was sent to the Headteachers of 300 schools in Wales; 150 primary schools and 150 secondary schools and the email contained a link to the survey. The Headteachers shared the survey with the teachers at their school. Upon opening the link, the participants viewed an information section explaining the topic of the study, followed by a consent information section where they could consent to participate in the study. This section also explained their right to withdraw. Participants were unable to continue to complete the HBQ unless they had given their full consent to participate.

Once the questionnaire had been completed, participants were presented with a debrief information section which explained the purpose and aims of the study, that their information will remain anonymous and confidential and that they could still withdraw from the study. Participants were not asked for any personal information following the

participation of this study. All measures used in the study took approximately ten minutes to complete and were presented in the following order: Information section, Demographics survey, Consent information, Handling Bullying Questionnaire, Debrief information.

Chapter 3 – Results

The following section presents the results for the school-type and length of teaching experience on a handling bullying survey. Table 2 presents the means and standard deviations of the school-type and length of teaching experience on each of the five handling bullying measures.

3.1 Table 2

Mean differences and standard deviations for school-type and length of teaching experience on the five handling scales.

Variable	Primary		Secondary		1-4 years		5+ years	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Working with the victim	11.53	3.40	9.76	3.28	10.26	3.44	11.03	3.43
Working with the bully	20.12	3.05	19.01	3.25	19.46	3.04	19.67	3.32
Ignoring the incident	6.52	3.31	6.06	1.73	6.93	3.61	6.06	1.63
Enlisting other adults	21.82	3.06	19.82	2.70	20.80	2.96	20.83	3.06
Disciplining the bully	13.41	2.38	13.72	1.78	13.72	1.93	13.41	2.16

Table 2 shows that when looking at working with the victim, primary school teachers and teachers with 5+ years teaching experience held the highest means, whereas secondary school teachers and teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience held the lowest means. For working with the bully, it can be seen that primary school teachers and teachers with 5+ years' teaching experience held the highest means, although secondary school teachers and teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience held the lowest means. Scores for ignoring the incident were very similar among all the conditions, although primary school teachers held the highest mean for enlisting other adults when compared to secondary school teachers and teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience held the highest mean when compared to teachers with 5+ years teaching experience. Lastly, when looking at disciplining the bully, secondary school teachers and teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience held the highest mean when compared to primary school teachers and teachers with 5+ years teaching experience.

Table 3 presents the means and standard deviations for the school-type and length of teaching experience interaction on the five handling bullying measures.

3.2 Table 3

Mean differences and standard deviations for school-type and length of teaching experience interaction on the five handling scales.

Variable	Primary				Secondary			
	1-4 years		5+ years		1-4 years		5+ years	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Working with the victim	11.15	2.99	11.91	3.69	9.36	3.74	10.15	3.16
Working with the bully	19.73	3.22	20.5	2.92	19.18	2.86	18.83	3.44
Ignoring the incident	7.31	4.61	5.74	1.52	6.55	1.90	6.38	1.67
Enlisting other adults	21.92	2.74	21.71	3.32	19.68	2.80	19.96	2.67
Disciplining the bully	13.58	2.21	13.24	2.52	13.86	1.58	13.58	1.88

As shown by Table 3, primary school teachers with 5+ years teaching experience held the highest means when looking at working with the victim when compared to secondary school teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience who held the lowest mean. For working with the bully, primary school teachers with 5+ years teaching experience held the highest means, whereas secondary school teachers with 5+ years teaching experience held the lowest means. When looking at ignoring the incident, it can be seen that primary school teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience held the highest means, when compared to primary school teachers with 5+ years teaching experience who held the lowest means, although, scores were very similar across secondary school teachers with 1-4 years and 5+ years teaching experience. Means for enlisting other adults were very similar across all conditions, although primary school teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience held the highest means, whereas secondary school teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience held the lowest. Lastly, when looking at disciplining the bully, mean scores were also very similar across all the conditions, however, secondary school teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience held the highest means, when compared to primary school teachers with 5+ years teaching experience who held the lowest means.

In order to explore whether these differences are significant, a two-way 2 (school type: primary or secondary) x 2 (teaching experience: 1-4 years or 5+ years) mixed ANOVA was conducted and this was done separately for each subscale.

Working with the victim

The results of the two-way ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for school-type, with a large effect size, $F(3,126) = 8.44, p = .004, \eta^2 = .063$, but not for teaching experience $F(3,126) = 1.58, p = .211, \eta^2 = .012$, or the interaction $F(1,139) = .000, p = .984, \eta^2 = .000$, with a small to large effect size respectively. The main effect for school type indicates that primary school teachers are more likely to work with the victim during a bullying scenario than secondary school teachers ($M = 11.53, SD = 3.40$ and $M = 9.76, SD = 3.28$, respectively).

Working with the bully

The results of the two-way ANOVA revealed no significant main effect for school-type, with a large effect size, $F(3,126) = 3.64, p = .059, \eta^2 = .028$, and no significant main effect for teaching experience, $F(3,126) = .131, p = .718, \eta^2 = .001$, or the interaction $F(3,126) = .926, p = .338, \eta^2 = .007$, with a small to medium effect size respectively. This indicates that differences in working with the bully scores were not statistically significant between the school type and length of teaching experience.

Ignoring the incident

The results of the two-way ANOVA revealed no significant main effect for school type, with a small effect size, $F(3,126) = .017, p = .896, \eta^2 = .000$, and no significant main effect for teaching experience, $F(3,126) = 3.50, p = .064, \eta^2 = 0.27$, or the interaction $F(3,126) = 2.27, p = .135, \eta^2 = 0.18$, with medium effect sizes respectively. This indicates that differences in ignoring the incident scores were not statistically significant between the primary and secondary teachers nor the length of teaching experience.

Enlisting other adults

The results of the two-way ANOVA revealed a significant main effect for school-type, with a large effect size, $F(3,126) = 14.21, p = .000, \eta^2 = .101$, but not for teaching experience $F(3,126) = .003, p = .955, \eta^2 = .000$, or the interaction $F(3,126) = .218, p = .642, \eta^2 = .002$, with small effect sizes respectively. The main effect for school type indicates that primary

school teachers are more likely to enlist other adults during a bullying scenario than secondary school teachers ($M = 21.82$, $SD = 3.06$ and $M = 19.82$, $SD = 2.70$, respectively).

