2012

Potential Empathy Deficits, Motivations, and Desistence in Traditional and Cyber Bullies

Colleen M. Keelan
West Virginia University

Follow this and additional works at: <https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd>

Recommended Citation

Keelan, Colleen M., "Potential Empathy Deficits, Motivations, and Desistence in Traditional and Cyber Bullies" (2012). *Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports*. 133.
<https://researchrepository.wvu.edu/etd/133>

This Thesis is protected by copyright and/or related rights. It has been brought to you by the The Research Repository @ WVU with permission from the rights-holder(s). You are free to use this Thesis in any way that is permitted by the copyright and related rights legislation that applies to your use. For other uses you must obtain permission from the rights-holder(s) directly, unless additional rights are indicated by a Creative Commons license in the record and/ or on the work itself. This Thesis has been accepted for inclusion in WVU Graduate Theses, Dissertations, and Problem Reports collection by an authorized administrator of The Research Repository @ WVU. For more information, please contact researchrepository@mail.wvu.edu.

Potential Empathy Deficits, Motivations, and Desistence in Traditional and Cyber Bullies

Colleen M. Keelan

Thesis submitted to the
Eberly College of Arts and Sciences
at West Virginia University
in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Science
in
Psychology

William Fremouw, Ph.D., Chair
Amy Fiske, Ph.D.
Amy Gentzler, Ph.D.

Department of Psychology

Morgantown, West Virginia
2012

Keywords: traditional bullying; cyberbullying; empathy; motivations; desistence
Copyright 2012 Colleen M. Keelan

ABSTRACT

Potential Empathy Deficits, Motivations, and Desistence in Traditional and Cyber Bullies

Colleen M. Keelan

Bullying is a serious phenomenon that includes behaviors conducted in a variety of mediums, including face-to-face (i.e. traditional bullying) and through technology (i.e. cyberbullying). This study examined differences between traditional bullies and cyberbullies in empathy deficits, motivation to engage in bullying behavior, and reasons for desistence of bullying behavior. The Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire was used to assess traditional bullying whereas the Internet Experience Questionnaire was used to assess cyberbullying. In a sample of 288 college students, there was no significant differences in total empathy, affective empathy, or cognitive empathy, between traditional bullies (N = 41), cyberbullies (N = 48), victims (N = 110), and controls (N = 89). Empathy deficits were assessed using the Basic Empathy Scale. A significant gender difference was found, with women demonstrating higher levels of empathy than men. When asked why he/she engaged in traditional and cyber bullying behaviors, 33% of cyberbullies denied the behaviors (i.e. "I would never do that"), whereas only 14% of traditional bullies responded with a statement of denial. Traditional bullies' most common motivation was peer pressure. In regards to desistence, cyberbullies again denied the behavior most frequently and traditional bullies reported that they gained self-awareness. These findings suggest that more research is needed to determine if empathy is an important construct to target in bullying interventions. Also, cyberbullies' denial of the bullying behavior suggests that more education about these behaviors is necessary

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Title Page	li
Abstract	2ii
List of Tables	vv
List of Figures	vivi
Introduction.....	1
Definitions of Bullying	1
Cyberbullying	2
Theories of Bullying	5
Characteristics of Bullies	7
Empathy and Bullying	10
Motivations and Desistence of Bullying Behaviors.....	11
Purpose.....	14
Method	15
Participants.....	15
Measures	17
Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire	17
Internet Experience Questionnaire.....	18
Motivations and Desistance Questionnaire.....	18
Modified Social Desirability Scale.	18
Basic Empathy Scale.....	19
Demographic Questionnaire.	20
Procedure	20
Results.....	21
Empathy Deficits	21
Motivations of Bullying Behaviors.....	22
Desistence of Bullying Behaviors.....	23
Discussion.....	23
Empathy Deficits	24
Motivations for Bullying Behaviors	25
Desistence of Bullying Behaviors.....	26
Limitations.....	26

Future Research	27
References.....	29
Tables.....	35
Figures.	39
Appendix.....	45

LIST OF TABLES

1. Descriptive data for traditional bullies, cyberbullies, victims, and controls.....	34
2. Means for BES total, affective, and cognitive scores for male and female participants.....	35
3. Means for BES total, affective, and cognitive empathy scores for traditional bullies, cyberbullies, victims, and controls	36
4. Motivation and desistence responses for cyber and traditional bullies.....	37

LIST OF FIGURES

1. Conceptualization of traditional and cyberbullying	38
2. Diagram of participant exclusion	39
3. Final sample of participants including matched controls	40
4. Means of BES total empathy as a function of group and gender	41
5. Means of BES cognitive empathy as a function of group and gender	42
6. Means of BES affective empathy as a function of group and gender	43

Potential Empathy Deficits, Motivations, and Desistence in Traditional and Cyber Bullies

On September 22, 2010, Tyler Clemente jumped to his death from the George Washington Bridge after being cyberbullied by a college roommate. *People* magazine brought national attention to this tragedy through the article, “Deadly Bullying” which described the suicide deaths of three teenage victims of bullying (Smolowe, 2010). Tyler Clemente, a freshman at Rutgers University, was one of those victims. Tyler’s roommate videotaped him with another male student and broadcast it to the cyber world. This videotape “outed” Tyler, because it was not well known that he was gay.

Bullying is a phenomenon that has been studied since the 1970s. Olweus began this line of research by studying face-to-face or direct bullying, now termed traditional bullying (Olweus, 1993). He defined bullying as a situation “when he or she is exposed, repeatedly over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students” (1993, p. 9). Direct bullying includes physical bullying (e.g. hitting and kicking) and verbal bullying (e.g. name calling). Traditional bullying also includes indirect bullying (e.g. rumor spreading and social isolation). Repetitive behaviors and a power differential characterize important components of this definition. Wang, Iannotti, and Nansel (2009) have found that of traditional bullying behaviors, verbal bullying is the most frequent (37.4%), followed by indirect bullying (27.2%), and lastly, physical bullying (13.3%). In regards to gender, boys were involved in direct, physical bullying (28%) more than girls (14.3%) and girls (55.1%) were involved in indirect bullying more than boys (47.5%) (Wang et al., 2009).

To date, most of the bullying literature has concentrated on bullies in adolescence or middle school (e.g. Ang & Goh, 2009; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006; Wang et al., 2009). Few studies have examined bullying within a college population (Chappell, Casey, Dela Cruz, Ferrell,

Forman, et al., 2004; Chapell, Hasselman, Kitchin, Lomon, MacIver, & Sarullo, 2006; Kraft & Wang, 2010; MacDonald & Roberts-Pittman, 2010; Ragatz, Anderson, Fremouw, & Schwartz, 2010; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012). Chappell et al. (2004) examined 1025 undergraduate students and found that 18% had been bullied while in college and 33% witnessed bullying in college. Chapell et al. (2006) examined verbal, social, and physical bullying in 119 undergraduate students and reported that 19% of participants had bullied someone once or twice in college and 2.5% of participants bullied someone “occasionally”. This study also asked about bullying behavior in high school and elementary school. Of those who bullied others in college, 53.8% also bullied in high school. These studies demonstrated that while bullying in college is less prevalent than bullying in high school, it is still a serious issue that needs to be addressed.

Likewise, Kraft and Wang (2010), MacDonald and Roberts-Pittman (2010) examined bullying with a college population, but both studies extended the literature to examine cyberbullying. Kraft and Wang (2010) studied 471 American college students and found that 10% of participants had cyberbullied another. MacDonald and Roberts-Pittman (2010) found a similar prevalence rate of 8.6% with a college sample of 239 students. This current research has examined the prevalence rates of both traditional and cyberbullying in a college sample. Research now must expand upon the phenomenon of bullying in college to better understand why these behaviors continue.

Cyberbullying

Recently, research has expanded the understanding of bullying to include cyber bullying (e.g. Ang & Goh, 2010; Campbell, 2005; Konig, Gollwitzer, & Steffgen, 2010). Cyberbullying is defined both by the behaviors and the tools used to engage in those behaviors and includes any electronic communication such as cell phones and the internet (Konig et al., 2010). Willard (n.d.)

described seven ways to engage in cyberbullying: flaming (i.e. cyber fighting), harassment (i.e. sending messages repeatedly), denigration (i.e. online rumor spreading), impersonation (i.e. pretending to be someone else), outing and trickery (i.e. broadcasting personal information that is unknown), exclusion (i.e. intentionally leaving someone out), and cyberstalking (i.e. stalking through continuously sending messages) (See Figure 1). Raskauskas and Stoltz (2007) examined 84 American adolescents (Mean age = 15.35 years) and found that text messages were the most prevalent form of cyberbullying. Huang and Chou (2010) examined 545 Taiwanese junior high students and found that 34.9% of participants have been victims of cyberbullying and 20.4% had cyberbullied other students. More male students were victims and perpetrators of cyberbullying than female students. Cyberbullying shares many similar qualities with traditional bullying, including that the behaviors are negative actions and that these behaviors have psychological consequences on the victims.

While there are similarities, there are also differences between cyber and traditional bullying such as a bigger audience, less escape, and the potential to be anonymous (Campbell, 2005). With traditional bullying, the audience is usually confined to peers during the school day. In contrast, cyberbullying behaviors can be quickly viewed by millions of people at any time. Even when a webpage is removed, the damaging material may already have been printed and remains elsewhere on the internet (Huang & Chou, 2010). Cyberbullying allows for the bullying behaviors to extend past school hours to the point where victims may feel that they have no escape. Lastly, because cyberbullying does not require the bully and the victim to be face-to-face, the behaviors may be anonymous. Research on the anonymity of cyberbullying varies. Huang and Chou (2010) found that 75% of cyberbully victims in Taiwan knew who bullied them. In a sample of 799 college students, 90% knew his/her perpetrator (Schenk & Fremouw,

2012). This suggests that while the potential for anonymity is there, most cyberbully victims know their perpetrator.

