Influencing Positive Peer Interventions:
A Synthesis of the Research Insight

Nancy Willard, M.S., J.D.

Embrace Civility in the Digital Age

October, 2012

This research synthesis was developed to provide the framework for Embrace Civility in the Digital Age's new bullying prevention program, Be a Friend ~ Lend a Hand. More information on this program is available here: http://www.embracecivility.org/civility-resources/be-a-friend-lend-a-hand/. This research synthesis also provides support for an important component of embrace civility's program to teach digital safety, *Cyber Savvy*. The *Cyber Savvy* program has been designed to reinforce positive norms, increase effective skills, and encourage students to be helpful allies if they witness that someone online is being hurt or is otherwise at risk. The insight presented in this document has helped to inform all of these objectives, with a particular focus on the helpful allies objective. More information on this program is here: http://www.embracecivility.org/civility-resources/be-a-friend-lend-a-hand/.

Research that addresses positive peer intervention is rather limited. The research studies also bear some similarity to the old tale of the wise men describing parts of an elephant. Various researchers are focusing on different aspects of what appears to be a larger "personal and ecological environment." This is to be expected at this stage and is actually quite helpful, as the research approach can delve into specific factors in more depth.

The following is the Embrace Civility in the Digital Age's effort to synthesize the current research findings into a more unified "whole."

Aggression Dynamics

Bullying is Socially Motivated

A significant amount of bullying is socially motivated.[1] Those who engage in hurtful behavior appear to be motivated by their desire to achieve status, power, and control.[2] They are dependent on peers for the realization of their social status goals. They chose the time and place for their hurtful actions in a way that will maximize exposure. Research studies have documented that peers are present in 85% to 93% of bullying incidents.[3] Bullying incidents last longer when more peers are present.[4]

They choose their targets wisely, selecting those students who lack social status, are "different," and have characteristics that are considered "less desirable" within the social environment of their peers.[5] This makes it more difficult for those who have been targeted to defend themselves or for students who want to defend those targeted to do so.

Researchers have made a distinction between "social preference," that is liking a person, and "popularity," that is thinking that someone is popular.[6] Those who engage in aggression are often perceived as very popular, cool, and powerful, but they are not well liked.[7] Unfortunately, many students appear to believe that those who engage in bullying are well-liked.

There is another kind of student who also engages in hurtful acts, the socially maligned students.[8] These students are motivated by their desire to fight back against a social culture that has rejected them. Often these are the "bully-victims." It is recognized that these students have significant other risk factors. One factor that is likely involved is that these students have been targeted by the socially motivated students. Thus if we can stop the socially motivated students, this may also help reduce the hurtful acts of the socially maligned students.

While there is no research that specifically focuses on motivation to engage in cyberbullying, there are some significant indications that a driving motivation for cyberbullying acts that involve posting or sending nasty material about others in a public manner is strongly motivated by an attention-getting purpose. There are other ways in which young people appear to be using digital technologies for attention-getting purposes. Young people frequently measure their popularity by how many friends they have on their Facebook profile or how many Tweet followers they have. Some teens (and adults) appear to be very active in sending status updates or tweets for the purpose gaining ongoing attention. When nasty materials about someone are posted online, this can generate a significant amount of attention by others who take the time to read and comment.

Most Students Hold Positive Values

The vast majority of students think that bullying is wrong, feel bad for the student targeted, and wish they could do something to help.[9] Further, they hold those who do defend in very high esteem. Studies have found that around 80 to 85% of youth do not approve of bullying and 80% of students expressed high admiration for peers who intervened.[10]

Defenders Can Be Effective

Defenders are often very effective in stopping the bullying acts.[11] In a naturalistic study of bullying incidents, when a witness intervened, the bullying stopped within 10 seconds 57% of the time. Such interventions were ineffective only 27% of the time. with the remainder it was not possible to tell the outcome, thus 57% is likely the lower end of effectiveness. Boys and girls were equally effective. When looking at the interventions, 66% were directed towards the student being aggressive, 15% were directed towards the student targeted, and 19% were directed at both.

