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ABSTRACT

Steven Russell
BULLYING IN COLLEGE AND RELATION TO SELF-ESTEEM
AND PARENTING STYLES
2002/2003
Dr. Mark Chapell
Master of Arts in Applied Psychology and Mental Health Counseling

This study investigates bullying in college and the relationship of bullying and self-esteem in the victims of bullying, as well as the relationship of parenting styles to bullying behavior. The study utilized $N = 85$ undergraduate students from a midsize northeastern university. The participants were administered a demographic questionnaire, a bullying questionnaire, the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and the Parental Authority Questionnaire. Frequency percentages were used to report incidence and types of bullying behavior. A correlation matrix was employed to ascertain the relationships between bullying and self-esteem, as well as between parenting style and bullying behavior, and a multiple regression analysis was used to further examine the relationship between parenting style and bullying behaviors. The results of the study showed that bullying in college by students and teachers is a fairly common occurrence. There were no gender differences found in frequency or type of bullying. Participants reported that the most common type of bullying by students and teachers was verbal bullying. Students also reported social exclusion and isolation as a type of bullying, but
to a lesser extent. There were no reports of physical bullying by students or teachers. As expected, there was a significant negative correlation between frequency of bullying and self-esteem. As hypothesized, student bullying behavior was predicted significantly by mother’s permissive style and father’s authoritarian parental style.
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Introduction

We all know them; the tough kid who harangues others for their lunch money. The one who pushes others around to get their way or things they want. They are the malicious teasers and pokers-of-fun who make others cry, and who make their victims wish they could just disappear or stay away. They are also the ones who snub certain individuals from their ‘inner circle’ or who deliberately spread rumors about someone to cast them in a social shadow. They are usually bigger and tougher, and really don’t mind throwing their weight around or using their social influence negatively. They don’t feel bad about it. Sometimes they are even our teachers and co-workers who misuse and/or abuse their positions of authority. They are the bullies of childhood and adolescence, and in this study I will investigate the persistence of bullying into adulthood, focusing on bullying in college students. How much goes on and what forms does it take? I will also focus on self-esteem as one of the negative mental-health correlates of bullying. Lastly, in this study I will examine the theoretically important relationship between parenting style and bullying behaviors by college students.
Bullying is a worldwide problem, with slightly varying rates of incidence depending on locale (Smith et al., 1999). Dan Olweus, who pioneered the study of bullying in the early 1970’s in Scandinavia, and has compiled data on literally hundreds of thousands of school students to date, gives us the definition of bullying that is widely accepted (Smith et al., 1999; Smith et al., 2002). This definition is derived from his seminal work outlining the characteristics of bullies and victims, and further refined in his longitudinal studies in Swedish schools (Olweus, 1973, 1978). Bullying is an aggressive behavior or intentional harm doing, which is carried out “repeatedly and over time” in an interpersonal relationship characterized by an imbalance of power (Olweus, 1993, 1999). “A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other students” (Olweus, 1999, p. 10). These negative actions can be further categorized into different forms of bullying. There can be physical bullying, in which the aggressor(s) hits, kicks, pushes or shoves the victim around; there are verbal attacks, where the aggressor(s) says mean and unpleasant things or makes fun of the victim or calls them mean and hurtful names; and there is bullying by isolation and social exclusion, where victims are ignored, excluded from groups or left out of things on purpose, as well as having rumors, lies and negative portrayals spread about them (Olweus, 1999).

In his 1983 nationwide survey of Norwegian primary and secondary schools, involving approximately 130,000 students, ages 7-16, Olweus found that 15% of these
students were involved in bully/victim problems with some regularity—either as bullies or victims (Olweus, 1999). Approximately 9% of students were victims, and 7% bullied other students with some regularity (Olweus, 1993). Olweus (1999) estimated that 7% of students in the 2nd to 9th grades have bullied others at some point. The percentage of students reporting being victimized by bullies decreased systematically from 15% in 2nd grade to 5% in 9th grade (Olweus, 1999, p. 10). These last figures are notable, and quite important from a developmental point of view on the bullying problem. As Olweus and others worldwide have found, the overall level and types of bullying appear to change with age, from higher incidences and more physical bullying in the lower primary grades to less frequent and more insidious forms of bullying, such as verbal bullying and social exclusion in secondary school. When graphed, there is a smooth decline in bullying problems as children age: “The decline is most marked in the primary school grades (1 through 6, roughly corresponding to ages 7 through 13 in Scandinavia.) Thus the percentage of students who are bullied decreases with higher grades” (Olweus, 1993, p. 15). Olweus found that in secondary/junior high school, grades 7-9, (roughly corresponding to ages 13 through 16), the amount of bullying continues to decrease with age across adolescence. Hence, the average percentage of students (boys and girls combined) who were bullied in grades 2-6 (11.6%) was approximately twice that in grades 7-9 (5.4%). With regard to the ways in which the bullying is carried out, there is a clear trend toward less use of physical means (physical violence) in the higher grades (Olweus, 1993).

Following Olweus’ groundbreaking investigations, researchers in countries around the world took notice and turned their attention to the issue in their own
backyards. There are similar findings in many countries throughout the world, including other European countries, Asia, and most recently the United States.

In a study by Whitney and Smith (1993) in Sheffield, England, 27% of primary school students reported being bullied 'sometimes' or more frequently, with 10% bullied 'once a week' or more frequently, and the figures for secondary school students were 10% and 4% respectively (Whitney & Smith, 1993). The Netherlands, through the work of Mooij (as cited in Smith et al., 1999) and Junger-Tas (1990) have reported incidences of bullying in primary schools 'from time to time' at 23% and in secondary schools 'from time to time' at 6% (as cited in Junger-Tas, 1999). In Ireland, Byrne (1992) reported an overall incidence rate of 10.4% of children involved in bullying behavior, with 5.3% as bullies and 5.1% as victims (as cited in Byrne, 1999). Italy weighs in with average results from a five-city survey conducted in 1993, which found that 41.6% of primary school students reporting being bullied 'sometimes or more frequently in the last two or three months', with 17.5% of these children reporting being bullied 'once a week or more frequently', while in middle school 26.4% report being bullied 'sometimes or more' and 9.5% being bullied 'once a week or more frequently'. They also found that there were decreasing reports of bullying from primary to middle school, corresponding to ages 8-14 (Fonzi, et al., 1999). Belgium's Stevens and Van Oost (as cited in Smith et al., 1999) of Ghent University conducted a study on bullying in 1993 in that country, and found that 15.9% of primary education students bully others regularly or often, with 5.6% bullying at least once per week. In secondary education these figures are 12.3% and 3.9% respectively; again corroborating the decline of bullying behavior with age (Vettenberg, 1999). In the same study, 23% of students report being bullied in the
elementary grades with 9.1% of these reporting being bullied at least once a week. In secondary school, 15.2% of the students reported being bullied regularly, and 6.4% had been bullied at least once a week (Vettenberg, 1999).