Another difference between cyberbullying and traditional bullying includes an imbalance of power and repetition. An important characteristic of the definition of traditional bullying is an imbalance of power. For example, in physical bullying, the bully is usually physically stronger and larger than the victim. While important for the definition of traditional bullying, this imbalance is not necessary (at least in the physical sense) while engaging in cyber bullying (Huang & Chou, 2010). In regards to an imbalance of power, cyberspace also gives cyberbullies a sense of control over certain situations. Dooley, Pyzalski, and Cross (2009) stated that cyberbully victims are even more powerless than traditional bully victims because of the bullying information is always accessible through the internet, whereas traditional bullying stops once the victims gets away from the perpetrator.

A key component of the definition of bullying (i.e. traditional bullying) is repetition. When operationalizing the definition of cyberbullying researchers are conflicted over whether or not to include the word “repetitive.” Dooley et al. (2009) stated that every time someone sees the bullying information, whether logging onto a website or viewing the text message, the bullying behavior is being repeated. Therefore, they do not agree that the act of setting up a website or sending a nasty text message needs to be repeated. Griggs (2010) also agreed that repetition is possible without the perpetrator repeating the act. Bystanders can forward the message/video to others and the number of times the message/video is viewed could be considered repetitive.

Lastly, the victims of cyberbullying tend to be different than those of traditional bullying. A study by Konig et al. (2010) found that 14% of cyberbullies perpetrated against someone who had traditionally bullied them. The researchers speculated that cyberspace allowed the

cyberbullies a place to enact revenge against previous perpetrators without the fear of retaliation. Whereas a motivation for traditional bullies is to assert their power, in cyberbullying a proportion (14%) of bullies are enacting revenge on someone who has hurt them in the past. In contrast to this finding, Raskauskas and Stolz (2007) and Gradinger, Strohmeier, and Spiel (2009) both found that traditional victims of bullying were not cyberbullies. The research remained unclear as to the motivations behind cyberbullying.

Bullying research has continued to evolve with studies comparing traditional and cyberbullies (Raskauskas & Stolz, 2007). Raskauskas and Stolz examined eighty-four 13-18 year old American adolescents and found that 21.4% (N = 18) were cyberbullies and 64.3% (N = 54) were traditional bullies. In a small sample of 18 cyberbullies, 17 of them (94%) were also traditional bullies. For this study, participants were recruited during “Youth Development Events” (Raskauskas & Stolz, 2007, p. 567). They completed a self-report questionnaire with a 4 point Likert-type scale with choices ranging from “Not at all like me,” “a little like me,” “kind of like me,” and “a lot like me.” Participants who answered the question with anything other than “not at all like me” were considered either a traditional or cyberbully (based on the questions answered). These lenient criteria may factor into the large percentage of bullies in this sample. Gradinger et al. (2009) studied 761 Austrian adolescents (ages ranging from 14-19) comparing both traditional and cyber bullies and bully-victims. Very few participants were only cyberbullies or cyberbully-victims, instead most were either only traditional bullies or a combination of traditional and cyber bully-victims.

Theories of Bullying

Many theories of traditional bullying have been proposed while fewer theories have been used to explain cyberbullying. Rigby (2003) described several theories of bullying including:

developmental theory, sociocultural theory, group process theory, and individual differences theory. The developmental theory of bullying proposes that bullying begins in childhood when children are unaware of socially acceptable behaviors and should decline as the child becomes older and understands how to socially interact with others. This theory fails to explain why bullying is still a concern in college. The sociocultural theory of bullying suggests that bullying exists because of levels of power within cultures. Similar to the sociocultural theory is the group process theory which states that bullies engage in these behaviors because of peer pressure and reinforcement. Many incidences of traditional bullying take place with peers or in the presence of peers. This theory does not explain why cyberbullying takes place behind the mask of technology. Another theory of bullying pertains to individual differences which lead someone to bully others. Rigby (2003) suggested differences such as self-esteem and lack of social skills could explain why someone engages in bullying behavior. Bhat (2008) also stated that individual differences may explain why people cyberbully others. Bhat suggested that impulsivity may be a strong factor in cyberbully behaviors. An impulsive person may send a message out of anger or embarrassment without considering the consequences.

Another theory of cyberbullying is the disinhibition effect which suggests that cyber bullying behaviors exist because the anonymity of the technology allows bullies to act harsher than usual (Mason, 2008). The disinhibition effect is derived from psychology's understanding of deindividuation. Deindividuation is when "a series of antecedent social conditions lead to changes in perception of self and others, and thereby to a lowered threshold of normally restrained behavior" (Zimbardo, 1970, p. 251). Cyberbullies are able to distance themselves from the situation because they do not have the normal constraints as traditional bullies do. The internet allows cyberbullies more distance and potential anonymity than face-to-face bullying.

Characteristics of Bullies

Bullies, both traditional and cyber, exhibit certain characteristics including: poor relationships with caregivers, substance use, delinquency, depressive symptoms, higher criminal thinking scores, higher levels of primary and secondary psychopathy, and empathy deficits (Ragatz et al., 2010; Ybarra & Mitchell, 2004). Ybarra and Mitchell examined 1501 cyberharassers (i.e. harassment that takes place on the internet) and found that 44% of them had a poor relationship with their caregiver. Thirty-two percent of cyberharassers had frequent substance use and this related to increased odds of harassing others, as did delinquency and depressive symptoms. Ragatz et al. examined 960 college students and found that bullies had higher scores on the Psychological Inventory of Criminal Thinking Styles than victims or controls. They also determined that bullies were higher in primary psychopathy such as callousness, grandiosity, superficial charm and remorselessness. Bullies were also higher in secondary psychopathy such as impulsivity and lack of responsibility. Empathy deficits, determined using the Basic Empathy Scale, have also been found to characterize bullies (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006).

Empathy deficits are often cited as an important characteristic of bullies. In a review of empathy definitions, three iconic studies are credited for developing the current understanding of empathy (Hogan, 1969; Davis, 1980; Strayer, 1993). Hogan defined empathy as an “act of constructing for oneself another person’s mental state” (1969, p. 308). Initially, empathy was considered a unitary concept. Hogan developed an empathy questionnaire by asking people to describe an empathic individual. The characteristics included: 1) socially perceptive, 2) aware of impression he gives others, 3) good social skills and imagination, 4) insight into own behavior,

and 5) evaluate motivations of others (1969). This scale became the basis for future empathy scales.

Expanding this definition to include perspective taking, Chandler (1973) developed a cartoon picture measure to examine perspective-taking and designed a study to test whether increasing perspective-taking could lessen future delinquent behavior. This was a measure in which participants were shown two pictures with the first picture containing an incident such as a boy jumping in a mud puddle. The second picture contained the first character along with a second character such as the boy looking worried and an older woman. Participants were asked to describe the cartoons stating what both characters might be feeling and thinking. These answers were then coded as to how well participants were able to take the perspective of the cartoon characters. This study then randomly assigned 45 youth who were at risk for delinquency to either an experimental condition which consisted of a role-taking program, or one of two control conditions. In a six month follow-up, Chandler found that participants in the role-taking program increased in empathy and engaged in less delinquent behavior than participants in either of the control conditions.

Davis further developed empathy measures with the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI), a self-report measure which examined perspective taking as well as emotional empathy (Davis, 1980, 1983). Davis describes empathy as a multidimensional concept. Perspective taking was defined as “allow[ing] an individual to anticipate the behavior and reactions of others” (Davis, 1983). He defined emotional empathy in terms of sympathy and warmth. The IRI consisted of 45-items in four areas: fantasy, perspective-taking, empathetic concern, and personal distress.

In 1993, Strayer also described empathy as a multidimensional construct comprised of cognition and emotion. Strayer stated that empathy lies on a continuum comprised of both the

concept of affect matching and cognitive attribution. Affective matching is when someone has the ability to feel the same emotion as another whereas cognitive attribution is an understanding of what another person is thinking. Strayer's research helped clarify the components of cognitive and affective empathy that are examined today.

Currently, empathy is conceptualized as the culmination of two separate constructs, cognitive and affective empathy, which both describe people's emotions (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). This understanding is different from Strayer's (1993) theory that empathy included understanding what someone is thinking. Cognitive and affective empathy are now considered distinct concepts from perspective-taking and sympathy, respectively. While perspective taking is looking at a situation from the point of view of another person and understanding what he/she is thinking, cognitive empathy is "understanding the emotions of another" (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006, p. 592). Sympathy is defined as the evaluation of another's emotions and reaction to those emotions; however this emotion is not always the same emotion as the other person is exhibiting. In contrast to sympathy, with affective empathy a person takes on the emotions of another (Jolliffe & Farrington).

Empathy deficits have commonly been measured by self-report descriptive measures (e.g. Hogan Empathy Scale, Interpersonal Reactivity Index, and the Basic Empathy Scale). The self-report descriptive measures are constructed on a Likert-type scale and examine different aspects of empathy such as cognitive, affective, emotional, and perspective-taking. Empathy has also been measured using response generated measures such as Chandler's perspective-taking task and the SCAN Bullying test (Almeida, del Barrio, Marques, Gutierrez, & van der Meulen, 2001). These measures require participants to examine a cartoon picture, describe the situation, and explain how each character feels.

Empathy and Bullying

Research examining whether empathy deficits are related to bullying behaviors have found mixed results. One consistency in research is differences in empathy levels for males and females with females having higher empathy scores overall (Gini, Albiero, Benelli & Altoe, 2007; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006; Mayberry & Espelage, 2007; Munoz et al., 2010).