The support defenders provide for those targeted can help to reduce the negative impact.[12] Having protective friends buffers against the pain. Students who are the target of hurtful behavior who have one or more defenders are reportedly less anxious and less depressed.

Being A Defender

Steps to be an Effective Defender

To be an effective defender requires taking note of a negative situation and interpreting it accurately, feeling a personal responsibility to respond, and having the skills, resources, and sufficient "power" to effectively respond.[13]

Defender Attributes

Various studies have determined that defenders have very positive attributes.[14] They hold personal values that reinforce the importance of being personally responsible for the well-being of others and they are tolerant of differences. They are sensitive to how others are feeling, rating high in affective empathy. They have a high degree of social self-efficacy, that is they have good social and problem-solving skills and are confident. They are both popular and well-liked.

Comparing Rescuers & Defenders

Fascinating insight can be derived from studies of people who acted to rescue the Jews during the Holocaust. Eva Fogelman, daughter of a survivor, conducted interviews with such rescuers and found four very common attributes:[15]

- They had well-developed inner values, acceptance of differences, and a strong belief that individual action mattered.

- They came from loving homes, where parents used reasoned discipline rather than punishment. They had an altruistic caregiver who modeled compassionate values and frequently had suffered a loss in their own family that had given rise to increased sympathy for others.

- They had a strong sense of self-competency and in their ability to find creative solutions to the very difficult situations.

- There were enabling situations that occurred that helped to support their efforts. This included a support network of like-minded rescuers.

The are significant similarities between rescuers and defenders in bullying situations, and one notable difference. The rescuers worked in secret. Defenders actions are frequently more public. Thus, attributes of the social environment are more highly relevant to the issue of intervening in bullying situations.

Tolerance/Acceptance

Bullying prevention researchers have focused on factors related to personal responsibility and empathy, and curiously have not fully explored the aspect of tolerance or acceptance of others who are different. Clearly, the students targeted are most often selected for abuse because they present in ways that are perceived as "different" with negative connotations. Personal values that tolerate, accept, and even embrace such differences likely play a significant role in the motivation to intervene.

Personal Responsibility

Active defending of a peer appears to be strongly linked to the value of personal responsibility for the well-bring of others.[16]

Although this linkage has not been fully researched in the context of bullying intervention, clearly the value of personal responsibility for others is something that is transmitted and modeled by parents, and may also often be reinforced by the family's religious or spiritual foundations.

Empathy

The factor of empathy has a number of curious dimensions.[17] Affective empathy, feeling distress when seeing distress, has been associated with defending.[18] However, simply having affective empathy, and feeling distressed by seeing someone being hurt, is insufficient, in and of itself, to generate action. Passive observers also demonstrate affective empathy.

Cognitive empathy, that is being able to predict how someone is feeling is not associated with defending, but is associated with bullying.[19] In fact, highly popular adolescent girls use their cognitive empathy skills very effectively to engage in aggression against others. There is no evidence that increasing empathy will increase defending.

Differences Between Intent and Action

There is, however, a significant disparity between expressed intent to help and action.[20] When asked how they would respond to hypothetical situations, significant portion of students either indicate that they would intervene or would like to intervene to stop the bullying. In various studies the percentage of students who told investigators they would intervene ranged from 43% to 68%. But in surveys that ask about actual interventions and naturalistic observations of bullying incidents, the numbers of students who intervene is significantly less. Based on a number of studies, it appears that around 17 to 25% of youth may intervene.

It is probable that some of the differences in the data relates to students providing a "socially desirable" response to questions that ask whether they would intend to try to help.

It is important to carefully consider these findings. Roughly speaking, the number of students who want to help is twice to three times more than those who actually do. The intent to help is already present. It is imperative that we focus attention on efforts to turn this intent into action a greater portion of the time.