In Australia, Rigby and Slee found an average overall victimization rate of being bullied 'at least once a week' of 19.3% for boys and 14.6% for girls (Rigby, 1996). They also corroborated Olweus' previous studies, finding that bullying decreases as students get older, with younger children in primary schools, aged 8 and 9, reporting more bullying than students in the secondary schools, particularly those students over 15 (Rigby, 1996).

In Japan, where bullying is termed Ijime, Morita conducted pioneering studies on the problem. In a survey in Tokyo and Osaka, he found an overall incidence of 11.3% of reported occurrences of Ijime in a sample of 1718 fifth and eighth graders (Morita, Soeda, Soeda, & Taki, 1999). For several years following these studies, the problem of Ijime (bullying) in Japan was downplayed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Culture, also known as The Monbusho. However, continued interest in the topic and several sensational media suicides, allegedly the result of victimization by peers, prompted the Researchers' Conference Regarding Problematic Behaviour Among Children (Monbusho, 1996), to conduct a large scale study of the actual incidence of Ijime occurring in the schools in 1994-1995. They found that 21.9% of elementary school, 13.2% of lower secondary school and 3.9% of upper secondary school children were 'currently victims' or 'were victims in the year but are not now victims' (as cited in Morita, Soeda, Soeda, & Taki, 1999, p. 317).

Finally, a World Health Organization international survey of adolescent health-
related behaviors, (King, Wold, Tudor-Smith, & Harel, 1996) found that the percentage of students who reported taking part in bullying at least once during the current school term ranged from a low of 13% of girls and 28% of boys in Wales, to a high of 67% of girls and 78% of boys in Greenland. The percentage of students who reported having been victims of bullying ranged from a low of 13% of girls and 15% of boys in Sweden to a high of 72% of girls and 77% of boys in Greenland.

In comparison to the aforementioned studies, the systematic study of bullying in the U.S. was overlooked in the 1970's and 80's. Only in the past ten years have American researchers focused on documenting the incidence of bullying in our schools. The 1993 National Household Education Survey of 6500 6th-12th graders in the U.S. reported that an average of 8% of these students had been bullied, with victimization decreasing from 13% for 6th graders to 2.9% for 12th graders (NCES, 1995). Data from the World Health Organization international survey of health-related behaviors taken in 1997/1998 indicates that for students in the U.S., 19.5% reported bullying others three or more times over the past year, and 8.8% reported bullying others once a week or more (Haynie et al., 2001). In the 1999 School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey, 8400 6th-12th graders reported a 5% victimization rate in school during the preceding 6 months, with rates of victimization decreasing with age from 10.5% of 6th graders to 1.2% for 12th graders (NCES, 2001). In a study by Nansel et al. (2001), it was found that in a nationally representative sample of 15,686 6th –10th graders, an average of 13% bullied others regularly, while 10.6% reported having been bullied on a regular basis.
Finally, in the most recent national study of bullying in American students, Indicators of School Crime and Safety 2002 (NCES, 2002), it was found that both males and females were more likely to be bullied in 2001 than in 1999. In 2001, males were more likely than females to be bullied (9 and 7 percent respectively); however, in 1999 no such difference could be detected (5 percent each). In this same study, the rates of victimization resemble Olweus’ (1999) repeated findings that younger children, that is in earlier grades, exhibit a greater incidence of bullying behavior than do children and adolescents in higher grades. In 6th grade, 14% of students reported being bullied, compared with 2% of students in grade 12 (NCES, 2002).

Based on the previously mentioned studies, it is clear that there is a substantial body of evidence suggesting that bullying in primary and secondary schools is a serious problem for many young people throughout the world. Additionally, it appears that the rates of bullying decrease substantially with age, from elementary school through high school. One of the primary goals of this study is to investigate the incidence of bullying in a college sample. There have been no published studies documenting bullying in college to date. There has, however, been substantial research in the area of workplace bullying, so we know that adults are quite capable of carrying this negative behavior past high school.

In a study by Rayner (1997), workplace bullying has been estimated to affect up to 50% of the United Kingdom’s workforce at some time in their working lives (as cited in McAvoy & Murtagh, 2003), with annual prevalences of up to 38%, and is becoming increasingly identified as a major occupational stressor (UK National Workplace Bullying Advice Line, 2003). Summarizing the research on incidence rates of European
countries, Zapf, Einarsen, Hoel and Vartia (2003), report that between 1 and 4 percent of employees may experience serious bullying, and between 8 and 10 percent experience occasional bullying (as cited in Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003, p. 121).

In America, in a 1993 Northwest National Life Insurance Co. study (as cited in Einarsen, Hoel, Zapf, & Cooper, 2003), based on a sample of 600 full-time workers, researchers concluded that one in four workers (25%) reported being harassed, threatened or physically attacked on the job in the previous twelve months. In a state-wide survey of Michigan residents, Keashly & Jagatic (2003) reported that about 59% of the representative working sample indicated they had experienced at least one type of emotionally abusive behavior at the hands of fellow workers.

Bullying in college has only been looked at in one previous unpublished study by Chapell et al. (in press). In this study, it was found that in a sample of 1025 undergraduate students in a mid-sized, public Northeastern university, a significant portion of this total sample had been exposed to some aspect of bullying. Specifically, Chapell et al. (in press) found that: 24.7% reported having seen students bully students occasionally and 2.8% very frequently, 5% had been bullied by students occasionally and 1.1% very frequently, 12.8% had seen teachers bully students occasionally and 1.9% very frequently, 4.2% had been bullied by teachers occasionally and .5% very frequently, while 3.2% had bullied other students occasionally and 1.9% very frequently.