Disciplining the bully

The results of the two-way ANOVA revealed no significant main effect for school-type, with a medium effect size, $F(3,126) = .687$, $p = .409$, $\eta^2 = .005$, and no significant main effect for teaching experience, $F(3,126) = .660$, $p = .418$, $\eta^2 = .005$, or the interaction, $F(3,126) = .006$, $p = .936$, $\eta^2 = .000$, with a medium to small effect size respectively. This indicates that differences in disciplining the bully scores were not statistically significant between the school type and length of teaching experience.

To explore if there were significant differences between the strategies used by both primary and secondary school teachers and teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and 5+ years teaching experience, two separate one-way ANOVAs were conducted across the five subscales.

The results of the one-way ANOVA for primary school teachers revealed a significant difference between the strategies selected ($F(4,295) = 257.15$, $p = .000$). A Tukey post-hoc test revealed significant differences across each of the strategies ($p < .05$). This indicates that the handling bullying strategies chosen by primary school teachers were all effective.

For secondary school teachers, the results of the one-way ANOVA revealed significant differences across all combinations ($F(4,345) = 333.9$, $p = .000$). A Tukey post-hoc test revealed significant differences across each of the strategy combinations except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults ($p = .230$). This shows that working with the victim and disciplining the bully were the strategies chosen by most of the teachers, except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults.

Results of the one-way ANOVA for teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience revealed significant differences across each of the strategy combinations ($F(2,239) = 180.60$, $p = .000$). A Tukey post-hoc test revealed significant differences across all combinations except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults ($p = .157$). This shows that

working with the victim and disciplining the bully were the strategies chosen by most of the teachers, except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults.

For teachers with 5+ years teaching experience, the results of the one-way ANOVA revealed significant differences across each of the strategy combinations ($F(4,405) = 382.58$, $p = .000$). A Tukey post-hoc test revealed significant differences across all combinations except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults ($p = .065$). This shows that working with the victim and disciplining the bully were the strategies chosen by most of the teachers, except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults.

Chapter 4 – Discussion

The primary aim of this study was to explore the extent to which a hypothetical bullying scenario is handled using the ‘Handling Bullying Questionnaire’ (HBQ) (Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa, 2008). This study also aimed to establish whether primary and secondary school teachers differ in their handling of a bullying scenario and aimed to establish any differences in the handling of bullying scenarios dependent on years of teaching experience.

Overall, this study has found that primary school teachers and secondary school teachers were most inclined to enlist other adults, followed by working with the bully, disciplining the bully and working with the victim. As expected, teachers were least likely to ignore the incident as this specific subscale received the lowest scores from all the groups. School-type was found to be a statistically significant variable in explaining the responses of teachers and all the predictions regarding school-type were supported and both primary school teachers and secondary school teachers handled bullying scenarios effectively.

Length of teaching experience did not have a significant effect on the responses to the handling bullying strategies as all scores among the conditions were very similar. The only statistically significant comparison between teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and 5+ years teaching experience was for working with the victim, disciplining the bully and ignoring the incident. Teachers with 5+ years teaching experience were more likely to work with the victim than teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience. From this, it can be said that teaching experience does not appear to improve or worsen teacher’s self-reported handling effectiveness.

The results of this study revealed that primary and secondary school teachers and teachers with 1-4 years and 5+ years teaching experience were more likely to handle bullying incidences, rather than ignore them, therefore supporting the hypothesis. Research has shown that up to 50 percent of school pupils have experienced bullying in primary schools, whereas only 10 to 20 percent of school pupils have experienced bullying in secondary schools (Oliver and Candappa, 2003). As hypothesised, statistical significance showed that primary school teachers and secondary school teachers were more inclined to handle bullying scenarios rather than ignore them as they both scored the highest on the ‘Enlisting other adults’ subscale, followed by ‘Working with the bully’, ‘Disciplining the bully’, ‘Working

with the victim' and 'Ignoring the incident' (see Table 2). Although, primary school teachers were significantly more likely to work with the victim and enlist other adults when compared to secondary school teachers. This also supports the prediction that primary school teachers and secondary school teachers would differ in how they handle bullying scenarios.

Confirming the findings of Sairanen and Pfeffer, (2011) and supporting the hypothesis, the results indicate that secondary school teachers were more likely to discipline the bully, before working with the victim, as well as confirming that teachers would be less likely to ignore the incident. These findings also provide important implications for the victim, as research has shown that children who experience bullying leave the situation pass, without telling an adult.

Moreover, as predicted, the results indicated that all teachers were more inclined to handle bullying scenarios rather than ignore them as they all scored the highest on the 'Enlisting other adults' subscale, followed by 'Working with the bully', 'Disciplining the bully', 'Working with the victim' and 'Ignoring the incident' (see Table 2). However, no statistical significance was found between teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and teachers with 5+ years teaching experience. Although, the results show significant differences among the scores for each handling strategy for teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and teachers with 5+ years teaching experience, supporting the predictions that teachers would differ in how they handle bullying scenarios. These findings, however, are contradictory to the findings of Oldenburg et al., (2014), neither supporting the hypothesis that teachers with 5+ years teaching experience will be more likely to handle bullying scenarios as no statistical significance was found between the subscales. The results also did not support the interaction prediction that primary school teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and secondary school teachers with 5+ years teaching experience will differ in how they handle bullying scenarios, as no statistical significance was found between the subscales. This finding did not support the findings of Oldenburg et al., (2014), as the findings of this study indicated that the type of school and the length of teaching experience do not make a significant difference as to how a bullying scenario is handled.

Significant differences were found between all the handling bullying strategies among primary school teachers, although for secondary school teachers, significant differences were found between all the handling bullying strategy scores, except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults. This could be due to how secondary school teachers scored very similarly on the working with the bully and enlisting other adults' subscales, indicating that

secondary schools are equally as likely to enlist other adults, as they are to work with the bully. It is important that future training regarding bullying for teachers focuses on specific areas of how to handle bullying incidences, where training teachers in how to work with the victim is of paramount importance. Research has shown that implementing training for teachers and developing anti-bullying strategies is more difficult in secondary schools and this could be due to how secondary schools are larger than primary schools. In addition, within secondary schools, a teacher's role may differ and may see the responsibility for dealing with bullying as more diffused, therefore, teachers may find reacting to bullying incidences more difficult (Smith, 2009).