Jolliffe and Farrington (2006) examined 720 British adolescents (age 15 years) on measures of bullying and empathy by comparing differences in gender, frequency of bullying, and type of bullying. When comparing frequency of bullying behaviors, Jolliffe and Farrington found that men and women who bullied “often” had lower levels of affective and total empathy compared to men who bullied “once or twice.” When comparing bullies with controls, they concluded that men who bullied did not differ on any type of empathy (cognitive, affective, or total score) from men who did not bully. Females who bullied had lower levels of affective empathy and total empathy than females who did not bully, but did not differ on cognitive empathy.

To date, only two studies have examined empathy with cyberbullies (Ang & Goh, 2010; Schultze-Krumbholz & Scheithauer, 2009). Ang and Goh sampled 396 adolescents (ages 12-18 years) in Singapore using a nine item cyberbullying questionnaire and the Basic Empathy Scale. The cyberbullying questionnaire was constructed with a 5-point Likert scale, from “once or twice a year” to “a few times every week” and lastly, “never bullied others” (Ang & Goh, 2010, p. 391). Using this measure, Ang and Goh classified bullies into “non-bullies” (i.e. never bullied), “infrequent bullies” (i.e. a couple times a year) and “frequent bullies” (bullied weekly). They found that when participants had low levels of affective empathy and low levels of cognitive empathy, they were significantly likely to be involved in cyberbullying for both boys and girls.

When boys had high levels of affective empathy and low levels of cognitive empathy they were more likely to be engaged in cyberbullying. For girls with high levels of affective empathy, high or low levels of cognitive empathy did not affect cyberbullying behavior. Ang and Goh suggested that boys are more affected by empathy deficits than girls.

In a brief report, Schultze-Krumbholz and Scheithauer examined 71 German adolescents (mean age = 14 years). Empathy was assessed using a peer estimated scale; further details of this scale were not described. They concluded that adolescents who engaged in cyberbullying had significantly lower levels of empathy than control students who did not engage in cyberbullying.

Traditional bullies who bully others “often” have displayed empathy deficits. Cyberbullies have also displayed empathy deficits. These deficits have been examined in either traditional bullies or cyberbullies, but research has yet to compare empathy deficits between traditional and cyberbullies.

Motivations and Desistence of Bullying Behaviors

Researchers have examined not only bully characteristics (e.g. empathy) but also why people bully others and how bullying stops. Currently, there is no standard way to measure motivations for bullying. Most researchers have examined motivations by qualitative analysis (e.g. Martinez, 2006; Varjas, Talley, Meyers, Parris, and Cutts , 2010; Hara, 2002). Participants are usually asked their general impression about why bullying happens and what makes it stop but little research has asked bullies what motivated them and why they stopped. In general, motivations for bullying others include: personality aspects of the bully and personality and physical aspects of the victim. Research has yet to examine the effects of situational factors on bullying behaviors.

In an examination of motivations to traditionally bully others, Martinez (2006) examined 2181 Spanish students ages 10 to 18 years. He posed three questions to victims, bullies, and controls: (1) “If you have been bullied, why do you think they did it?”, (2) “If you participated in bullying, why did you do it?”, and (3) “Why do you think some kids bully others?”. In response to the first question they coded the following responses: because I provoked them, because I am different from them, because I am weaker, to bother me, to play a joke on me, and because I deserved it. The second question elicited the following responses: because they provoked me, because others do this to me, because they are different, because they are weaker, to bother them, and to play a joke. Finally in response to the third question they found the reasons to be: to bother them, because they are intimidated, because they are stronger, and to play a joke.

Similarly, Frisen, Jonsson, and Persson asked 119 Swedish adolescents ages 15 to 20, “why do you think individuals are bullied?” and “why do some children and adolescents bully others?” (2007, p. 751). Answers to the latter question fell into nine areas, self-esteem, personal problems, popularity, respect, jealousy, annoyance, peer pressure, and victimization with the bully’s low self-esteem as the most popular answer. Frisen, Holmqvist, and Oscarsson administered the same question to 877 Swedish adolescents (mean age = 13.58 years): “Why do you think children/adolescents are bullied?” (2008, p. 110). Categories of responses included victims’: appearance, behavior, clothes, differences and also bullies’ personality. The most popular response was that the victims appeared different than others and the second most popular response centered on the bully’s problems.

Cyberbullies’ motivations appear to fit into comparable themes of traditional bullies, such as internal motivations (e.g. revenge) or external motivations (e.g. victim was different). Varjas et al. (2010) conducted a focus group of 20 high school students who gave responses in a semi-

structured interview. Students were not asked whether or not they had ever been involved in cyberbullying. The researchers posed the question “What are senders [cyberbullies] motivations?” Using qualitative analysis the answers clustered into two categories: internal and external motivations (Varjas et al., 2010). The internal motivation reasons included: “redirect feelings, revenge, make themselves feel better, boredom, instigation, protection, jealousy, seeking approval, trying out a new persona, anonymity/disinhibition effect” (Varjas et al., 2010, p. 270). The external motivations included: “no consequences, non-confrontational, and target was different” (Varjas et al., 2010, p. 271). Overall, internal motivations for cyberbullying were much more common than external motivations.

Similar to motivations for bullying, Hara (2002) examined justifications for bullying in 100 Japanese adolescents, ages 12-14. Participants were prompted to describe a situation in which bullying is right or allowed. The justifications included blaming outside factors, lack of injury, blaming the victim, blaming society, and feelings of self-righteousness. Hara found a gender difference in the justifications provided, with females stating that it was right because no one was injured and males stated that it was right because the victim provoked the situation in some way.

Examining why an individual chooses to bully a peer is important, as is determining why bullying stops. One study asked Swedish adolescents, “What do you think makes bullying stop” (Frisen et al., 2007, p. 751). Of the eight responses, four involved a change with the victim (e.g. moves, gets revenge, stands up for himself/herself), three involved a change with the bully (e.g. matures, feels guilty), and one involved adults intervening. The most popular answer was that the bully matured. There was a discrepancy between answers from those who were not involved in bullying and those who were bullied. Many participants who were not involved in bullying

stated that the victim stood up for himself/herself. The participants who were victims did not state this answer as often.

Currently there is no information regarding the desistence of cyberbullying.

In conclusion, researchers have asked participants why they think people are bullied and what makes bullying stop, but few researchers have asked the bullies why they, themselves, engaged in those behaviors and what made them stop. There are several broad themes of motivations for bullying including: provocation (i.e. situations from the past), asymmetric (i.e. differences in power), and minimization (i.e. making a situation seem unimportant) (Martinez, 2006). Reasons elicited from bullies about their behavior include: because they provoked me, because others do this to me, because they are different, because they are weaker, to bother them, and to play a joke (Martinez, 2006). No research has directly asked cyberbullies why they engage in bullying behaviors and no research has asked traditional or cyber bullies what caused their desistence.

Purpose

The purpose of this study was to examine potential differences between traditional bullies and cyberbullies in a) empathy deficits, b) motivations to engage in bullying behavior, and c) desistence of bullying behavior. Participants completed anonymous questionnaires and were divided into 4 groups: traditional bullies, cyberbullies, victims, and controls based on the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire-Revised and the Internet Experience Questionnaire.

1. The first purpose was to examine potential empathy deficits of traditional and cyberbullies on a self-description measure (Basic Empathy Scale). The Basic Empathy Scale is a self-report, likert-type scale of cognitive and affective empathy (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006).

- It was hypothesized that A) traditional bullies and cyberbullies would have larger empathy deficits than victims and controls and B) traditional bullies would have larger empathy deficits than cyberbullies.
2. The second purpose was to examine motivations of both traditional and cyber bullies. Questions about motivations for bullying behaviors were assessed with the Motivations and Desistence Questionnaire derived from Martinez (2006). The questionnaire was formatted for a college population and revised to distinguish between motivations for traditional bullying and cyberbullying.
 3. The final purpose of this study was to examine desistence in traditional and cyber bullies. This was assessed with the Motivations and Desistence Questionnaire using an open-ended question asking “If you traditionally bullied others, why did you stop?” and “If you cyberbullied others, why did you stop?”

Method

Participants

Prior to data collection, a power analysis was run using GPower and it was determined that a total sample size of 179 participants was needed to detect a meaningful difference with a medium effect size, $\eta^2 = .25$, Power = .80. This analysis suggested that 23 participants were needed for each of the four groups in the analyses.

An initial sample consisted of 700 college students from a large Mid-Atlantic University. Participants ages ranged from 18-25 with a mean age of 19.7 (SD = 1.5). In a procedure similar to Schenk and Fremouw (2012) and Ragatz et al. (2011), participants who took less than ten minutes to complete the study were eliminated. Ten minutes was chosen because the average participant completed the study in 38 minutes (SD = 43 minutes). Also, a score of three or

greater on the Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire was used to determine inconsistent responding. Lastly, four participants were eliminated due to a large amount of missing data (more than 50%). After these procedures, 580 participants remained (See Figure 2).

Participants were then divided into four independent groups: cyberbullies, traditional bullies, victims, and controls. Participants were categorized as cyberbullies ($N = 48$) if they endorsed engaging in any of the behaviors on the Internet Experience Questionnaire more than twice (Schenk & Fremouw, 2012). "More than twice" was defined as any bullying behavior endorsed at a frequency of "two or three times a month" or at least three separate behaviors endorsed at a frequency of "once or twice." Similarly, traditional bullies ($N = 27$) consisted of participants who endorsed engaging more than twice in any of the behaviors on the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus, 1996). Participants who endorsed engaging in both cyber and traditional bullying behaviors were categorized as traditional bullies ($N = 14$). Previous research suggested that because of the anonymity of the internet, cyberbullies may engage in bullying behaviors because they are disinhibited or removed from facing their victim. Because of this disinhibition effect, cyberbullies were thought to have less empathy deficits than traditional bullies. Therefore, participants who bully both traditionally and through cyber-means should be more similar to traditional bullies than cyberbullies because traditional bullies do not exhibit the disinhibition effect. This resulted in a total sample size of 41 traditional bullies. Participants were considered victims ($N = 110$) if they endorsed more than twice any questions about being victimized on the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire and/or the Internet Experience Questionnaire. Lastly control participants ($N = 381$) did not endorse behaviors consistent with bullying or victimization. Control participants were matched with traditional and

cyber bullies on age, gender, and ethnicity (See Table 1 for descriptive data). This resulted in a final sample of 288 participants (See Figures 3).