The first goal of the current study will be to address the issue of bullying behavior by investigating and reporting the incidence of bullying in college by students toward their peers. Types of bullying in college students will also be examined. Chapell et al. (in press) investigated the incidence of bullying in college by students, but did not
examine the types of bullying used. By way of extension, the current study will seek to explore the various types of bullying behaviors categorized by Olweus (1999): physical, verbal, and social exclusion/isolation.

The second goal of the study will be to examine the incidence of bullying of students by teachers. Olweus conducted the first study of bullying by teachers in 1985, and found that in a sample of 2,400 Norwegian 6th-9th graders, 1.7% had been bullied by their teachers in the previous five months (Olweus, 1999). The current study will seek to replicate the Chapell et al. study (in press) reviewed above, in which about 5% of college students reported having been bullied occasionally or very frequently by their teachers, and will extend the investigation to study the types of bullying used by teachers, delineated into physical, verbal and social types.

The third goal of the study will be to examine gender differences in the types of bullying used by college students. Olweus has investigated gender differences in types of bullying, and has found that harassment by non-physical means, i.e. verbal and social, were the most common forms of bullying exhibited by both males and females (Olweus, 1999). Chapell et al. (in press) did not investigate different types of bullying by male and female college students.

There are many negative mental health correlates of bully victimization, one of the most well-established of which is school avoidance. A study by Balding, Regis, Wise, Bish and Muirden (1996) surveyed over 11,000 students in England aged 11-16 using the Health Related Behavior Questionnaire. When they focused on the target question of fear of going to school because of the possibility of being bullied or witnessing bullying at school, they found that 27% of the sample reported some fear of
bullying, with 5% often fearing it (as cited in Smith, 1999). A similar finding was reported in American 6th – 12th graders in the 1993 National Household Education Survey (NCES, 1995). In this study, about half of 6th – 12th grade students personally witnessed bullying, robbery, or physical assault at school. Of the more than 24,000 students surveyed, 7% used skipping school as a strategy to avoid harm at school (NCES, 1995). Some other correlates of bully victimization are: victims turning into aggressors, (i.e. committing murders at school) (Hazler, 2000); suffering nervousness and panic at school (Sharp, 1995); as well as depression (Bond, Carlin, Thomas, Rubin, & Patton, 2001; Olweus, 1993; Salmon, James, Cassidy, & Javaloyes, 2000), and suicidality (Rigby, as cited in Juvonen and Jaana, 2001; Morita, 1999; Rigby & Slee, 1999).

Elementary and secondary school student victims of bullying have been found to be more likely to suffer from lower levels of self-esteem compared to nonbullied students and students in general (Olweus, 1993; O’Moore & Kirkham, 2001; Smith, 1999). Olweus found in a longitudinal study of victimized Swedish boys, that by age 23, even though many of them had ‘normalized’ in many ways as young adults, having considerably greater freedom to choose their own social and physical environments, “...in two respects they had fared worse. They were more likely to be depressed and had poorer self-esteem” (Olweus, 1993). In a study by Bjorkqvist, Ekman and Lagerspetz (as cited in Smith et al., 1999), victims of bullying were found to have extremely low levels of self-esteem and felt themselves to be social failures (Bjorkqvist & Osterman, 1999). In Australia, research has also supported this correlation between bully victimization and low self-esteem (Rigby, 1996). Accordingly, the fourth goal in the present study will be to investigate self-esteem as a
correlate of bully victimization in a college sample. Consistent with the previous findings, it is expected in the present study with college students that there will be a negative correlation between level of self-esteem and bully victimization by students and teachers. As the reported incidences of bullying rise, the level of self-esteem is predicted to be lower in the victim.

The final topic to be addressed in this study deals with the question of development of bullying behavior. Where do bullies come from? What are the possible origins of this negative and prevalent behavior? This study will focus on the parental contribution to bullying by their child, specifically parental style as perceived by the participants in this study.

Based on the results of his 1980 study with samples of 6th and 9th graders, Olweus theorized that there are four main ingredients in the young child’s life that contribute to what he terms “an aggressive reaction pattern” which characterize bullies. The first factor is the temperament of the child him/herself. An aggressive, hotheaded child is more likely to develop into an aggressive youngster than a child with a milder temperament (Olweus, 1999). The other three of the four components are parental in nature: a) a negative emotional attitude, characterized by lack of warmth and involvement toward the child (usually the mother); b) maternal permissiveness for aggressive behavior by the child; c) the use of power-assertive child-rearing methods such as physical punishment and violent emotional outbursts (Olweus, 1980, 1999).

Olweus’ characterization of the parental components contributing to an aggressive reaction pattern is modeled on the research of Sears et al. (1957). Sears and his colleagues emphasized the importance of the following three factors for the development
of an aggressive reaction pattern in younger children: lack of mother's warmth, use of physical punishment, and permissiveness for aggression (Olweus, 1980). These three parental variables: mother's negativism or rejection, permissiveness for aggression and parental use of power-assertive disciplinary methods also are identified by McCord, McCord & Howard (1961), and are cited by Olweus (1980, p. 657) as being contributing factors to negative, aggressive behaviors in children. These patterns of parental practices resemble the constructs of Authoritarian and Permissive parenting styles as conceptualized by (Baumrind, 1967, 1971) and (Maccoby & Martin, 1983). Recently, a study conducted in a middle school in Rome found that authoritarian parenting styles were associated with bullying behavior in boys and girls 11-14 years of age (Baldry & Farrington, 2000). Delinquent behaviors were correlated with conflictual (authoritarian) and 'low supportive' parents (Baldry & Farrington, 2000).

In the current study, the relationship of parenting style to bullying behavior in college students will be addressed. Drawing on Olweus’ model of parental influences on the development of bullies, it is hypothesized that students who indicate a maternal permissive parenting style and/or an authoritarian parenting style as the dominant mode of their upbringing will exhibit greater incidences of bullying behavior than students who indicate being raised with a different parenting style.