Significant differences were also found between all the handling bullying strategy scores among teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience, except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults. This could be due to how teachers scored very similarly on the working with the bully and enlisting other adults' subscales, indicating that teachers are equally as likely to enlist other adults, as they are to work with the bully. For teachers with 5+ years teaching experience, significant differences were also found between all the handling bullying strategy scores, except for working with the bully and enlisting other adults. This could be due to how teachers scored very similarly on the working with the bully and enlisting other adults' subscales, indicating that teachers are equally as likely to work with the bully, as they are to enlist other adults. According to Oldenburg et al., (2014), teachers that have recently started their careers will be less experienced in how to handle incidences of bullying, whereas teachers who are more experienced would have encountered more bullying incidences, and therefore, would have an advanced understanding of how to handle bullying scenarios when they arise. Although, research has also shown that bullying occurs more often in the classrooms of more experienced teachers, and this could explain how this study found no difference in the length of teaching experience (Oldenburg et al., 2014).

These findings also show that length of teaching experience does not make a difference in how bullying scenarios are handled on these two levels. This could be due to how research has shown that teachers often need advice and guidance for dealing with bullying incidences, as well as dealing with the victims and their parents and this could be due to a variety of factors, including beliefs of self-efficacy (Oliver and Candappa, 2003). All schools should aim to provide teachers with enhanced support when dealing with bullying

incidences, as some teachers may feel less confident to handle bullying incidences than others. In order to increase a teacher's confidence and self-efficacy, specific procedures that focus on effective management of bullying behaviours should be given to all teachers, to ensure that all teachers are confident when it comes to handling bullying incidences when they arise (Ozkilic, 2014).

The most important part of effective handling bullying measures is that the bullying incident is not ignored, and therefore, was an important finding of this study. According to Olweus, (1993), teachers must intervene during bullying incidences, even if they suspect that bullying is taking place (Sairanen and Pfeffer, 2011). The hypothetical bullying scenario used in the present study made it clear that verbal and relational bullying was taking place. As predicted, teachers chose to handle the bullying scenario, rather than ignore it, and this is shown as all teachers held the lowest scores, when compared to the other handling bullying measures.

Although this study has produced interesting results, it has also produced many limitations. One of these includes how a teacher's response to bullying could have been influenced by their attitudes towards bullying in general. Satisfaction with their occupations, including the amount of bullying training received, could have influenced how they choose to handle bullying incidences, although satisfaction with their occupation was not independently measured. Future research could make this limitation clear to allow teachers to give their full honesty when completing questionnaires, to avoid discrepancies in their results.

Another limitation to this study could include other variables that could have impacted the results that were not measured in the present study. For example, educational qualifications that teachers hold, such as a bachelors or master's degree, as well as whether teachers have received training on bullying and whether teachers have received support from the school. If this study was to be repeated, future research could look at the factors not examined in this study, to allow for a broader range of results. Future research could also take these variables into account, due to how they can pose an impact to the results. Research has shown that the more qualifications a teacher holds, the more likely they are to handle incidence of bullying. This is due to how teachers have been educated on how to identify bullying when it occurs, as well as how they have a more advanced understanding of the training needed to identify bullying behaviours. These variables could have an impact on how

teachers perceive bullying incidences, and in turn, influence how they choose to handle them (Skinner, Babinski and Gifford, 2014). Therefore, it is important that these variables are looked at when producing new research.

In addition, the present study relied on the self-reported handling of bullying of teachers. Due to this, it is important not to assume that teachers' responses to the hypothetical bullying scenario actually translate into action when faced with naturally occurring situations, producing another limitation to this study. To provide more understanding into teachers' real life responses to bullying incidences, future research could focus on the use of observational data collection to determine a teachers' handling of bullying more accurately, as well as the use of qualitative data to explore a teacher's ways of handling bullying incidences in more detail, as well as their attitudes towards and their experiences with bullying.

The influence of gender-bias could have impacted the results of the present study due to how the sample consisted of 90 females and 40 males, producing yet another limitation. Research has shown that female teachers view bullying situations as more severe than male teachers, as well as how female teachers hold more empathetic attitudes towards pupils (Yoon, Sulkowski and Bauman, 2016). Due to this, it can be said that due to the majority of the participants being women, this could have had an effect on the handling scores. If this study was to be replicated, future studies should ensure that their participants are of even numbers of men and women, to ensure that their study produces a more diverse range of results.

Selection-bias and report-bias may have also had an effect on the results of this study due to the voluntary nature of the survey, where teachers who express more concern about bullying may have been more likely to participate. Some teachers may have felt a strong need to participate, whereas others may not recognise the importance. Additionally, some teachers may have been dishonest when completing the survey and this could have impacted the results. Due to this, future studies should take selection-bias and report-bias into consideration when producing new research, to ensure that their results are reliable.

Moreover, there were no significant differences found between the handling bullying subscales for teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and teachers with 5+ years teaching experience, and this could have been due to how the difference between the years of

experience was not substantial, therefore, producing another limitation. The categories used in the present study were only of five years difference, and due to this, the participants may have held similar views. In addition, this could be the reason behind the present study not finding significant differences between the groups. Future research should measure a broader range of length of experience, for example, 1-20 years, 21-40 years and 41-60 years. An example of this can include research conducted by Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa, (2008), who measured a larger sample of teaching experience to obtain a wider range of results. From this, if this study was to be replicated, researchers should ensure that measure a wider sample of years of experience to gain results of improved significance.

In addition to the limitations, this study has also produced many implications to education, due to the importance of teacher responses to bullying scenarios in the classroom. Before schools begin to implement effective bullying prevention and intervention programmes in schools, teachers need to be trained in bullying, as well as being trained in how to handle scenarios of bullying effectively. The findings of this study indicate that teachers are more likely to enlist other adults during bullying episodes, facilitating the importance of teacher training. Future efforts in effective handling of bullying in the classroom should focus on effective programme and policy implementation, including training in teacher preparation programmes to equip teachers who are new to their jobs with an understanding of the intervention skills needed to make a difference (Bauman and Del Rio, 2006).