In regards to missing data, on the Basic Empathy Scale, five participants were each missing one item on the scale. No participants were missing more than one item. Mean imputation was used on the five missing data points. On the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire, 14 participants had one item missing and no participants were missing more than one item. These fourteen data points were not included in the determination of group. Visual inspection of the missing data showed that the missing item did not affect the participant's group placement (i.e. regardless of the answer to that particular question, participants would have remained in the same group). The same procedure was used for the Internet Experience Questionnaire in which two participants were missing one item and one participant was missing two items.

Measures

Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. The Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Olweus, 1996) used in this study was adapted from Ragatz et al. (2010). It is a 42-item, self-report measure of bullying behaviors and attitudes (Appendix A). It includes items about direct, indirect and cyberbullying behaviors. For the purpose of this project, participants were asked whether they have been bullied or bullied others during college. Response choices were as follows: *never, once or twice, two or three times a month, once a week, or several times a week*. One strength of this measure is that it begins with a detailed definition bullying and asks participants to answer questions based on that definition. The Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire was chosen because it is the most widely administered measure of bullying behaviors (Lee & Cornell, 2010).

Internet Experience Questionnaire (IEQ). The IEQ was adapted from Schenk and Fremouw (2012) for the purposes of this study (Appendix B). It is a 61-item measure assessing a variety of internet activities including cyberbully victimization and perpetration. It included a 10-item section pertaining to cyberbully perpetration with a 5 point Likert-type response format. Answer choices were: *never, once or twice, two or three times a month, once a week, several times a week*. This questionnaire is also composed of other response formats such as open-ended questions, dichotomous answer choices (yes/no), multiple choice, and check all that apply.

Motivations and Desistance Questionnaire. To assess motivations for bullying, participants completed a six-item measure derived from Martinez (2006) (Appendix C). It included the following items: (1) “If you have been traditionally bullied at some time, why do you think they did it?”, (2) “If you have been cyber bullied at some time, why do you think they did it?”, (3) “If you participated in traditional bullying situations towards others, why did you do it?”, (4) “If you participated in cyber bullying situations towards others, why did you do it?”, (5) “Why do you think some people traditionally bully others?” and (6) “Why do you think some people cyberbully others?”. Two questions examined desistance of bullying behaviors including: “If you traditionally bullied others, why did you stop?” and “If you cyberbullied others, why did you stop.” Themes were derived from the responses given by participants.

Modified Social Desirability Scale. A measure was constructed for the purpose of this study which combined the 10 infrequency validity scale items from the Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire (Zuckerman, 2002) and 10-items from the Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale (Crowne-Marlowe, 1960) (Appendix D). All items have dichotomous responses (True/False). The Crowne-Marlowe Social Desirability Scale items were used to conceal the purpose of the infrequency items. The 10 infrequency scale items from the

Zuckerman-Kuhlman Personality Questionnaire were scored with true responses receiving one point and false responses receiving zero points. Scores of three or greater signified careless or socially desirable responding and these participants' responses were dropped from further analyses.

Basic Empathy Scale. The Basic Empathy Scale (BES) is a 20-item, self-report measure of both cognitive and affective empathy (Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). The measure was constructed to bridge the gaps in other self-report measures of empathy. Most closely related to the BES is the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI) which measures cognitive and emotional empathy (Davis, 1980). Jolliffe and Farrington argued that the IRI measures sympathy rather than empathy, and that cognitive empathy and perspective taking are separate constructs. The BES's items were derived from the definitions of cognitive and affective empathy, as well as from basic emotions. To validate the BES, Jolliffe and Farrington gave a longer 40-item, 5-point scale measure to 363 adolescents along with the IRI and a bullying measure. An exploratory factor analysis revealed two factors (affective and cognitive empathy). They then collected data from 357 more adolescents on a shorter, 20-item measure derived from the factor analysis. Jolliffe and Farrington found high correlations between the BES and the IRI, yet not perfect correlations which suggested that they may not be examining the exact same constructs.

Two studies examined the internal consistency of the BES and found the BES to be a good measure of empathy (Albiero, Matricardi, Speltri, & Toso, 2009; D'Ambrosio, Olivier, Didon, & Besche, 2009). In France, D'Ambrosio et al. examined the internal consistency of the BES. They found a total score alpha of .80, an affective empathy alpha of .77 and a cognitive empathy alpha of .66. Test-retest reliability ranged from $r = .66$ for total score, $r = .70$ for affective empathy, and $r = .54$ for cognitive empathy. In Italy, Albiero et al. found internal

consistency alpha of .87 for total empathy, .74 for cognitive empathy, and .86 for affective empathy. This measure was chosen because many current studies of empathy and bullying have used it. Another reason for choosing this measure was that it examines both cognitive and affective empathy in a short, self-report measure. Similar to previous findings, in the current sample the Cronbach's alphas for total empathy was .86, affective empathy was .83, and cognitive empathy was .76.

Demographic Questionnaire. Participants answered a short series of demographic questions including age, gender, race, and class status (Appendix E).

Procedure

This study received approval from the University's Institutional Review Board. Participants completed the anonymous self-report questionnaires via SurveyMonkey and Sona systems. Sona systems is a web-based product which universities use to manage participants whereas SurveyMonkey is a service used to create online questionnaires. Students logged onto Sona Systems, selected the study and then were directed, via a url link, to the SurveyMonkey site where they the questionnaires were located.

The study began with an informed consent document that included a description of the project, the length of time, the risks and benefits of completing the study, and stated that participants can continue without completing all questions and are free to discontinue at any time without penalty. Participants who were willing to continue selected "I agree" and began the study. They completed the questionnaires in the following order: the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire, the Internet Experience Questionnaire, Motivations and Desistence Questionnaire, Modified Social Desirability Scale, Basic Empathy Scale and the Demographics

Questionnaire. Lastly, participants were debriefed with a description of the study and the expected results.

Results

Empathy Deficits

To examine the hypothesis that traditional bullies have less empathy than cyberbullies, victims, and controls, a series of ANOVAs were conducted (Table 2 & 3). Three 2 (participant gender) X 4 (traditional bully vs. cyberbully vs. victims vs. controls) ANOVAs were used to compare the three dependent variables; total empathy, affective empathy, and cognitive empathy scores.

In regards to total empathy scores, women ($M = 77.85$, $SD = 8.52$) had significantly higher levels of empathy than men ($M = 69.01$, $SD = 9.74$), $F(1, 2917) = 37.05$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .117$. Contrary to expectations, total empathy scores were not significantly different between traditional bullies ($M = 72.15$, $SD = 10.74$), cyberbullies ($M = 75.14$, $SD = 9.90$), victims ($M = 77.50$, $SD = 8.17$), or controls ($M = 74.13$, $SD = 10.42$), $F(3, 78) = 1.00$, $p = .39$, $\eta_p^2 = .011$. Lastly, there was not a significant interaction between groups and gender on total empathy scores, $F(3, 56) = .72$, $p = .54$, $\eta_p^2 = .008$ (See Figure 4).

Similar results were found for cognitive empathy scores, with women ($M = 35.54$, $SD = 4.32$) displaying higher levels of cognitive empathy compared to men ($M = 33.29$, $SD = 4.81$), $F(1, 132) = 6.69$, $p = .01$, $\eta_p^2 = .02$. Cognitive empathy scores were not significantly different between traditional bullies ($M = 33.22$, $SD = 5.54$), cyberbullies ($M = 34.80$, $SD = 5.03$), victims ($M = 35.58$, $SD = 3.81$), and controls ($M = 34.85$, $SD = 4.54$), $F(6, 556) = 1.34$, $p = .26$, $\eta_p^2 = .014$. Again, there was no significant interaction between group and gender on cognitive empathy, $F(3, 17) = .87$, $p = .46$, $\eta_p^2 = .009$ (See Figure 5).

Lastly, affective empathy scores for women ($M = 42.32$, $SD = 5.58$) were significantly higher than for men ($M = 35.72$, $SD = 6.83$), $F(1, 1805) = 50.66$, $p < .001$, $\eta_p^2 = .15$. There was no significant difference between traditional bullies ($M = 38.93$, $SD = 6.84$), cyberbullies ($M = 40.33$, $SD = 6.19$), victims ($M = 41.92$, $SD = 5.80$), and controls ($M = 39.28$, $SD = 7.48$) on affective empathy scores, $F(3, 28) = .80$, $p = .49$, $\eta_p^2 = .009$. Again, there was no significant interaction between group and gender on affective empathy, $F(3, 13) = .38$, $p = .77$, $\eta_p^2 = .004$ (See Figure 6).

Motivations of Bullying Behaviors

To analyze the motivations of bullying behaviors, participants were asked: “If you cyberbullied others, why did you do it?” and “If you traditionally bullied others, why did you do it?” The open-ended responses were coded into one of six categories based on the first answer given. The categories were created by the author who grouped the responses logically into themes (See Table 4). Ten percent of the responses for both cyber and traditional bullies were coded by a second researcher, a doctoral student. There was a 90% agreement rate between coders (9/10 responses).

A descriptive analysis of the motivations for bullying behaviors was conducted (Table 4). These frequencies were examined separately for cyber and traditional bullies. A large proportion (33.3%) of cyberbullies responded to the question “If you cyberbullied others, why did you do it” with a response of denial (i.e. I didn’t, I would never do that), whereas only 14.6% of traditional bullies responded with denial. A chi-squared goodness of fit test revealed that the frequency of denial was significantly different for traditional and cyber bullies, $\chi^2(1, N = 70) = 5.83$, $p = .02$. The most common motivation for traditional bullies (19.5%) was peer pressure (i.e. “I did it to fit in,” “because my friends were”), while the most common response, when a

response was given, for cyberbullies was issues with the individual (i.e., “I didn’t like the person,” “I was mad at them”).