In summary, the main goals of the present study are: 1) to report the incidence of bullying in college by students, and the types of bullying used; 2) to report the incidence of bullying by teachers in college, and the types of bullying used; 3) to examine the gender differences in the types of bullying used by college students; 4) to examine self-esteem as a negative mental health correlate of bully victimization; and 5) to test Olweus’
(1980) hypothesis that a permissive parenting style, specifically by the mother, and an authoritarian parenting style by one or both parents, contributes significantly to the development of bullying behavior.
Method

Participants

The present study was conducted at a mid-size, public university in the northeast of the U.S. during the fall of 2002 and spring of 2003. The participants were 85 undergraduates who voluntarily completed the requisite measures and questionnaires. The respondents were 24.7% male ($n = 21$) and 75.3% female ($n = 64$). This ratio roughly approximates the overall university gender ratio of 39.6% male students and 60.4% female students (Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2003). The mean age for this sample was 20.2 years, ($SD = 3.25$ years). The class year breakdown is as follows: Freshman 41.2%, ($n = 35$), Sophomore 21.2%, ($n = 18$), Junior 20%, ($n = 17$), and Senior 17.7%, ($n = 15$).

Ethnically, the sample was 75.3% ($n = 64$) European American (White, not Hispanic); 10.6% ($n = 9$) African American; 4.71% ($n = 4$) Hispanic American; 3.53% ($n = 3$) Mixed (parents from different ethnic groups); 2.35% ($n = 2$) Asian American; 2.35% ($n = 2$) Other; 1.18% ($n = 1$) International student; and 0% Native American. This distribution closely approximates the ethnic distribution of the University’s student body with 79.5% White, 9.3% African American, 5.1% Hispanic, 2.9% Asian American and .4% Native American respectively (Office of Institutional Research and Planning, 2003).

Procedure

A multi-page handout was administered by the author to several classes of undergraduates (see Appendix A - E). It consisted of an informed consent form, 7 pages
of questionnaires, and a debriefing sheet. Following completion of the informed consent form, students completed the questionnaires, including a one-page demographic information questionnaire, a one page bullying questionnaire, a one-page self-esteem measure, and a four-page parenting style questionnaire. After completing these questionnaires, participants were given a debriefing sheet, which explained the purpose of the study and also informed them that help with bullying problems was available at the University counseling center.

**Measures**

*Demographic Information.*

The demographic questionnaire asked participants about their age, gender, undergraduate year in school, residential status (do you live in a residence hall?), cumulative grade point average and ethnicity (see Appendix B).

*Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale.*

The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale is the most widely used measure of global self-esteem. Test-retest reliability is high; typically in the range of .82 to .88 (see Blasovich & Tomaka, 1993, and Rosenberg, 1986). The test is scored as a Likert scale with a range from 0 to 3. There are ten items making up the test, half of which are reverse-coded. Items 1, 2, 4, 6, 7 are scored thusly: Strongly Agree = 3, Agree = 2, Disagree = 1, Strongly Disagree = 0. Items 3, 5, 8, 9, 10 are scored with reversed values; hence: Strongly Agree = 0, Agree = 1, Disagree = 2 and Strongly Disagree = 3. Overall scores on the test can range from a low of 0 to a high of 30, with higher scores indicating a greater level of self-esteem. All final scores for each participant were divided by 10 to yield the measure of self-esteem in the descriptive statistics. Further information on this
scale and its development can be found in Rosenberg (1965). (see Appendix B).

**Bullying Questionnaire.**

The next section of the study packet is the eight item questionnaire (see Appendix C). This questionnaire is based on the bullying questionnaire developed by Chapell et al. (in press) to address bullying in college by students and teachers, which incorporates Olweus’ widely accepted definition of bullying (Smith et al., 1999; Smith et al., 2002). Olweus characterizes school bullying by stating that: “A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time to negative actions on the part of one or more other students” (Olweus, 1999 p. 10). Chapell et al. (in press) further refined this description to include bullying in college by students and teachers:

“As a student in college, you are being bullied when someone who is more powerful than you deliberately and repeatedly tries to hurt you by: a) attacking you verbally, using harmful words or names; or b) attacking you physically; or c) making obscene gestures towards you; or d) intentionally isolating you or excluding you from a social group” Chapell et al. (in press).

The definition of bullying used in the current study is very much the same as in the Chapell et al. (in press) study, with a slight modification. In this study, the definition of bullying is stated as:

“As a student you are being bullied when someone who is more powerful than you repeatedly tries to hurt you by: 1) attacking you verbally, through harmful, words, names or threats; 2) attacking you physically; 3) intentionally isolating you or excluding you from a social group.”

16
Following this definition of bullying, there are eight questions:

1) Have you ever seen a student being bullied in college by another student?
2) Have you ever been bullied in college by another student?
3) If you have been bullied in college by another student, how were you bullied most frequently?
4) Have you ever seen a student being bullied in college by a teacher?
5) Have you ever been bullied in college by a teacher?
6) If you have been bullied in college by a teacher, how were you bullied most frequently?
7) Have you ever bullied another student in college?
8) If you have bullied another student in college, how did you bully them most frequently?

The bullying frequency questions (1, 2, 4, 5, 7) had four response categories: “Very Frequently” = 3, “Occasionally” = 2, “Once or Twice” = 1, “Never” = 0. The bullying style questions (3, 6, 8) had three response categories: “Verbal Attacks”, “Physical Attacks” and “By being intentionally isolated or excluded from a social group.” These three response categories directly mirror the definition used to describe bullying at the start of this particular assessment tool. The participant had only to put a check next to their chosen response for each question.

*Parental Authority Questionnaire.*

The last measure utilized in this study was developed by Buri (1991). (see Appendix D). This questionnaire was developed to measure Baumrind’s (1971) permissive, authoritarian, and authoritative parental authority prototypes in older
adolescents and young adults. Baumrind’s model has frequently been cited for its multidimensional character, its typological clarity and its empirical efficacy (Buri, 1991). Test-retest reliability of the Parental Authority Questionnaire on a sample of college students yielded reliabilities of .81 for mother’s permissiveness, .86 for mother’s authoritarianism, .78 for mother’s authoritativeness, .77 for father’s permissiveness, .85 for father’s authoritarianism, and .92 for father’s authoritativeness (Buri, 1991). The scale consists of 30 items per parent and yields separate scores for both mother and father, derived from the retrospective phenomenological appraisals of the parents’ authority by the participant (Buri, 1991). The participant is essentially rating their parents as they perceived them during the time they were growing up. There are 10 questions in each style category, yielding scores corresponding to each of the three distinct parenting styles. The measure is scored on a Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The questionnaire thus yields six separate final scores: mother’s permissiveness, authoritarianism, authoritativeness; likewise for father, with total scores on each variable ranging from 10 to 50. The higher the score, the greater the appraised level of the parental authority prototype measured (Buri, 1991).
Results

There are several data analyses that were carried out on the variables. First, a frequency distribution of incidence of bullying behaviors by students and teachers is presented, followed by the frequency distribution of types of bullying behavior. A Chi-Square analysis was performed to examine gender differences in types of bullying. Intercorrelations among self-esteem, bullying behaviors and parenting styles were calculated and a multiple regression analysis was conducted to further analyze the relationship between having bullied others and parenting styles.