The findings of this study also provide pathways regarding practices currently in place for training for teachers to deal with incidences of school bullying effectively. Providing teachers with information regarding the negative, long-term effects that bullying can have on the emotional, educational and social outcomes for pupils are of paramount importance, as research has shown that training appears to be one of the best approaches for supporting teachers in handling bullying scenarios effectively, rather than ignoring them. Providing teachers with training on how to identify bullying incidences is also important, as research has shown that teachers are less likely to handle bullying scenarios if they do not perceive the incident as serious (Ellis et al., 2007). The results of this study also support the need for anti-bullying programs and policies that emphasize teacher education.

This study's results have indicated that primary school teachers, secondary school teachers, teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and teachers with 5+ years teaching experience are all more likely to enlist other adults, before disciplining the bully or working with the victim and this could be due to a variety of factors. Due to this, the results of this study could serve as a baseline to evaluate current curriculum and training to identify why this may be. Future research could look into factors such as perceived seriousness and self-efficacy, as well as confidence levels of teachers, to determine why teachers feel the need to enlist other adults, before handling the bullying incident in other ways, such as disciplining the bully. This can provide reasoning as to why it is of paramount importance that teachers understand how to identify bullying scenarios, and in turn, handle them effectively and with confidence.

One study that has looked at the effectiveness of teacher training to identify bullying in the classroom can include that of Stavroulia, Ruiz-Harisiou, Manouchou, Georgiou, Stella and Lanitis, (2016). The authors investigated the effectiveness of using a dedicated Virtual Reality application, used to train teachers to identify bullying incidences. The application was tested by active teachers and the results suggested that the application could be used in teacher training as it gives teachers feedback on how to recognise and handle bullying scenarios. Therefore, this shows that providing teachers with bullying training can improve the way teachers handle bullying scenarios in the classroom (Stavroulia et al., 2016).

Furthermore, as pupils were not included in the present study, exploring the perceptions of children and young people should be an important area to consider when producing new policies and interventions in schools. By exploring children's perceptions and thoughts of how they believe teachers handle bullying scenarios in the classroom could be informative and could be used to guide future teacher training. As pupils are at the frontline when it comes to bullying in the classroom, gaining their views on how they believe teachers handle bullying could be of paramount importance when producing new research. Future studies should aim to focus on gaining information surrounding the perceptions of classroom pupils, as this can provide importance for the successful training of bullying for teachers.

Bullying research has looked into the perceptions of children and how they feel bullying incidences are handled by adults and one of these can include that of Oliver and Candappa, (2003). This study explored the perspectives of children and young people in

primary and secondary schools and aimed to investigate children's views regarding adult responses to bullying. Pupils involved in this study believed that in their school, some teachers deal with bullying incidences better than others, as they believed that some teachers were better at listening to pupils, they were more prepared to take them seriously and were prepared to take firm action against the perpetrator (Oliver and Candappa, 2003).

These findings produce important implications for education due to the importance of gaining the perspectives of children, to produce effective policies and strategies for reducing the prevalence of bullying in the classroom. During recent years, improved government policy has made important improvements in recognising the importance of listening to children and by doing this, ensures that all areas of teacher intervention during bullying episodes are accounted for. Schools and other educational faculties can use the findings of the present study and that of Oliver and Candappa, (2003), to develop bullying interventions, whilst working directly with children and young people to enhance their participation in developing effective anti-bullying strategies, as well as listening to pupils as part of a whole-school approach to tackle bullying and improve the ways teachers handle cases of classroom bullying. Listening to children and young people's views can enhance the realisation that the way bullying is handled by teachers is of paramount importance (Oliver and Candappa, 2003).

In order for anti-bullying policies to be effective, research has shown that anti-bullying policies should be developed with staff and pupils and revisited frequently and often evaluated and not just when bullying incidences arise. Future research should focus on assessing current anti-bullying policies and strategy effectiveness to ensure that all bullying procedures are being followed, ensuring the reduction of bullying episodes. This can also ensure that teachers are aware of what is expected of them, during the event of a bullying incident.

As the present study only looked at the ways that teachers handle bullying incidences, future research may benefit from a more diverse sample by examining the effects of both teachers and teaching assistants. Doing this will provide a broader range of information regarding how bullying is handled in the classroom, as teaching assistants could handle bullying incidences in different ways than teachers would. It is important that future research takes the views of bullying handling of teaching assistants into account, as teaching assistants

have a just as important role towards the education of children and young people as teachers do.

Using the Handling Bullying Questionnaire (Bauman, Rigby and Hoppa, 2008), the present study has provided useful information about the strategies teachers believe they would use in response to a specific bullying scenario. In general, it can be said that teachers are not inclined to ignore incidences of bullying but were most likely to enlist other adults and were less inclined to work with the victim. Primary and secondary school teachers and teachers with 1-4 years teaching experience and 5+ years teaching experience have all shown that they would handle bullying scenarios in the same ways, by being highly likely to enlist other adults, while being least likely to ignore the incident. The findings of this research add to the importance of teacher training towards bullying, as well as providing foundations for future research that explores the many different factors that contribute to the way's teachers choose to handle bullying incidences in their classrooms.

Reference List

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 50(2), 179-211.
- Assembly, U. G. (1989). Convention on the Rights of the Child. *United Nations, Treaty*
- Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98(1), 219.
- Burk, B. N., DiRenzo, A., & Fuller, R. H. (2019). Who is a Bully Anyway?: Examining Perceptions of Bullying among Parents and Children. *Journal of Park & Recreation Administration*, 37(2).
- Davis, T. J. (2015). *Teacher beliefs and perceptions about preschool bullying* (Doctoral dissertation, The University of Alabama).
- Department for Education. (2017). *Preventing and tackling bullying: Advice for headteachers, staff and governing bodies*. Retrieved from https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/623895/Preventing_and_tackling_bullying_advice.pdf
- Ellis, A. A., & Shute, R. (2007). Teacher responses to bullying in relation to moral orientation and seriousness of bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 77(3), 649-663.
- Glew, G. M., Fan, M. Y., Katon, W., Rivara, F. P., & Kernic, M. A. (2005). Bullying, psychosocial adjustment, and academic performance in elementary school. *Archives of pediatrics & adolescent medicine*, 159(11), 1026-1031.
- Glover, D., Gough, G., Johnson, M., & Cartwright, N. (2000). Bullying in 25 secondary schools: Incidence, impact and intervention. *Educational research*, 42(2), 141-156.
- Juvonen, J., Wang, Y., & Espinoza, G. (2011). Bullying experiences and compromised academic performance across middle school grades. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 31(1), 152-173.
- Kahn, J. H., Jones, J. L., & Wieland, A. L. (2012). Preservice teachers' coping styles and their responses to bullying. *Psychology in the Schools*, 49(8), 784-793.
- Kennedy, T. D., Russom, A. G., & Kevorkian, M. M. (2012). Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of Bullying in Schools. *International journal of education policy and leadership*, 7(5), 1-12.
- Kshirsagar, V. Y., Agarwal, R., & Bavdekar, S. B. (2007). Bullying in schools: prevalence and short-term impact. *Indian pediatrics*, 44(1), 25.
- Mattioni, L. (2012). School staff's perceptions and attitudes towards cyberbullying.