Desistence of Bullying Behaviors

The same procedure was followed for the desistence questions (i.e. “If you cyberbullied others, why did you stop?” and “If you traditionally bullied others, why did you stop?”). Again the six categories were created by logically grouping responses into themes (See Table 4). Also, a second doctoral student separately coded 10% of the data. There was an 80% agreement rate between coders (8/10 responses).

Consistent with the motivations for bullying behaviors, 29% of cyberbullies responded to the question “Why did the bullying stop” with denial, whereas only 7.3% of traditional bullies responded in the same manner. A chi-squared goodness of fit test revealed that cyberbullies denied engaging in bullying behaviors at a significantly higher frequency than traditional bullies, $\chi^2 (1, N = 62) = 9.81, p = .002$. The most endorsed reason that traditional bullies reported was that the bullying behaviors stopped because they gained self-awareness (i.e. “I realized it was wrong,” “I wouldn’t have wanted the same thing to happen to me”) (34.1%). Cyberbullies also endorsed self-awareness (10.4%) as well as maturity (10.4%) as the most common reasons for desistence, when a reason was given. A chi-squared goodness of fit test also revealed that the frequency of self-awareness reasons was significantly higher for traditional bullies than for cyberbullies, $\chi^2 (1, N = 62) = 6.15, p = .013$.

Discussion

The phenomenon of bullying, which has been studied for many years, is quickly evolving to include behaviors in a variety of mediums. Previous research found that 19% of college students admitted to traditionally bullying others once or twice while in college (Chapell et al.,

2006). Chapell et al. found that only 2.5% of college students admitted to traditionally bullying others “occasionally.” In regards to cyberbullying, prevalence rates in college samples have ranged from 8.6 – 10% (MacDonald & Roberts-Pittsman, 2010; Kraft & Wang, 2010, respectively). The current study found similar results for cyberbullying behaviors with 8.3% of students being identified as cyberbullies. The prevalence rate for traditional bullying was comparable to previous research of “occasional” traditional bullying with 4% identified as traditional bullies only. The definition of bullying behaviors in the current study is similar to the finding of Chapell et al. when they considered “occasional” bullies rather than bullying that happened once or twice. The current study also found that 2% of students identified as both traditional and cyberbully bullies. No study to date has compared prevalence rates of individuals who engaged in both types of bullying behaviors.

Empathy deficits

Contrary to the hypothesis, traditional bullies and cyberbullies did not differ from each other on any type of empathy (i.e. total, cognitive, or affective), nor did they differ from victims or controls. Previous research on empathy deficits and bullying behaviors has found mixed results. Research has examined either traditional bullying or cyber bullying. Also, they have compared the frequency of bullying behaviors (i.e. “occasionally “versus “often”), rather than comparing across types of bullying. Previous research examining empathy and bullying has examined empathy in high school-aged students (Ang & Goh, 2010; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006). While the ultimate findings differed from the previous studies, mean empathy scores were very similar.

Consistent with the literature, significant differences in empathy were found between men and women, with women exhibiting higher levels of empathy than men. These findings were stable across all three types of empathy.

Further research is needed to determine whether empathy is a variable to focus on for interventions with college-aged bullies. Similar findings about empathy have been found in the sexual offender literature. Victim empathy is not a predictor of treatment success and therefore the research suggested that it is not necessary to include in treatment (Seto & Lalumiere, 2010). Rather than trying to increase empathy in bullies, perhaps bullying interventions could focus on increasing all men's levels of empathy.

Motivations for Bullying Behaviors

When asked why he/she cyberbullied another person, cyberbullies' most common responses were to deny they took part in bullying behaviors. Participants' responses included "I didn't cyberbully others" and "I would never do that." In comparison to cyberbullies, traditional bullies tended to acknowledge that they had engaged in certain behaviors and understood that these behaviors were considered bullying. Traditional bullies most commonly reported that peer pressure was the motivation behind their bullying behaviors. When cyberbullies did acknowledge that their behavior was bullying, they commonly reported that the individual bothered them in some way (e.g. "I was mad at her," "I didn't like her"). These findings demonstrated a need for further education of cyberbullying behaviors. Students should be taught what behaviors are considered cyberbullying as well as the impact of those behaviors have on other students. Traditional bullies' common motivation of peer pressure suggests that interventions could strive to promote self-efficacy and pro-social behavior. If students are more

self-efficacious and have confidence in their decisions and behaviors, perhaps peer pressure is less of a problem.

In contrast to previous research by Konig et al. (2010), this study found that revenge was not the most common response for traditional (14.6%) and cyberbullies (4.2%). Konig et al. suggested that cyberbullying occurred as a way for a victim of traditional bullying to enact revenge on a former bully. Our findings would suggest that this is not the primary motivation behind most cyberbullying.

Desistence of Bullying Behaviors

Consistent with the above findings about denial, when asked why the cyberbullying behaviors stopped, cyberbullies commonly reported that they never engaged in bullying behaviors. Logically, if an individual failed to recognize that they engaged in bullying behaviors they would not be able to articulate why they discontinued that behavior. Again, most traditional bullies acknowledged that the behavior they engaged in was considered bullying. Traditional bullies' reason for desistence of bullying behaviors was most often that they gained self-awareness (e.g. "I realized that I was hurting someone," "I wouldn't have wanted it to happen to me"). This was also the most common response when cyberbullies articulated a reason for discontinuing bullying behaviors. Understanding that bullies stop their behavior when they are made aware of the consequences suggested that future interventions could focus on increasing this awareness particularly on an individual level.

Limitations

One limitation of the current study is that it was a single sample from one university. Multi-site studies are needed to compare results across a variety of participants. This study also

had a disproportionate number of women, particularly in the cyber bully (37 women, 11 men) and victim (89 women, 20 men) groups.

All of the questionnaires used in this study were self-report. This is a significant limitation for both the bullying measures as well as the empathy measure. The Basic Empathy Scale is a face valid measure of a socially desirable topic. This may have led participants to present themselves in a certain manner. A behavioral measure of empathy is needed to examine this construct in a way that is less obvious to the participants. The same is true for measures of bullying behaviors.

Future Research

Future research should consider alternative methods for examining bullying behaviors and empathy, as well as a systematic examination of motivations for bullying behaviors. Many bullying studies conducted with elementary and middle school students have used procedures such as peer nominations instead of self-report questionnaires. Future studies with college students should consider peer nominations with groups such as sororities or athletic teams as an additional measure of bullying. As technology continues to evolve, so will the means through which people bully other individuals. Future research also needs to continue to evolve with the technology.

The face validity of empathy questionnaires has long been a concern in the literature. Future research could examine alternative measures of empathy such as scenario-based or cartoon-based measures. These measures would require participants to actually respond in an “empathetic” manner rather than state what actions they take in certain situations. Also, Jolliffe and Farrington (2006) suggested that perspective taking is a separate construct than cognitive

empathy. Future research should examine whether deficits in perspective taking exist for traditional and cyber bullies.

To date, little is known about the motivations for bullying, especially for cyberbullying. A more thorough, systematic method of analyzing motivations for bullying is needed. The same is true for examining desistence of bullying behaviors. The more clear our understanding of the reasons these behaviors occur, the better our prevention and intervention strategies can be implemented.

In conclusion, traditional and cyber bullying are serious phenomena that continue to occur throughout the college years. Current events, such as the death of college freshman Tyler Clementine, have shed light on the detrimental effects of these behaviors. While this study did not find empathy deficits in traditional or cyber bullies, potential motivations for these individuals' behaviors were explored. Interestingly, cyberbullies frequently deny that the behaviors they are engaging in are actually bullying. Prevention and intervention programs should strive to further educate students on the seriousness of these behaviors.

References

- Albiero, P., Matricardi, G., Speltri, D., & Toso, D. (2008). The assessment of empathy in adolescence: A contribution to the Italian validation of the "Basic Empathy Scale". *Journal of Adolescence*, 32, 393-408. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2008.01.001
- Almeida A., del Barrio C., Marques M., Gutierrez H., & van der Meulen K. (2001). Scan-bullying: A script-cartoon narrative to assess cognitions, emotions and coping strategies in bullying situations. In: Martinez M (ed.): *Prevention and Control of Aggression and the Impact on its Victims* (pp. 161-168). New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers.
- Ang, R. P., & Goh, D. H. (2010). Cyberbullying among adolescents: The role of affective and cognitive empathy, and gender. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 41(4), 387-397. doi:10.1007/s10578-010-0176-3
- Bhat, C. (2008). Cyber bullying: Overview and strategies for school counselors, guidance officers, and all school personnel. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling*, 18(1), 53-66. doi: 10.1375/ajgc.18.1.53
- Campbell, M. (2005). Cyberbullying: An old problem in a new guise? *Guidance and Counseling*, 15(1), 68-76. Retrieved from <http://www.atyponlink.com/AAP/doi/pdf/10.1375/ajgc.15.1.68>
- Chandler, M. (1973). Egocentrism and antisocial behavior: The assessment and training of social perspective-taking skills. *Developmental Psychology*, 9(3), 326-332.
- Chapell, M. S., Hasselman, S. L., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S. N., MacIver, K. W., & Sarullo, P. L. (2006). Bullying in elementary school, high school, and college. *Adolescence*, 41(164), 633-648. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=psyh&AN=2006-23510-003&site=ehost-live>