Descriptive statistics of the sample ($N=85$) are presented in Table 1. The variables of import here are: age of subject, overall GPA, scores on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and the scores on the Parental Authority Questionnaire. For each variable the mean, standard deviation and range are reported.

A frequency analysis was conducted to assess the frequency of bullying by students and teachers (see Table 2). A total of 29.4% ($n = 25$) students reported having seen a student bullied by another student once or twice, and another 29.4% ($n = 25$) reported having seen a student bully another student occasionally. Having been bullied by another student only once or twice was reported by 20% ($n = 17$) of students, while 3.5% ($n = 3$) reported having been bullied occasionally. A total of 31.8% ($n = 27$) of students reported seeing another student being bullied by a teacher, while 8.2% ($n = 7$) of students reported having seen a teacher bullying another student occasionally, and 1.2% ($n = 1$) reported seeing a teacher bully another student very frequently. Also, 15.3% ($n = 13$) of
students reported being bullied by a teacher once or twice. Finally, 12.9% \((n = 11)\) of students reported bullying another student once or twice, while 2.4% \((n = 2)\) reported bullying another student occasionally, and 1.2% \((n = 1)\) reported bullying another student very frequently.

The frequency of different types of bullying are presented in Table 3. Verbal attacks from other students were reported by 15.3% of students \((n = 13)\). Being intentionally isolated from a social group was reported by 7.1% of students \((n = 6)\). Being bullied by a teacher verbally was reported by 11.8% of students \((n = 10)\). Being bullied by a teacher by being intentionally isolated or excluded was reported by 3.5% of students \((n = 3)\). Bullying another student verbally while in college was reported by 10.6% of students \((n = 9)\). Intentionally excluding or isolating another student from a social group was reported by 5.9% of students \((n = 5)\). No physical attacks by students or teachers were reported.

A Chi-Square test was conducted to test for gender differences in types of bullying (question 8 of bullying questionnaire). No significant differences were found between males and females in the use of verbal, social or physical forms of bullying; \(X^2 (2, 85) = .44, \ p < .80\).

A correlation matrix was constructed to examine the relationship among self-esteem, bullying behaviors and parenting style (see Table 4). As expected, there was a significant negative correlation between having been bullied by another student in college and self-esteem \((r = -.26, \ p < .05)\), and there was also a significant negative correlation between self-esteem and having witnessed a student being bullied by another student \((r = -.22, \ p < .05)\). There was, however, no significant correlation between level of
student self-esteem and having been bullied by a teacher or having witnessed other students being bullied by a teacher.

There was a significant positive correlation between having bullied another student while in college and having a mother that utilized a permissive parenting style, \( r = .22, \ p < .05 \) Interestingly, when the significance level was increased to .10, there was a positive, albeit weaker correlation between having bullied another student while in college and father’s authoritarian parenting style, \( r = .19, \ p < .10 \). To further analyze these relationships, mother’s permissiveness and father’s authoritarianism were regressed on student bullying, and both were found to be significant predictors of student bullying; mother’s permissiveness \( (p < .01) \) and father’s authoritarianism \( (p < .05) \) (see Table 5).
Discussion

Incidence and Types of Bullying by Students and Teachers

The first two goals of this study were to investigate the incidence and types of bullying by students and teachers in a college sample ($N = 85$). The results suggest that bullying occurs in college among the student population; student to student, as well as teacher to student. More than half of the participants, 58.8% ($n = 50$), had seen a student bully another student. Half of these students witnessed occasional bullying by other students and half reported having witnessed bullying once or twice. Overall, 16.5% of the participants reported that they had bullied other students while in college, including 1.2% who bullied very frequently, 2.35% who bullied other students occasionally, and 12.9% who reported bullying other students at least once or twice since they had been in college.

The most common type of bullying between peers in the sample was verbal, with social exclusion/isolation reported to a lesser extent. No participant reported physical bullying as the most frequent form of bullying they had been subjected to, or had used to bully others. Since physical bullying, or what many would notice as stereotypical bullying behavior, was not reported as the most common type of bullying by any student bully or any bullied student, the results of this study suggest the possibility of the transmutation of bullying from an outright physical, ‘observable’ occurrence (the stereotypical kind) into a more subtle, behind-the-scenes, and insidious type of verbal, social and ultimately psychological style of directed attack in the college student.
Seemingly then, bullying behavior may follow a developmental trend from more physical, open attacks in younger children to the primarily verbal and social types observed in adults in this study and in studies on workplace bullying.

Alarmingly, 31.8% of participants reported that they had witnessed a student being bullied by a teacher occasionally, and 8.2% reported that they had witnessed this once or twice since they had been in college. A further result is that 15.3% of participants reported having been bullied personally by teachers once or twice since they had been in college. Social bullying was reported by participants as the main style of bullying by teachers, with social isolation/exclusion used less often. Again, no participant reported that physical bullying was the most frequent type of bullying employed by any teacher.

The incidence rates of bullying by students and teachers in this study are similar to the results of the study by Chapell et al. (in press) in several respects. Chapell et al. found that 24.7% of students had witnessed student to student bullying occasionally, compared to 29.4% in this study, while 33.4% had witnessed it once or twice, compared to 29.4% in the present study. Chapell et al. (in press) reported that 5% of students had been bullied by other students occasionally, compared to 3.5% in this study, and that 18.5% reported being bullied once or twice compared to 20% in this study. The rates of students reporting bullying other students were virtually the same in the Chapell et al. (in press) study and the present study. Chapell et al. (in press) found that 1.9% of students reported seeing a teacher bully another student very frequently, 12.8% occasionally, and 29.4% once or twice, compared to 1.2%, 8.2% and 31.8% respectively,
in this study. Chapell et al. also found that 14.5% of students reported being bullied by a teacher once or twice, compared to 15.3% in this study.