- McCabe, P. C., Robinson, F., Dragowski, E. A., & Elizalde-Utnick, G. (2013). Behavioral intention of teachers, school psychologists, and counselors to intervene and prevent harassment of LGBTQ youth. *Psychology in the Schools*, 50(7), 672-688.
- Nicolaides, S., Toda, Y., & Smith, P. K. (2002). Knowledge and attitudes about school bullying in trainee teachers. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 72(1), 105-118.
- Oldenburg, B., van Duijn, M., Sentse, M., Huitsing, G., van der Ploeg, R., Salmivalli, C., & Veenstra, R. (2015). Teacher characteristics and peer victimization in elementary schools: A classroom-level perspective. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 43(1), 33-44. *Series*, 1577(3).
- Oliver, C., & Candappa, M. (2003). *Tackling bullying: Listening to the views of children and young people*. Nottingham: DfES.
- Özkiliç, R. (2014). Students bullying toward teachers and teacher self-efficacy beliefs. *Eğitim ve Bilim*, 39(175).
- Skinner, A. T., Babinski, L. M., & Gifford, E. J. (2014). TEACHERS' EXPECTATIONS AND SELF-EFFICACY FOR WORKING WITH BULLIES AND VICTIMS. *Psychology in the Schools*, 51(1), 72-84.
- Smith, P. K. (2009). Bullying in primary and secondary schools. *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective*, 137.
- Stavroulia, K. E., Ruiz-Harisiou, A., Manouchou, E., Georgiou, K., Sella, F., & Lanitis, A. (2016, April). A 3D virtual environment for training teachers to identify bullying. In *2016 18th Mediterranean Electrotechnical Conference (MELECON)* (pp. 1-6). IEEE.
- Tucker, E., & Maunder, R. (2015). Helping children to get along: teachers' strategies for dealing with bullying in primary schools. *Educational Studies*, 41(4), 466-470.
- Wijtenburg, L. H. (2015). Parent and teacher attitudes toward bullying in school.
- Yoon, J., & Bauman, S. (2014). Teachers: A critical but overlooked component of bullying prevention and intervention. *Theory Into Practice*, 53(4), 308-314.
- Yoon, J., Sulkowski, M. L., & Bauman, S. A. (2016). Teachers' responses to bullying incidents: Effects of teacher characteristics and contexts. *Journal of school violence*, 15(1), 91-113.

Appendices

Appendix A

Information Section

Bullying can be defined as aggressive behaviour or causing intentional harm by a person or a group, which is usually carried out over a period of time. Bullying can involve direct or indirect aggression, including physical violence such as hitting and kicking, as well as verbal violence such as teasing and threatening. (Hinduja and Patchin, 2010).

Schools and other educational settings should be safe place where children and adolescents feel they can learn and socialise. Although, bullying-related situations remain a frequent problem which interferes with the statement of safety in the classroom. Many previous studies have looked at teacher attitudes towards bullying and they have shown that the positive attitudes teachers hold towards teaching are important determinants of their attitudes towards bullying among children in the classroom. (Rigby, 2003).

Appendix B

Consent Information

This research is being undertaken by a third year BSc Applied Psychology student, as part of a dissertation project. For the purpose of this research, I am looking for both teachers and teaching assistants to complete a short survey looking at how they might handle a hypothetical bullying scenario.

The following survey includes a number of demographic questions and asks you to read a short bullying scenario for which you will answer twenty-two questions that will take approximately 10 minutes to complete.

Participating within this study is entirely voluntary and you are free to click off the questions to withdraw your answers at any point and your answers will not be included in the analysis. All answers are anonymous and confidential and no information will or can be tracked back to you or your school. All data will be stored in accordance with the Data Protection Act 2018.

A full debrief will be provided following the completion of the survey. You will also have the opportunity to withdraw from the study by not submitting your answers at the end of the survey.

If you have any concerns at this stage regarding the questions then you are free to email the researcher, Laura Boyling: 1706534@student.uwtsd.ac.uk or the academic supervisor; Dr. Charlotte Greenway c.greenway@uwtsd.ac.uk

If you wish to continue, please click next.

Appendix C

Demographic Questionnaire

Are you male or female? Female / Male

Please select your age group: 18-25 / 26-45 / 46-60

Please state whether you teach at primary or secondary level.

Primary ☐ Secondary ☐

Please state how many years have you worked in a school:

1-4 years ☐ 5+ years ☐

Appendix D

The Handling Bullying Questionnaire

Teachers have alternative ways of dealing with incidents of bullying in a school. To some extent, what is done depends on the circumstances in which the bullying takes place, and the severity of the bullying. It is, of course, sometimes difficult to generalize, but in answering the following questions, indicate what you think you might do.

Imagine the following scenario:

A 12-year-old student is being repeatedly teased and called unpleasant names by another, more powerful, student who has successfully persuaded other students to avoid the targeted person as much as possible. As a result, the victim of this behaviour is feeling angry, miserable, and often isolated.