- Chapell, M., Casey, D., De, I. C., Ferrell, J., Forman, J., Lipkin, R., . . . Whittaker, S. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. *Adolescence*, 39(153), 53-64. Retrieved from
<http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=a9h&AN=13335640&site=ehost>
- Crowne, D. & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology* 24(4), 349-354.
doi: 10.1037/h0047358
- Davis, M. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology*, 10, 85. Retrieved from
http://www.uv.es/~friasnav/Davis_1980.pdf
- Davis, M. (1983). Measuring individual differences in empathy: Evidence for a multidimensional approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44(1), 113-126.
doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.44.1.113
- Dooley, J., Pyzalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying: a theoretical and conceptual review. *Zeitschrift fur Psychologie/ Journal of Psychology*, 217(4), 182-188. doi: 10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.182
- Frisen, A., Holmqvist, K., & Oscarsson, D. (2008). 13-year-olds' perception of bullying: definitions, reasons for victimization and experience of adults' response. *Educational Studies*, 34(2), 105-117. doi: 10.1080/03055693701811149

- Frisen, A., Jonsson, A., & Persson, C. (2007). Adolescents' perception of bullying: Who is the victim? Who is the bully? What can be done to stop bullying? *Adolescence*, 42(168), 749-761. Retrieved from <http://web.ebscohost.com/ehost/detail?sid=bd8b9462-82b8-4729-82f82264d1037102%40sessionmgr110&vid=3&hid=119&bdata=JnNpdGU9ZWhvc3QtbGl2ZQ%3d%3d#db=psyh&AN=2007-19818-009>
- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoè, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending behavior? *Aggressive Behavior*, 33(5), 467-476. doi:10.1002/ab.20204
- Gradinger, P., Strohmeier, D., & Spiel, C. (2009). Traditional bullying and cyberbullying: Identification of risk groups for adjustment problems. *Zeitschrift fur Psychologie/ Journal of Psychology*, 217(4), 205-213. doi: 10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.205
- Griggs, D. (2010). Cyber-agression: Definition and concept of cyberbullying. *Australian Journal of Guidance Counseling*, 20(2), 143-156. doi: 10.1375/ajgc.20.2.143
- Hara, H. (2002). Justifications for bullying among Japanese schoolchildren. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology*, 5, 197-204. doi: 10.1111/1467-839X.00104.
- Hogan, R. (1969). Development of an empathy scale. *Journal of Counseling and Clinical Psychology*, 33(3), 307-316. doi: 10.1037/h0027580
- Huang, Y. & Chou, C. (2010). An analysis of multiple factors of cyberbullying among junior high school students in Taiwan. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 26, 1581-1590. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2010.06.005
- Jolliffe, D., & Farrington, D. P. (2006). Examining the relationship between low empathy and bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(6), 540-550. doi:10.1002/ab.20154

- Konig, A., Gollwitzer M., & Steffgen, G. (2010). Cyberbullying as an act of revenge?
Australian Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 20(2), 210-224.
doi: 10.1375/ajgc.20.2.210
- Kraft, E. & Wang, J. (2010). An exploratory study of the cyberbullying and cyberstalking experiences and factors related to victimization of students at a public liberal arts college.
International Journal of Technoethics, 1(4), 74-91. doi: 10.4018/jte.2010100106
- Lee, T. & Cornell, D. (2010). Concurrent validity of the Olweus bully/victim questionnaire.
Journal of School Violence, 9, 56-73. doi: 10.1080/15388220903185613
- MacDonald, C. & Roberts-Pittman, B. (2010). Cyberbullying among college students: prevalence and demographic differences. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 9, 2003-2009. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2010.12.436
- Martinez, J. (2006). Differences of causal attribution in bullying among participants. *Electronic Journal of Research in Educational Psychology*, 9(2), 201-220. Retrieved from <http://investigacion-psicopedagogica.org/revista/new/english/index.php>
- Mason, K. (2008). Cyberbullying: A preliminary assessment for school personnel. *Psychology in the School*, 45(4), 323-348. doi: 10.1002/pits.20301
- Mayberry, M. L., & Espelage, D. L. (2007). Associations among empathy, social competence, & Reactive/Proactive aggression subtypes. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 36(6), 787-798. Retrieved from <http://www.springerlink.com/content/104945/>
- Munoz, L., Qualter, P., & Padgett, G. (2010). Empathy and bullying: Exploring the influence of callous-unemotional traits. *Child Psychiatry Human Development*, doi:10.1007/s10578-010-0206-1
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do about it*. Malden, MA: Malden Blackwell Publishing.

- Olweus, D. (1996). *Revised Olweus Bully-victim Questionnaire*. Mimeo, Bergen, Norway: Research Center for Health Promotion (HEMIL Center), University of Bergen.
- Ragatz, L., Anderson, R., Fremouw, W., & Schwartz, R. (2010). Criminal thinking patterns, aggression styles, and the psychopathic traits of late high school bullies and bully-victims. *Aggressive Behavior*, 37(2), 145-160. doi: 10.1002/ab.20377
- Raskauskas, J., & Stolz, A. (2007). Involvement in traditional and electronic bullying among adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 43(3), 564-575. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.3.564
- Rigby, K. (2003). Addressing bullying in schools: Theory and practice (Report No. 259). Retrieved from <http://aic.gov.au/documents/D/A/2/%7BDA2B9086-7A46-4CBB-B065-86B05BD2EA6C%7Dtandi259.pdf>
- Schenk, A., & Fremouw, W. (2012). Prevalence, psychological impact, and coping of cyberbully victims among college students. *Journal of School Violence*, 11, 21-37. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2011.630310
- Seto, M., & Lalumiere, M. (2010). What is so special about male adolescent sexual offending? A review and test of explanations through meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136(4), 526-575. doi: 10.1037/a0019700
- Schultze-Krumbholz, A., & Scheithauer, H. (2009). Social-behavioral correlates of cyberbullying in a German student sample. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie/Journal of Psychology*, 217(4), 224-226. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.224
- Smolowe, Jill. (2010, October 18). Confessions of a bully. *People*, 74(14), 70-71.
- Strayer, J. (1993). Children's concordant emotions and cognitions in response to observed emotions. *Child Development*, 64, 188-201. doi: 10.2307/1131445

- Varjas, K., Talley, J., Meyers, J., Parris, L., & Cutts, H. (2010). High school students' perceptions of motivations for cyberbullying: An exploratory study. *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 11(3), 269-273. Retrieved from <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2941365/>
- Wang, J., Iannotti, R. J., & Nansel, T. R. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 45(4), 368-375. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.03.021
- Willard, N. (n.d.). Educator's guide to cyberbullying, cyberthreats & sexting [Fact sheet]. Retrieved from <http://csriu.org/documents/>
- Ybarra, M. & Mitchell, K. (2004). Youth engaging in online harassment: associations with caregiver-child relationships, internet use, and personal characteristics. *Journal of Adolescence* 27, 319-336. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.03.007
- Zimbardo, P. (1970). The human choice: Individuation, reason, and order versus deindividuation, impulse, and chaos. *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, 17, 237-307.
- Zuckerman M. (2002). Zuckerman-Kuhlman personality questionnaire (ZKPQ): An alternative five-factorial model. In: de Raad B. Perugini M (eds). *Big Five Assessment*. Ashland, OH: Hogrefe & Huber Publishers, pp 376-392.

Table 1

Descriptive data for traditional bullies, cyberbullies, victims, and controls

	Traditional Bully		Cyber Bully		Victim		Control	
	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent
Participant Gender								
Male	20	48.8	11	22.9	21	19.09	31	34.8
Female	21	51.2	37	77.1	89	80.90	58	65.2
Class Rank	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent
Freshman	1	2.5	12	25.0	6	5.5	14	16.1
Sophomore	22	55.0	21	43.8	69	63.3	45	51.7
Junior	13	32.5	11	22.9	20	18.3	20	23.0
Senior	4	10.0	4	8.3	14	12.8	8	9.2
Marital Status	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent
Single	40	97.6	46	97.9	107	97.3	86	97.7
Married	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	2.7	1	1.1
Widowed	1	2.4	1	2.1	0	0.0	1	1.1
Ethnicity	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent	<i>N</i>	Percent
White/Caucasian	32	78.0	41	85.4	100	90.9	73	82.0
Black/African American	3	7.3	4	8.3	1	0.9	7	7.9
Latino/Hispanic	1	2.4	3	6.3	3	2.7	4	4.5
Asian American	2	4.9	0	0.0	2	1.8	1	1.1
Other	3	7.3	0	0.0	4	3.6	4	4.5

Table 2

Means for BES total, affective, and cognitive scores for male and female participants

	Female (N = 205)		Male (N = 83)		F	P	η_p^2
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>			
BES Total	77.85	8.52	69.01	9.74	37.05	< .001	.12
BES- Affective	42.32	5.58	35.72	6.83	50.66	< .001	.15
BES- Cognitive	35.54	4.32	33.29	4.81	6.69	.01	.02

Table 3

Means for BES total, affective, and cognitive empathy scores for traditional bullies, cyberbullies, victims, and controls

	Traditional Bully (N = 41)		Cyber Bully (N = 48)		Victim (N = 110)		Control (N = 89)		F	P
	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>		
BES Total	72.15	10.74	75.14	9.90	77.50	8.17	74.13	10.42	1.00	.39
BES- Affective	38.93	6.84	40.33	6.19	41.92	5.80	39.28	7.48	.80	.49
BES- Cognitive	33.22	5.54	34.80	5.03	35.58	3.81	34.85	4.54	1.34	.26

Note. The main effect for group was not significant; therefore a Tukey HSD procedure was not conducted.