There were several findings from the Chapell et al. (in press) study that were not borne out in the present study, most likely due to the much smaller sample size, which is a general limitation in this study ($N = 85$ compared to $N = 1,025$). Chapell et al. (in press) reported that 2.8% of students had seen a student bully another student very frequently, and that 1.1% reported having been bullied by another student very frequently, compared to 0% in both categories in the present study. Chapell et al. (in press) also found that .5% of students had been bullied by a teacher very frequently, and 4.2% reported being bullied by a teacher occasionally, compared to 0% in both categories of this study.

**Gender Differences in Types of Bullying**

The third goal of this study was to explore gender differences in the types of bullying behavior utilized by students in college. Both males and females used verbal bullying as the primary form of bullying, followed to a lesser extent by social bullying. No students reported physical bullying as the most common type of bullying used. This pattern of results is consistent with the findings of Olweus (1993), who also found that verbal bullying was the most common form of bullying in middle school boys and girls.

**Self-Esteem of Victims of Bullying**

The present study provides further confirmation in a college population of the link between being a victim of bullying and lower levels of self-esteem. This study found a significant relationship between having been bullied and overall level of global self-esteem, suggesting that higher levels of reported bullying victimization are related to
lower levels of self-esteem in college students. Lowered self-esteem has been associated with a number of negative problems including depressive symptoms (Block, Gjerde, & Block, 1991), health problems (Antonucci & Jackson, 1983; O'Connor & Vallerand, 1998), and antisocial behavior (Donnellan, Trzesniewski, Robins, Moffett & Caspi, 2002) (as cited in Trzesniewski, Donnellan, & Robins, 2003). As noted previously, Olweus’ longitudinal work has demonstrated that there are long-term consequences of being a victim of bullying. Victims suffer with lower levels of self-esteem and are more likely to be depressed in adulthood (Olweus, 1999).

Relationship of Parenting Styles to Bullying Behavior

In extending the previous work of Chapell et al. (in press), this study postulated that parenting style is an important component in the development of bullying behavior. Drawing on the research of Olweus, (1980, 1993, 1999); Maccoby & Martin, (1983); Baumrind, (1967, 1971); Sears et al., (1957) and McCord, McCord, & Howard, (1961), the present study addressed this issue to see if the theoretical framework could be applied to a college-age population. The results of this study are consistent with the literature. Significant positive correlations were obtained between mother’s permissive parenting style and amount of student bullying, and the regression analysis on student bullying also confirmed that mother’s permissive parenting style and father’s authoritarian parenting style were significant predictors of bullying behavior. These findings support Olweus’ (1999) theory of parental influences on the development of bullying behavior, and are consistent with Baldry and Farrington’s (2000) finding that authoritarian parenting is related to bullying behavior in middle school children.
Limitations and Directions for Future Research

The main limitation of this study is the small sample size. In particular, the investigation of types of bullying and gender differences in types of bullying behavior may have been improved with a larger sample, which might have included some participants reporting physical bullying as the most common type of bullying. This study did not ask participants to report the gender of teachers who bullied students, thus limiting the interpretation of the results on gender and types of bullying, and future studies need to address this particular issue. Another limitation is the lack of studies on bullying in a college population, with the exception of the Chapell et al. (in press) study, such that the present study extrapolated concepts from research conducted on primary through high school age populations.

Future research should focus on college age samples, drawn from colleges and universities worldwide. Studies should also address bullying of teachers by students, which this study did not. Longitudinal studies of bullying behaviors, their genesis, development, persistence, and possible remedies to the problem need to be conducted. Here I will note that Olweus has developed a comprehensive bullying intervention program designed for school-age children that has met with wide acceptance and strong, positive results (Olweus, 1993). Perhaps some version of this intervention program could be implemented at the college level to help victims of bullying, as well as the perpetrators, deal with the negative correlates of this behavior. Further research on the negative mental health consequences of bully victimization, such as depression in college students, should be conducted as well. Finally, are the bullies and victims in college the same bullies and victims in the primary grades through high school?
longitudinal studies are needed to investigate the continuation of bullying and victimization from child through adolescence and into adulthood.

Conclusions

The present study supports the previous findings of Chapell et al. (in press) in regards to the incidence of bullying behaviors by students and teachers in a college population, finding that bullying is indeed taking place between students and also that teachers bully students as well. This study also sought to investigate types of bullying used by college students and teachers, and gender differences in these types, if any. This study did not examine gender differences in teacher to student bullying.

No physical bullying was reported by any of the participants. Verbal and social forms of bullying were reported, with verbal being the most prominent among both male and female students. The effect of being victimized and its relation to overall level of self-esteem was investigated, and a significant negative correlation was obtained, indicating that being bullied was associated with a lower global level of self-esteem. This study also examined the influence of parental style on bullying behavior in college, and found that maternal permissiveness and paternal authoritarianism were significant predictors of student bullying.
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Table 1

*Means, Standard Deviations and Ranges of the Variables*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>20.24</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>18-42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>1.5-4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td>1.1-3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Authoritative</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>35.65</td>
<td>5.91</td>
<td>21-47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Authoritarian</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28.77</td>
<td>7.31</td>
<td>17-46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Permissive</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>24.61</td>
<td>4.99</td>
<td>10-35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Authoritative</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>33.48</td>
<td>7.67</td>
<td>10-48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Authoritarian</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>30.73</td>
<td>9.14</td>
<td>10-50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Permissive</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>24.41</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>10-41</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* M = mother, F = father
Table 2

*Percentage of Students Reporting Bullying Behavior of Students and Teachers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responses</th>
<th>Very Frequently</th>
<th>Occasionally</th>
<th>Only Once or Twice</th>
<th>Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seen Student Bullied by Student</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 25</td>
<td>n = 25</td>
<td>n = 35</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been Bullied By Student</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>76.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 3</td>
<td>n = 17</td>
<td>n = 65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Seen Student Bullied by Teacher</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>31.8</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 1</td>
<td>n = 7</td>
<td>n = 27</td>
<td>n = 50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Been Bullied By Teacher</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 13</td>
<td></td>
<td>n = 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Have Bullied Another Student</strong></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 1</td>
<td>n = 2</td>
<td>n = 11</td>
<td>n = 71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