Please circle the answer which is closest to what you think you would do

1	I would insist that the bully "cut it out."	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
2	I would treat the matter lightly	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
3	I would make sure the bully was suitably punished.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
4	I would discuss the matter with my colleagues at school.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
5	I would convene a meeting of students, including the bully or bullies, tell them what was happening, and ask them to suggest ways they could help improve the situation.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
6	I would tell the victim to stand up to the bully.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
7	I would make it clear to the bully that his or her behaviour would not be tolerated.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
8	I would leave it for someone else to sort out.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
9	I would share my concern with the bully about what happened to the victim and seek to get the bully to behave in a more caring and responsible manner.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not

10	I would let the students sort it out themselves.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
11	I would suggest that the victim act more assertively.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
12	I would discuss with the bully options from which he or she could make a choice in order to improve the situation.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
13	I would ask the school counsellor to intervene.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
14	I would refer the matter to an administrator (e.g., principal, vice principal, dean).	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
15	I would contact the victim's parents or guardians to express my concern about their child's wellbeing.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
16	I would just tell the kids to "grow up."	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
17	I would encourage the victim to show that he or she could not be intimidated.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
18	I would ignore it	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
19	I would help the bully achieve greater self-esteem so that he or she	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not

	would no longer want to bully anyone.					
20	I would insist to the parents(s) or guardian(s) of the bully that the behaviour must stop.	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
21	I would find the bully something more interesting to do	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not
22	I would advise the victim to tell the bully to "back off."	I definitely would	I probably would	I'm unsure	I probably would not	I definitely would not

Appendix E

Debrief Information

Thank you for taking part in the study.

The aim of this study was to explore the extent to which teachers and teaching assistants believe they handle bullying scenarios in the classroom. I specifically wanted to find out whether teachers and teaching assistants handle bullying scenarios differently in primary and secondary schools.

I also wanted to find out if teachers and teaching assistants handle bullying scenarios differently depending on the position they hold in the school and how long they have held their specific position for, as well as the type of school they work in.

Handling bullying situations in schools is important as bullying can have a very negative impact on a young person's education and health, therefore handling bullying situations effectively in schools is key to ensuring young people are kept safe in the classroom. Research has suggested that teachers and other school staff are often not aware of the occurrence of bullying and often confuse it with teasing or play. Due to this, this research is important as it can be beneficial to teachers and teaching assistants by providing them with an advanced understanding as to how school staff can handle bullying scenarios effectively. In

turn, this can also be beneficial for children and young people.

If you are happy for your data to be use in this study please press the submit button below, if not, please close the browser. All answers are anonymous and confidential and no information will or can be tracked back to you or your school.

If taking part in this study has raised any questions please contact the researcher, Laura Boyling on 1706534@student.uwtsd.ac.uk or contact the academic supervisor, Dr Charlotte Greenway on 01267 676923 or via email, c.greenway@uwtsd.ac.uk.

If you would like information on strategies for handling bullying in school you may wish to look at the following websites:

Bullying Prevention and Intervention in the School Environment: Factsheets and Tools - https://www.prevnet.ca/sites/prevnet.ca/files/prevnet_facts_and_tools_for_schools.pdf

Bullying prevention and response: a guide for schools

<https://www.education.govt.nz/assets/Documents/School/Bullying-prevention/MOEBullyingGuide2015Web.pdf>

Preventing and tackling bullying: Advice for headteachers, staff and governing bodies

<https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/preventing-and-tackling-bullying>

Thank you once again for taking time to participate in this study.

Appendix F

SPSS Output

Two-way ANOVA for working with the victim

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Working_Victim

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	109.241 ^a	3	36.414	3.260	.024	.072
Intercept	13510.894	1	13510.894	1209.767	.000	.906
School_Type	94.261	1	94.261	8.440	.004	.063
Teaching_Experience	17.680	1	17.680	1.583	.211	.012

School_Type * Teaching_Experience	.004	1	.004	.000	.984	.000
Error	1407.190	126	11.168			
Total	16336.000	130				
Corrected Total	1516.431	129				

a. R Squared = .072 (Adjusted R Squared = .050)

2. School-type:

Dependent Variable: Working_Victim

Please select what type of school you work in:		95% Confidence Interval		
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Primary	11.533	.435	10.671	12.394
Secondary	9.755	.430	8.903	10.606

3. Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Working_Victim

Please state how many years you have worked in a school:		95% Confidence Interval		
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 - 4 years	10.259	.484	9.301	11.217
5 + years	11.029	.375	10.288	11.770

4. School-type: * Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Working_Victim

Please select what type of school you work in:		Please state how many years you have worked in a school:				95% Confidence Interval	
		Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Primary	1 - 4 years	11.154	.655	9.857	12.451		
	5 + years	11.912	.573	10.778	13.046		

Secondary	1 - 4 years	9.364	.712	7.954	10.774
	5 + years	10.146	.482	9.191	11.100

Two-way ANOVA for working with the bully

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Working_Bully

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	58.938 ^a	3	19.646	1.953	.124	.044
Intercept	45634.840	1	45634.840	4536.285	.000	.973
School_Type	36.590	1	36.590	3.637	.059	.028
Teaching_Experience	1.320	1	1.320	.131	.718	.001
School_Type * Teaching_Experience	9.312	1	9.312	.926	.338	.007
Error	1267.555	126	10.060			
Total	50798.000	130				
Corrected Total	1326.492	129				

a. R Squared = .044 (Adjusted R Squared = .022)

2. School-type:

Dependent Variable: Working_Bully

Please select what type of school you work in:		95% Confidence Interval		
		Mean	Std. Error	
				Lower Bound
				Upper Bound
Primary		20.115	.413	19.298
Secondary		19.008	.408	18.200
				19.816

3. Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Working_Bully

Please state how many years you have worked in a school:	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 - 4 years	19.456	.459	18.547	20.365
5 + years	19.667	.355	18.963	20.370

4. School-type: * Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Working_Bully

Please select what type of school you work in:	Please state how many years you have worked in a school:	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Primary	1 - 4 years	19.731	.622	18.500	20.962
	5 + years	20.500	.544	19.424	21.576
Secondary	1 - 4 years	19.182	.676	17.844	20.520
	5 + years	18.833	.458	17.927	19.739

Two-way ANOVA for ignoring the incident

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Ignoring

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	36.870 ^a	3	12.290	1.900	.133	.043
Intercept	5024.555	1	5024.555	776.935	.000	.860
School_Type	.112	1	.112	.017	.896	.000
Teaching_Experience	22.641	1	22.641	3.501	.064	.027
School_Type * Teaching_Experience	14.650	1	14.650	2.265	.135	.018