Table 4

Motivation and desistence responses for cyber and traditional bullies

	Cyber Bully (N = 48)		Traditional Bully (N = 41)		
	n	Percent	n	Percent	
Motivations					
Denial ^a	16	(33.3)	6	(14.6)	$\chi^2(1, N = 70) = 5.83, p = .02$
Peer Pressure	5	(10.4)	8	(19.5)	$\chi^2(1, N = 70) = 1.08, p = .30$
Issues with Ind.	6	(12.5)	6	(14.6)	$\chi^2(1, N = 70) = .19, p = .67$
Revenge	2	(4.2)	6	(14.6)	Fisher Exact Test, $p = .15$
Joke/funny	4	(8.3)	5	(12.2)	Fisher Exact Test, $p = .73$
Other	3	(6.3)	3	(7.3)	Fisher Exact Test, $p = 1.00$
No response	12	(25)	7	(17.1)	$\chi^2(1, N = 88) = .73, p = .40$
Desistence					
Denial ^a	14	(29.2)	3	(7.3)	$\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 9.81, p = .002$
Awareness ^a	5	(10.4)	14	(34.1)	$\chi^2(1, N = 62) = 6.15, p = .013$
Matured	5	(10.4)	7	(17.1)	$\chi^2(1, N = 62) = .41, p = .52$
Situation ended	2	(4.2)	3	(7.3)	Fisher Exact Test, $p = 1.00$
Didn't stop	1	(2.1)	2	(4.9)	Fisher Exact Test, $p = 1.00$
Other	4	(8.3)	2	(4.9)	Fisher Exact Test, $p = .67$
No response	17	(35.4)	10	(24.4)	$\chi^2(1, N = 89) = 1.27, p = .26$

^a significant value $\leq p = .02$.

Figure 1. Conceptualization of traditional and cyber bullying (adapted from Schenk & Fremouw, 2012).

Figure 2. Diagram of participant exclusion.

Figure 3. Final sample of participants including matched controls.

Figure 4. Means of BES total empathy as a function of group and gender. Error bars represent standard errors.

Figure 5. Means of BES cognitive empathy as a function of group and gender. Error bars represent standard error.

Figure 6. Means of BES affective empathy as a function of group and gender. Error bars represent standard error.

Appendix A

ABOUT BEING BULLIED BY OTHER STUDENTS

Here are some questions about being bullied by other students. First we define or explain the word bullying. We say a student is being bullied when another student, or several other students

- say mean and hurtful things or make fun of him or her or call him or her mean and hurtful names
- completely ignore or exclude him or her from their group of friends or leave him or her out of things on purpose
- hit, kick, push, shove around, or lock him or her inside a room
- tell lies or spread false rumors about him or her or send mean notes and try to make other students dislike him or her
- and other hurtful things like that.

When we talk about bullying, these things happen repeatedly, and it is difficult for the student being bullied to defend himself or herself. We also call it bullying, when a student is teased repeatedly in a mean and hurtful way.

But we don't call it bullying when the teasing is done in a friendly and playful way. Also, it is not bullying when two students of about equal strength or power argue or fight.

1. How often were you bullied during your time at WVU?

- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

2. I was called mean names, was made fun of, or teased in a hurtful way.
 - A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
3. Other students left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from their group of friends, or completely ignored me.
 - A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
4. I was hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked indoors.
 - A. I wasn't bullied WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week

5. Other students told lies or spread false rumors about me and tried to make others dislike me.
 - A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
6. I had money or other things taken away from me or damaged
 - A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
7. I was threatened or forced to do things I didn't want to do
 - A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week

8. I was bullied with mean names or comments about my race or color
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
9. I was bullied with mean names, comments, or gestures with a sexual meaning
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
10. I was bullied by someone sending me a threatening message via the internet (e.g., e-mail, wall post, etc.).
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week

11. I was bullied by someone spreading a rumor about me via the internet (e.g., email, wall posts, etc.).
 - A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
12. I was bullied by someone sending pictures or messages via the internet (e.g., email, wall posts, etc.) that contained sexual content.
 - A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
13. I have been bullied by someone sending me a threatening text, picture or video message via my phone.
 - A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week

14. I have been bullied by someone putting a picture of me on the internet without my permission.
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
15. I have been bullied by someone taking a picture of me via their phone and sending or showing the picture to others without my permission.
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
16. In which year was the student or students who bullied you?
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. Same year as me
 - C. A year older
 - D. A year younger

17. Have you been bullied by male or female bullies?
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. Mainly by 1 female
 - C. By several females
 - D. Mainly by 1 male
 - E. By several males
 - F. By both males and females
18. By how many students have you usually been bullied?
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. Mainly by 1 student
 - C. By a group of 2-3 students
 - D. By a group of 4-9 students
 - E. By a group of more than 9 students
 - F. By several different students or groups of students
19. How long has the bullying lasted?
- A. I wasn't bullied at WVU
 - B. It lasted one or two weeks
 - C. It lasted about a month
 - D. It has lasted about 6 months
 - E. It has lasted about a year
 - F. It has gone on for several years

20. If the bullying has ended, how and why did it end? If you were victim of more than one type of bullying, please explain how each of the different types of bullying ended if they have ended.

21. If you are or were a victim of bullying, what advise would you offer to someone else who is being bullied?

22. When you see a student your age being bullied at school, what do you feel or think?

- A. That is probably what he or she deserves
- B. I don't feel much
- C. I feel a bit sorry for him or her
- D. I feel sorry for him or her and want to help him or her

ABOUT BULLYING OTHER STUDENTS

23. How often have you taken part in bullying another student(s) at WVU?

- A. I haven't bullied another student(s) at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

HAVE YOU BULLIED ANOTHER STUDENT(S) IN ANY OF THE FOLLOWING WAYS WHILE AT WVU? PLEASE ANSWER ALL QUESTIONS.

24. I called another student(s) mean names, made fun of or teased him or her in a hurtful way

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

25. I kept him or her out of things on purpose, excluded him or her from my group of friends or completely ignored him or her.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

26. I hit, kicked, pushed, and shoved him or her around or locked him or her indoors.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

27. I spread false rumors about him or her and tried to make others dislike him or her.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

28. I took money or other things from him or her or damaged his or her belongings.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

29. I threatened or forced him or her to do things he or she didn't want to do.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

30. I bullied him or her with mean names or comments about his or her race or color.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

31. I bullied him or her with mean names, comments, or gestures with a sexual meaning.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

32. I bullied him or her by sending them a threatening message via the internet (e.g., e-mail, wall post, etc.).

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

33. I bullied him or her by spreading a rumor about them via the internet (e.g., email, wall posts, etc.).
- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
34. I bullied him or her by sending pictures or messages of them via the internet (e.g., email, wall posts, etc.) that contained sexual content.
- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week
35. I bullied him or her by sending a threatening text, picture or video message to their phone.
- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
 - B. It has only happened once or twice
 - C. 2 or 3 times a month
 - D. About once a week
 - E. Several times a week

36. I bullied him or her by putting a picture of them on the internet without their permission.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

37. I have bullied him or her by taking a picture of them via my phone and sending or showing the picture to others without their permission.

- A. It hasn't happened at WVU
- B. It has only happened once or twice
- C. 2 or 3 times a month
- D. About once a week
- E. Several times a week

38. Have you stopped bullying?

- A. Yes
- B. No

39. If you have stopped bullying, why did you decide to stop? If you took part in more than one bullying behavior, please say why you decided to stop each of the bullying behaviors.

40. Do you think you could join in bullying a student whom you didn't like?
- A. Yes
 - B. Yes, maybe
 - C. I don't know
 - D. No, I don't think so
 - E. No
 - F. Definitely no
41. How do you usually react if you see or understand that a student your age is being bullied by other students?
- A. I have never noticed that students my age have been bullied
 - B. I take part in the bullying
 - C. I don't do anything, but I think the bullying is OK
 - D. I just watch what goes on
 - E. I don't do anything, but I think I ought to help the bullied student
 - F. I try to help the bullied student in one way or another
42. How often are you afraid of being bullied by other students in your school?
- A. Never
 - B. Seldom
 - C. Sometimes
 - D. Fairly often
 - E. Often
 - F. Very often

Appendix B

Internet Experiences Questionnaire

Your Experiences

For the following questions, please report how often you have engaged in each of these behaviors **while at WVU**.

1. I sent a threatening text message to someone
 1. a. Never
 1. b. Once or twice
 1. c. Two or three times a month
 1. d. About once a week
 1. e. Several times a week
 - 1.
2. I created a mean website about someone
 1. a. Never
 1. b. Once or twice
 1. c. Two or three times a month
 1. d. About once a week
 1. e. Several times a week
 - 1.
3. I used someone else's pictures online without their permission
 1. a. Never
 1. b. Once or twice
 1. c. Two or three times a month
 1. d. About once a week
 1. e. Several times a week
 - 1.
4. I posted damaging or embarrassing information about someone online.
 1. a. Never
 1. b. Once or twice
 1. c. Two or three times a month
 1. d. About once a week
 1. e. Several times a week
 - 1.
5. I created forums about someone
 1. a. Never
 1. b. Once or twice
 1. c. Two or three times a month
 1. d. About once a week
 1. e. Several times a week

6. I repeatedly sent harassing emails or instant messages to someone.
 - a. Never
 - b. Once or twice
 - c. Two or three times a month
 - d. About once a week
 - e. Several times a week
7. I have sent abusive chat room messages to someone.
 - a. Never
 - b. Once or twice
 - c. Two or three times a month
 - d. About once a week
 - e. Several times a week
8. I have taken pictures of someone on a cellphone without permission and shown the pictures to others to embarrass that person.
 - a. Never
 - b. Once or twice
 - c. Two or three times a month
 - d. About once a week
 - e. Several times a week
9. I repeatedly called someone not saying anything or leaving nasty/upsetting messages
 - a. Never
 - b. Once or twice
 - c. Two or three times a month
 - d. About once a week
 - e. Several times a week
10. I pretended to be someone else online to embarrass someone.
 - a. Never
 - b. Once or twice
 - c. Two or three times a month
 - d. About once a week
 - e. Several times a week
11. I posted a facebook status making fun of someone else.
 - a. Never
 - b. Once or twice
 - c. Two or three times a month
 - d. About once a week
 - e. Several times a week

For this section, bullying is when someone repeatedly says mean or hurtful things to another individual. This includes teasing, hitting or fighting, threats, leaving you out on purpose, sending you messages or images, or telling lies or starting rumors about you.