**Percentages of Types of Bullying by Students and Teachers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Bullying</th>
<th>Physical</th>
<th>Verbal</th>
<th>Social</th>
<th>Not Bullied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>By Student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>77.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 13</td>
<td>n = 6</td>
<td>n = 66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>By Teacher</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>84.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 10</td>
<td>n = 3</td>
<td>n = 72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another Student</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>83.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>n = 9</td>
<td>n = 5</td>
<td>n = 71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4

*Intercorrelations Among Self-Esteem, Frequency of Bullying and Parental Style*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>S-Est</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>M-Aut</th>
<th>M-Att</th>
<th>M-P</th>
<th>F-Aut</th>
<th>F-Att</th>
<th>F-P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-Esteem</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.22*</td>
<td>-.26*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ1</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.43***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ2</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.004</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ4</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.48***</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ5</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.38***</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ7</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Aut</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.34***</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.37***</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-Att</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.57***</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M-P</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
<td>.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Aut</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.30**</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-Att</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-.56***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F-P</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05*, p < .01**, p < .001***

*Note.* BQ = bullying question (from bullying questionnaire), M = mother, F = father, Aut = authoritative, Att = authoritarian, P = permissive (from Parental Authority questionnaire).
Table 5

*Summary of Regression Analysis for Variables Predicting Student Bullying*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$B$</th>
<th>$SE_B$</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maternal Permissiveness</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.03**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paternal Authoritarianism</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05 *, p < .01 ***
Appendix A

Informed Consent Sheet
Informed Consent Form

I agree to participate in a study entitled “Bullying in College”, which is being conducted by Steven Russell, a Rowan graduate student, under the supervision of Dr. Mark Chapell of the Psychology Department, Rowan University. The purpose of this study is to investigate the frequency of bullying in a college student body and the relation of bullying to parenting styles and self-esteem, and the data collected in this study will be submitted for publication in a research journal.

I understand that I will be required to complete several questionnaires, including measures of student grade point average, parenting style, self-esteem, and questions regarding bullying, a task which will take approximately 30 minutes.

I understand that my responses will be anonymous and that all the data gathered will be confidential. I agree that any information obtained from this study may be used in any way thought best for publication or education provided I am in no way identified and my name is not used.

I understand that there are no physical or psychological risks involved in this study, and that I am free to withdraw my participation at any time without penalty.

I understand that my participation does not imply employment with the state of New Jersey, Rowan University, the principal investigators, or any other project facilitator.

If I have any questions or problems concerning my participation in this study I may contact Dr. Mark Chapell at (856)-256-4500 ext. 3171.

(Signature of Participant) (Date)

(Signature of Investigator) (Date)
Appendix B

Demographic Sheet and Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale
Information Sheet

1. Age _____ (years)

2. Male ____ Female ____

3. Undergraduate year in school: Freshman____ Sophomore____ Junior____ Senior____

4. Do you live in a residence hall? Yes____ No____

5. What is your cumulative college GPA? ________

6. Write in the number that gives the best answer to the question:
   My ethnicity is ________
   (1) Asian American
   (2) African American
   (3) European American (White, not Hispanic)
   (4) Hispanic American
   (5) Native American
   (6) Mixed; parents are from different groups (please use two or more numbers)
   (7) International student
   (8) Other (please write in) ________________

7. Below is a list of statements dealing with your general feelings about yourself. If you strongly agree with the statement, circle SA (Strongly Agree). If you agree with the statement, circle A (Agree). If you disagree, circle D (Disagree). If you strongly disagree, circle SD (Strongly Disagree).

   a. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.  
   b. At times I think I am no good at all.  
   c. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.  
   d. I am able to do things as well as most other people.  
   e. I feel I do not have much to be proud of.  
   f. I certainly feel useless at times.  
   g. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal plane with others.  
   h. I wish I could have more respect for myself.  
   i. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.  
   j. I take a positive attitude toward myself.  

   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
   SA  A  D  SD
Appendix C

Bullying Questionnaire
ABOUT BEING BULLIED IN COLLEGE

As a student you are being bullied when someone who is more powerful than you repeatedly tries to hurt you by:

1) attacking you verbally, through harmful words, names, or threats
2) attacking you physically
3) intentionally isolating you or excluding you from a social group

Please place a checkmark in the space next to the answer that is correct for you.

1. Have you ever seen a student being bullied in college by another student?
   _____ Very frequently
   _____ Occasionally
   _____ Only once or twice since I’ve been in college
   _____ I have never seen a student being bullied in college by another student

2. Have you ever been bullied in college by another student?
   _____ Very frequently
   _____ Occasionally
   _____ Only once or twice since I’ve been in college
   _____ I have never been bullied in college by another student

3. If you have been bullied in college by another student, how were you bullied most frequently?
   _____ Verbal attacks
   _____ Physical attacks
   _____ By being intentionally isolated or excluded from a social group

4. Have you ever seen a student being bullied in college by a teacher?
   _____ Very frequently
   _____ Occasionally
   _____ Only once or twice since I’ve been in college
   _____ I have never seen a student being bullied in college by a teacher

5. Have you ever been bullied in college by a teacher?
   _____ Very frequently
   _____ Occasionally
   _____ Only once or twice since I’ve been in college
   _____ I have never been bullied in college by a teacher

6. If you have been bullied in college by a teacher, how were you bullied most frequently?
   _____ Verbal attacks
   _____ Physical attacks
   _____ By being intentionally isolated or excluded from a social group

7. Have you ever bullied another student in college?
   _____ Very frequently
   _____ Occasionally
   _____ Only once or twice since I’ve been in college
   _____ I have never bullied another student in college

8. If you have bullied another student in college, how did you bully them most frequently?
   _____ Verbal attacks
   _____ Physical attacks
   _____ By intentionally isolating or excluding them from a social group
Appendix D

Parental Authority Questionnaire
For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your mother. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your mother during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don’t spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impression regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1. While I was growing up my mother felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.  
2. Even if her children didn’t agree with her, my mother felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what she thought was right.  
3. Whenever my mother told me to do something as I was growing up, she expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.  
4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my mother discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.  
5. My mother has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.  
6. My mother has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.  
7. As I was growing up my mother did not allow me to question any decision that she had made.  
8. As I was growing up my mother directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.  
9. My mother has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.  
10. As I was growing up my mother did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.  
11. As I was growing up I knew what my mother expected of me in my family but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my mother when I felt that they were unreasonable.  
12. My mother felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.  
13. As I was growing up, my mother seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.  
14. Most of the time as I was growing up my mother did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.  
15. As the children in my family were growing up, my mother consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.
16. As I was growing up my mother would get very upset if I tried to disagree with her.