Error	814.861	126	6.467			
Total	6215.000	130				
Corrected Total	851.731	129				

a. R Squared = .043 (Adjusted R Squared = .021)

2. School-type:

Dependent Variable: Ignoring

Please select what type of school you work in:		95% Confidence Interval			
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
Primary	6.521	.331	5.866	7.177	
Secondary	6.460	.327	5.812	7.108	

3. Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Ignoring

Please state how many years you have worked in a school:		95% Confidence Interval			
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound	
1 - 4 years	6.927	.368	6.198	7.656	
5 + years	6.055	.285	5.491	6.619	

4. School-type: * Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Ignoring

Please select what type of school you work in:		95% Confidence Interval			
	Please state how many years you have worked in a school:	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Primary	1 - 4 years	7.308	.499	6.321	8.295
	5 + years	5.735	.436	4.872	6.598
Secondary	1 - 4 years	6.545	.542	5.472	7.618
	5 + years	6.375	.367	5.649	7.101

Two-way ANOVA for enlisting other adults

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Enlisting_Adults

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	122.013 ^a	3	40.671	4.873	.003	.104
Intercept	51682.198	1	51682.198	6192.461	.000	.980
School_Type	118.593	1	118.593	14.210	.000	.101
Teaching_Experience	.026	1	.026	.003	.955	.000
School_Type * Teaching_Experience	1.817	1	1.817	.218	.642	.002
Error	1051.594	126	8.346			
Total	57209.000	130				
Corrected Total	1173.608	129				

a. R Squared = .104 (Adjusted R Squared = .083)

2. School-type:

Dependent Variable: Enlisting_Adults

			95% Confidence Interval	
Please select what type of school you work in:				
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Primary	21.814	.376	21.070	22.559
Secondary	19.820	.372	19.084	20.556

3. Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Enlisting_Adults

			95% Confidence Interval	
Please state how many years you have worked in a school:				
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound

1 - 4 years	20.802	.418	19.974	21.631
5 + years	20.832	.324	20.191	21.473

4. School-type: * Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Enlisting_Adults

Please select what type of school you work in:	Please state how many years you have worked in a school:	95% Confidence Interval			
		Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Primary	1 - 4 years	21.923	.567	20.802	23.044
	5 + years	21.706	.495	20.725	22.686
Secondary	1 - 4 years	19.682	.616	18.463	20.901
	5 + years	19.958	.417	19.133	20.784

Two-way ANOVA for disciplining the bully

Tests of Between-Subjects Effects

Dependent Variable: Disciplining_Bully

Source	Type III Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Partial Eta Squared
Corrected Model	5.586 ^a	3	1.862	.426	.735	.010
Intercept	21944.197	1	21944.197	5020.631	.000	.976
School_Type	3.003	1	3.003	.687	.409	.005
Teaching_Experience	2.883	1	2.883	.660	.418	.005
School_Type * Teaching_Experience	.028	1	.028	.006	.936	.000
Error	550.721	126	4.371			
Total	24384.000	130				
Corrected Total	556.308	129				

a. R Squared = .010 (Adjusted R Squared = -.014)

2. School-type

Dependent Variable: Disciplining_Bully

Please select what type of school you work in:		95% Confidence Interval		
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Primary	13.406	.272	12.867	13.945
Secondary	13.723	.269	13.191	14.256

3. Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Disciplining_Bully

Please state how many years you have worked in a school:		95% Confidence Interval		
	Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1 - 4 years	13.720	.303	13.121	14.320
5 + years	13.409	.234	12.946	13.873

4. School-type: * Teaching Experience:

Dependent Variable: Disciplining_Bully

Please select what type of school you work in:		Please state how many years you have worked in a school:				95% Confidence Interval	
		Mean	Std. Error	Lower Bound	Upper Bound		
Primary	1 - 4 years	13.577	.410	12.766	14.388		
	5 + years	13.235	.359	12.526	13.945		
Secondary	1 - 4 years	13.864	.446	12.982	14.746		
	5 + years	13.583	.302	12.986	14.181		

T-Test for school-type**Group Statistics**

	Please state how many years you have worked in a school:	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Disciplining_Bully	1 - 4 years	48	13.708	1.9347	.2792
	5 + years	82	13.439	2.1608	.2386
Working_Victim	1 - 4 years	48	10.3333	3.43532	.49585
	5 + years	82	10.8780	3.42968	.37875
Working_Bully	1 - 4 years	48	19.4792	3.03868	.43860
	5 + years	82	19.5244	3.31932	.36656
Ignoring	1 - 4 years	48	6.9583	3.61415	.52166
	5 + years	82	6.1098	1.63304	.18034
Enlisting_Adults	1 - 4 years	48	20.8958	2.96246	.42759
	5 + years	82	20.6829	3.06263	.33821

T-Test for teaching experience**Group Statistics**

	Please select what type of school you work in:	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Disciplining_Bully	Primary	60	13.383	2.3799	.3072
	Secondary	70	13.671	1.7833	.2132
Working_Victim	Primary	60	11.5833	3.39637	.43847
	Secondary	70	9.9000	3.28435	.39255
Working_Bully	Primary	60	20.1667	3.04857	.39357
	Secondary	70	18.9429	3.25214	.38870
Ignoring	Primary	60	6.4167	3.30532	.42671
	Secondary	70	6.4286	1.73265	.20709
Enlisting_Adults	Primary	60	21.8000	3.05764	.39474
	Secondary	70	19.8714	2.69687	.32234