12. Since you've been at WVU, have you ever been bullied?

Yes No

13. Since you've been at WVU, have you ever bullied someone else?

Yes No

14. If Yes to the previous question, who did you bully?

- a. Friend
- b. Classmate
- c. Girlfriend/boyfriend
- d. Ex-girlfriend/ ex-boyfriend
- e. Someone who bullied you
- f. Stranger
- g. Other, please explain: _____

15. If you answer Yes to number 24, were your friends present when you bullied that person?

Yes No

Cyberbullying is defined as repeatedly harassing someone using technology such as email, instant messaging, social networking sites, blogs, other websites, cell phone, text messaging, picture messaging, video phones, etc. with the intent of harming, embarrassing, or damaging the other individual.

TEXT MESSAGING

16. During your time at WVU, have you ever been bullied through text-messaging?

Yes No

17. If yes to the previous question, how many times did this occur?

0 1-2 3-5 6-10 11-15 16 or more

18. Did you know who it was that was doing it? Yes No

19. How many different people bullied you through text messaging?

0 1-2 3-5 6 or more

20. How long did the cyberbullying via text-messaging last?

I haven't been bullied by text messages

1-2 Weeks

1 month

6 Months

1 year

Several years

INTERNET

21. During your time at WVU, have you ever been bullied by someone creating a website about you, using your pictures on-line without your permission, posting damaging or embarrassing information about you, creating forums about you, repeatedly sending you harassing emails or instant messages, receiving abusive chat room messages, etc?

Yes No

22. If yes to the previous question, how many times did this occur?

0 1-2 3-5 6-10 11-15 16 or more

23. Did you know who it was that was doing it? Yes No

24. How many different people bullied you via the Internet?

0 1-2 3-5 6 or more

25. How long did the cyberbullying via the Internet last?

I haven't been bullied by text messages

1-2 Weeks

1 month

6 Months

1 year

Several years

26. Was the internet bullying the result of a failed romantic relationship? Yes No

PICTURE/VIDEO PHONES—nasty or embarrassing pictures/photos or video clips sent to you, or nasty or embarrassing pictures or video clips sent to others about you

27. During your time at WVU, have you ever been bullied by someone taking pictures of you with pictures phones without permission and showing the pictures to others to embarrass you? Yes No

28. If yes to the previous question, how many times did this occur?

0 1-2 3-5 6-10 11-15 16 or more

29. Did you know who it was that was doing it? Yes No

30. How many different people bullied you through picture phones/messaging?

0 1-2 3-5 6 or more

31. How long did the cyberbullying via picture phones/messaging last?

I haven't been bullied by text messages

1-2 Weeks

1 month

6 Months

1 year

Several years

32. Was the picture phone bullying the result of a failed romantic relationship? Yes No

33. If you have been bullied by text-messaging, internet or picture phone, do you think that it has affected you? Yes No

If yes, how? _____

PHONE CALLS—repeatedly receiving nasty/upsetting or silent calls on your mobile phone

34. During your time at WVU, have you ever been bullied by someone repeatedly calling you on your mobile phone not saying anything or leaving nasty/upsetting messages?

Yes No

35. If yes to the previous question, how many times did this occur?

0 1-2 3-5 6-10 11-15 16 or more

36. Did you know who it was that was doing it? Yes No

37. How many different people bullied you through phone calls?

0 1-2 3-5 6 or more

38. How long did the cyberbullying via phone calls last?

I haven't been bullied by text messages

1-2 Weeks

1 month

6 Months

1 year

Several years

39. Was the phone-call bullying the result of a failed romantic relationship? Yes No

40. If you have been bullied by repeated phone calls, do you think that it has affected you?

Yes No

If yes, how? _____

GENERAL CYBERBULLYING

41. Are there any other forms of cyberbullying, involving the internet, mobile phones or any other electronic devices, which we have not mentioned?

Yes No

42. If yes, please describe the other forms of cyberbullying not mentioned. _____

43. If you have been cyberbullied in any way (texts, pictures or video-clips, email, website, chat-rooms, mobile phone calls, or other), what sorts of comments/remarks were made? Were comments made about your:

_____ Appearance YES NO

_____ Race YES NO

_____ Sexual Orientation YES NO

_____ Intelligence YES NO

_____ Self-worth YES NO

_____ Other: Please describe.

44. Please share any personal experiences or stories you have had with cyberbullying.

AWARENESS OF CYBERBULLYING

45. How frequently do you think other students at WVU are cyberbullied?

Frequently Occasionally Never Don't Know

46. Have you seen, or do you know of, any students who posted material online that threatened or suggested violence?

Yes No

47. Have you seen, or do you know of, any students who posted material online that threatened or suggested suicide?

Yes No

48. Have you seen, or do you know of, any students who participate in online hate groups?

Yes No

49. Have you seen, or do you know of, any students who participate in online gangs?

Yes No

50. How often do you think cyberbullying occurs when students are using school computers?

Frequently Occasionally Never Don't know

51. How often do you think cyberbullying occurs through cell phones or PDAs used at school?

Frequently Occasionally Never Don't know

REACTIONS TO CYBERBULLYING

52. If you saw that someone was being cyberbullied, how likely is it that you would do the following:

a. Join in by posting similar material.

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

b. Support the cyberbullying

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

c. Read the material, but not contribute

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

d. Avoid or leave the online environment

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

e. Complain to others, but not directly to the cyberbully

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

f. Try to help the victim privately

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

g. Tell the cyberbully to stop

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

h. Support the victim publicly

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

i. Report the cyberbullying to someone who can help

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

53. What are some things you can do that could reduce the possibility that you might be cyberbullied? (Please list all actions you can think of.) _____

54. If you were being cyberbullied, what would you do? (Please list all actions you can think of.) _____

55. If you were being cyberbullied and you could not get it to stop by yourself, would you tell your parents?

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely Not sure

56. If you were being cyberbullied at school, would you tell a staff member?

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

57. If you saw or knew that another student was being cyberbullied, would you tell your parents or a school staff member?

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

58. If you saw or knew that a student had posted material threatening or suggesting violence or suicide, would you tell your parents or a schools staff member?

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

59. If you saw or knew that a student was participating in a hate group or gang, would you tell a school staff member?

Very likely Somewhat likely Somewhat unlikely Very unlikely

60. What would your concerns about telling your parents be? _____

61. What would your concerns about telling a school staff member be? _____

Appendix C

Motivations and Desistence

1. If you have been traditionally bullied at some time, why do you think they did it?

2. If you have been cyber bullied at some time, why do you think they did it?

3. If you participated in traditional bullying situations towards others, why did you do it?

4. If you participated in cyber bullying situations towards others, why did you do it?

5. Why do you think some people traditionally bully others?

6. Why do you think some people cyberbully others?

7. If you traditionally bullied others, why did you stop?

8. If you cyberbullied others, why did you stop?

Appendix D
Modified Social Desirability Scale

The following questions ask about your attitudes and behaviors. Choose the answer that best describes you.

1.	It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.	True	False
2.	I never met a person that I didn't like.	True	False
3.	On occasions I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.	True	False
4.	I have always told the truth.	True	False
5.	I sometimes feel resentful when I don't get my way.	True	False
6.	I always win at games.	True	False
7.	I like to gossip at times	True	False
8.	I have never been bored.	True	False
9.	I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.	True	False
10.	I never get lost, even in unfamiliar places.	True	False
11.	There have been occasions when I have taken advantage of someone.	True	False
12.	I never get annoyed when people cut ahead of me in line.	True	False
13.	I sometime try to get even rather than forgive and forget.	True	False
14.	I never have any trouble understanding anything I read the first time I read it.	True	False
15.	There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.	True	False
16.	I have never lost anything.	True	False
17.	I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.	True	False
18.	No matter how hot or cold it gets, I am always quite comfortable.	True	False
19.	I sometimes think when people have a misfortune they only got what they deserved.	True	False
20.	It doesn't bother me if someone takes advantage of me.	True	False

Appendix E
Demographic Questionnaire

Tell us about yourself:

The following questions address information regarding your personal characteristics and experiences. Please answer the following questions as honestly as possible. If you feel uncomfortable answering any questions you may choose not to answer it.

1. What is your age? _____
2. What is your gender? (check one): _____Female _____Male
3. With what ethnic group do you most closely identify? (check one)
_____ White/Caucasian _____ Black/African American _____ Latino/Hispanic
_____ Native American _____ Asian American _____ Other
4. Marital Status: (check one):
_____ Married _____ Widowed _____ Single _____ Divorced _____ Separated
5. How many years of education have you completed? _____
6. What is your current class status?
Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate Student Other
7. Where do you live on campus?
Dorm Apartment w/roommates Home w/parents Other
8. What is your family's annually income? (check one)
_____ 20,000 or less _____ 21,000-60,000 _____ 61,000-100,000 _____ 101,000 or higher
9. Which of the following electronic devices do you have access to? (check all that apply)
_____ Computer with email

- _____ Webpage building software
- _____ Cell phones with text-message capabilities
- _____ Cell phones with picture taking capabilities
- _____ Digital Camera

10. Approximately how many hours are you online on a typical day? _____

11. What are your favorite online activities? (Please check all that apply)

- _____ Communicating with friends
- _____ Meeting new people in online social communities
- _____ Surfing to look for stuff or learn new things
- _____ Playing online games
- _____ Shopping
- _____ Homework
- _____ Viewing pornography
- _____ Designing Web sites or profiles
- _____ Other: _____