17. My mother feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions, and desires as they are growing up.

18. As I was growing up, my mother let me know what behaviors she expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, she punished me.

19. As I was growing up my mother allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from her.

20. As I was growing up my mother took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but she would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.

21. My mother did not view herself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.

22. My mother had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but she was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.

23. My mother gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and she expected me to follow her direction, but she was always willing to listen to my concerns and to discuss that direction with me.

24. As I was growing up my mother allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and she generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.

25. My mother has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to as they are growing up.

26. As I was growing up my mother often told me exactly what she wanted me to do and how she expected me to do it.

27. As I was growing up my mother gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but she was also understanding when I disagreed with her.

28. As I was growing up my mother did not direct the behaviors, activities and desires of the children in the family.

29. As I was growing up I knew what my mother expected of me in the family and she insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for her authority.

30. As I was growing up, if my mother made a decision in the family that hurt me, she was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if she had made a mistake.
For each of the following statements, circle the number on the 5-point scale that best indicates how that statement applies to you and your father. Try to read and think about each statement as it applies to you and your father during your years of growing up at home. There are no right or wrong answers, so don’t spend a lot of time on any one item. We are looking for your overall impressions regarding each statement. Be sure not to omit any items.

1. While I was growing up my father felt that in a well-run home the children should have their way in the family as often as the parents do.
2. Even if his children didn’t agree with him, my father felt that it was for our own good if we were forced to conform to what he thought was right.
3. Whenever my father told me to do something as I was growing up, he expected me to do it immediately without asking any questions.
4. As I was growing up, once family policy had been established, my father discussed the reasoning behind the policy with the children in the family.
5. My father has always encouraged verbal give-and-take whenever I have felt that family rules and restrictions were unreasonable.
6. My father has always felt that what children need is to be free to make up their own minds and to do what they want to do, even if this does not agree with what their parents might want.
7. As I was growing up my father did not allow me to question any decision that he had made.
8. As I was growing up my father directed the activities and decisions of the children in the family through reasoning and discipline.
9. My father has always felt that more force should be used by parents in order to get their children to behave the way they are supposed to.
10. As I was growing up my father did not feel that I needed to obey rules and regulations of behavior simply because someone in authority had established them.
11. As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in my family, but I also felt free to discuss those expectations with my father when I felt that they were unreasonable.
12. My father felt that wise parents should teach their children early just who is boss in the family.
13. As I was growing up, my father seldom gave me expectations and guidelines for my behavior.
14. Most of the time as I was growing up my father did what the children in the family wanted when making family decisions.
15. As the children in my family were growing up, my father consistently gave us direction and guidance in rational and objective ways.
16. As I was growing up my father would get very upset if I tried to disagree with him.

17. My father feels that most problems in society would be solved if parents would not restrict their children's activities, decisions and desires as they are growing up.

18. As I was growing up, my father let me know what behavior he expected of me, and if I didn't meet those expectations, he punished me.

19. As I was growing up my father allowed me to decide most things for myself without a lot of direction from him.

20. As I was growing up my father took the children's opinions into consideration when making family decisions, but he would not decide for something simply because the children wanted it.

21. My father did not view himself as responsible for directing and guiding my behavior as I was growing up.

22. My father had clear standards of behavior for the children in our home as I was growing up, but he was willing to adjust those standards to the needs of each of the individual children in the family.

23. My father gave me direction for my behavior and activities as I was growing up and he expected me to follow his direction, but he was always willing to listen to my concerns and discuss that direction with me.

24. As I was growing up my father allowed me to form my own point of view on family matters and he generally allowed me to decide for myself what I was going to do.

25. My father has always felt that most problems in society would be solved if we could get parents to strictly and forcibly deal with their children when they don't do what they are supposed to do as they are growing up.

26. As I was growing up my father often told me exactly what he wanted me to do and how he expected me to do it.

27. As I was growing up my father gave me clear direction for my behaviors and activities, but he was also understanding when I disagreed with him.

28. As I was growing up my father did not direct the behaviors, activities and desires of the children in the family.

29. As I was growing up I knew what my father expected of me in the family and he insisted that I conform to those expectations simply out of respect for his authority.

30. As I was growing up, if my father made a decision in the family that hurt me, he was willing to discuss that decision with me and to admit it if he had made a mistake.
Appendix E

Debriefing Sheet
Bullying in College

Principal Investigator: Steven Russell, supervised by Dr. Mark Chapell (856-256-4500/ext. 3171; e-mail: Chapell@rowan.edu).

The practice of bullying in school is widespread throughout the world. Dan Olweus, the most well known investigator in this field, has tested over 130,000 Norwegian children from 1st through 9th graders (Olweus, 1994), and reports that 10% of all male and female students describe themselves as having been bullied in each grade, and that 5% describe themselves as bullies in each grade. Other large studies have found similar results in primary and secondary schools in Australia, New Zealand, England, Ireland, and Sweden. In a recent study of the prevalence of bullying in the United States, Nansel et al. (2001) gathered data from a representative sample of 16,000 students in grades 6 through 10, and also found that about 11% described themselves as being bullied in each grade.

Despite the substantial body of work documenting the frequency of bullying in primary and secondary school students, to date, only one study has explored bullying in college students (Chapell et al., 2002), and the main purpose of this investigation is further study the frequency of bullying in college by students and teachers, and to examine several theoretically important correlates of bullying, including parenting styles and self-esteem.

The study you have just participated in was designed to measure bullying in a large university that is representative of the age, gender and ethnic group distributions present in the national population, and the results will help to provide better estimates of the number of college students across the country who are being bullied. If you think you might have been bullied in college, the professionally trained counselors of the Rowan University Counseling and Psychological Services Center in Savitz Hall (856-256-4222) are available to provide confidential counseling addressing this and other challenges faced by college students.

Thank you for participating in this study. If you’d like to find out what the final overall results of the study were, please contact Dr. Chapell.
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