One-way ANOVA for primary school teachers

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Primary

Tukey HSD

(I) Subscale	(J) Subscale	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Victim	Bully	-8.58333*	.55838	.000	-10.1159	-7.0507
	Ignoring	5.16667*	.55838	.000	3.6341	6.6993
	Enlisting	-10.21667*	.55838	.000	-11.7493	-8.6841
	Disciplining	-1.80000*	.55838	.012	-3.3326	-.2674
Bully	Victim	8.58333*	.55838	.000	7.0507	10.1159
	Ignoring	13.75000*	.55838	.000	12.2174	15.2826
	Enlisting	-1.63333*	.55838	.030	-3.1659	-.1007
	Disciplining	6.78333*	.55838	.000	5.2507	8.3159
Ignoring	Victim	-5.16667*	.55838	.000	-6.6993	-3.6341
	Bully	-13.75000*	.55838	.000	-15.2826	-12.2174
	Enlisting	-15.38333*	.55838	.000	-16.9159	-13.8507
	Disciplining	-6.96667*	.55838	.000	-8.4993	-5.4341
Enlisting	Victim	10.21667*	.55838	.000	8.6841	11.7493
	Bully	1.63333*	.55838	.030	.1007	3.1659
	Ignoring	15.38333*	.55838	.000	13.8507	16.9159
	Disciplining	8.41667*	.55838	.000	6.8841	9.9493
Disciplining	Victim	1.80000*	.55838	.012	.2674	3.3326
	Bully	-6.78333*	.55838	.000	-8.3159	-5.2507
	Ignoring	6.96667*	.55838	.000	5.4341	8.4993
	Enlisting	-8.41667*	.55838	.000	-9.9493	-6.8841

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

One-way ANOVA for secondary school teachers

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Secondary

Tukey HSD

(I) Subscale	(J) Subscale	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Victim	Bully	-9.04286*	.44605	.000	-10.2661	-7.8197
	Ignoring	3.47143*	.44605	.000	2.2482	4.6946
	Enlisting	-9.97143*	.44605	.000	-11.1946	-8.7482
	Disciplining	-3.77143*	.44605	.000	-4.9946	-2.5482
Bully	Victim	9.04286*	.44605	.000	7.8197	10.2661
	Ignoring	12.51429*	.44605	.000	11.2911	13.7375
	Enlisting	-.92857	.44605	.230	-2.1518	.2946
	Disciplining	5.27143*	.44605	.000	4.0482	6.4946
Ignoring	Victim	-3.47143*	.44605	.000	-4.6946	-2.2482
	Bully	-12.51429*	.44605	.000	-13.7375	-11.2911
	Enlisting	-13.44286*	.44605	.000	-14.6661	-12.2197
	Disciplining	-7.24286*	.44605	.000	-8.4661	-6.0197
Enlisting	Victim	9.97143*	.44605	.000	8.7482	11.1946
	Bully	.92857	.44605	.230	-.2946	2.1518
	Ignoring	13.44286*	.44605	.000	12.2197	14.6661
	Disciplining	6.20000*	.44605	.000	4.9768	7.4232
Disciplining	Victim	3.77143*	.44605	.000	2.5482	4.9946
	Bully	-5.27143*	.44605	.000	-6.4946	-4.0482
	Ignoring	7.24286*	.44605	.000	6.0197	8.4661
	Enlisting	-6.20000*	.44605	.000	-7.4232	-4.9768

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

One-way ANOVA for 1-4 years teaching experience

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: One_To_Four_Years

Tukey HSD

(I) Subscale	(J) Subscale	Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
					Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Victim	Bully	-9.14583*	.62327	.000	-10.8593	-7.4324
	Ignoring	3.37500*	.62327	.000	1.6616	5.0884
	Enlisting	-10.56250*	.62327	.000	-12.2759	-8.8491
	Disciplining	-3.37500*	.62327	.000	-5.0884	-1.6616
Bully	Victim	9.14583*	.62327	.000	7.4324	10.8593
	Ignoring	12.52083*	.62327	.000	10.8074	14.2343
	Enlisting	-1.41667	.62327	.157	-3.1301	.2968
	Disciplining	5.77083*	.62327	.000	4.0574	7.4843
Ignoring	Victim	-3.37500*	.62327	.000	-5.0884	-1.6616
	Bully	-12.52083*	.62327	.000	-14.2343	-10.8074
	Enlisting	-13.93750*	.62327	.000	-15.6509	-12.2241
	Disciplining	-6.75000*	.62327	.000	-8.4634	-5.0366
Enlisting	Victim	10.56250*	.62327	.000	8.8491	12.2759
	Bully	1.41667	.62327	.157	-.2968	3.1301
	Ignoring	13.93750*	.62327	.000	12.2241	15.6509
	Disciplining	7.18750*	.62327	.000	5.4741	8.9009
Disciplining	Victim	3.37500*	.62327	.000	1.6616	5.0884
	Bully	-5.77083*	.62327	.000	-7.4843	-4.0574
	Ignoring	6.75000*	.62327	.000	5.0366	8.4634
	Enlisting	-7.18750*	.62327	.000	-8.9009	-5.4741

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

One-way ANOVA for 5+ years teaching experience

Multiple Comparisons

Dependent Variable: Five_Plus_Years

Tukey HSD

(I) Subscale	(J) Subscale	Mean Difference		Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
		(I-J)	Std. Error		Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Victim	Bully	-8.64634*	.43894	.000	-9.8491	-7.4436
	Ignoring	4.76829*	.43894	.000	3.5656	5.9710
	Enlisting	-9.80488*	.43894	.000	-11.0076	-8.6021
	Disciplining	-2.56098*	.43894	.000	-3.7637	-1.3582
Bully	Victim	8.64634*	.43894	.000	7.4436	9.8491
	Ignoring	13.41463*	.43894	.000	12.2119	14.6174
	Enlisting	-1.15854	.43894	.065	-2.3613	.0442
	Disciplining	6.08537*	.43894	.000	4.8826	7.2881
Ignoring	Victim	-4.76829*	.43894	.000	-5.9710	-3.5656
	Bully	-13.41463*	.43894	.000	-14.6174	-12.2119
	Enlisting	-14.57317*	.43894	.000	-15.7759	-13.3704
	Disciplining	-7.32927*	.43894	.000	-8.5320	-6.1265
Enlisting	Victim	9.80488*	.43894	.000	8.6021	11.0076
	Bully	1.15854	.43894	.065	-.0442	2.3613
	Ignoring	14.57317*	.43894	.000	13.3704	15.7759
	Disciplining	7.24390*	.43894	.000	6.0412	8.4466
Disciplining	Victim	2.56098*	.43894	.000	1.3582	3.7637
	Bully	-6.08537*	.43894	.000	-7.2881	-4.8826
	Ignoring	7.32927*	.43894	.000	6.1265	8.5320
	Enlisting	-7.24390*	.43894	.000	-8.4466	-6.0412

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.