Social Self-Efficacy and Effective Strategies

Social self-efficacy is a combination of strategies and skills, along with the confidence that one can act in an effective manner.[21] Defenders demonstrate such social self-efficacy and this distinguishes them from passive observers. Lack of effective strategies is likely a major reason for failure to intervene.[22]

Social Status

Research has documented that the social status of the potential defender appears to be a controlling factor.[23] Beyond motivation and skills, if one does not have a sufficient high social status, attempting to intervene can backfire due to the power and high social status of the student being aggressive and the low social status of one targeted.

Barriers to Positive Intervention

There appear to be a significant number of barriers to positive intervention. These include the following.

Bystander Effect

As bullying incidents tend to have many witnesses, the likelihood individual witnesses might intervene may be influenced by presence of others.[24] Consistent research over decades has identified what is generally called the "bystander effect"--the recognition that an increase in the number of people who perceive a negative or emergency situation correlates with a decrease in the possibility that any one person will intervene.[25] There are three mechanisms that underlie this bystander effect:

- Diffusion of responsibility. When many people are witnesses to a negative event, individuals will assume that someone else is responsible for responding.

- Audience inhibition. When others are watching, there is the potential for public failure and the resulting embarrassment.

- Social Influence. When witnessing a negative event with others, each individual will take social cues from those nearby in assessing how serious the incident is and whether a response is warranted.

Most of the studies on the bystander effect have involved adults, however, an insightful study has been conducted involving students.[26] The researcher set up a situation in a classroom where a student was on the floor crying when students entered the class. He watched what happened and then interviewed the responders and non-responders to determine their thinking. Only one student went to the student who was crying and stayed with this student until the teacher was alerted to the problem.

The interview responses from the students matched and expanded on the bystander effect factors. Diffusion of responsibility was clearly present in many students' thinking. The students expressed the opinion that was the responsibility of the teacher, this student's friends, or the one who caused the problem to intervene, not their responsibility.

There were clearly concerns of embarrassment, including a concern expressed by a girl that if she helped this boy, others would think she liked him. The issue of fear of embarrassment, likely related to the potential for failure in the context of challenging the person being aggressive who has high social status has not received specific attention from bullying prevention researchers and is likely a significant barrier that relates to both the effectiveness of intervention strategies and social status differences.

A variation on the social cues barrier was the class expectations. The very clear expectations for students was that when they came into class, they were to go directly to their seats, be quiet, and get to work. The one student who "broke the rules" explained his actions in accord with a clear universal value. Q: "How come you think it is important you go over and ask about what has happened?" A: "Otherwise the person might think no one cares about me."[27]

As will be addressed further below, it will be important for schools to carefully consider how school rules and expectations might present barriers for students to positively intervene.

Mechanisms for Moral Disengagement

Social learning theory, specifically Bandura's theory on moral disengagement, provides helpful insight into

hurtful behavior.[28] According to this theory, people "turn off" their inclination to follow what they believe to be appropriate moral standards of behavior, but when they do so, they create rationalizations or justifications for why failing to abide by these standards is necessary or required in this particular situation. These rationalizations guard against feelings of guilt and personal responsibility. Bandura identified four common mechanisms people use to rationalize hurtful behavior, including:

- Reconstruing Conduct (Spin It). Actions are portrayed as serving some larger purpose or euphemistic terms are used to describe the action. "I was just joking around." "It was a prank."

- Displacing or Diffusing Responsibility (Blame Others). This can occur if many people are engaging in certain behavior, so no one person appears to be responsible or if someone else can be blamed for "encouraging" the action. "Everybody does it." "He or she started it and I just joined in." "Someone else should be responsible for stopping this."

- Disregarding or Misrepresenting Injurious Consequences (Deny the Harm). Sometimes the perception that the harm was minimal is balanced against the benefit received. "What I did wasn't that bad. Everyone is just overreacting."

- Dehumanizing or Blaming the Victim (Put Down). Those who are targeted frequently have personal characteristics that make it easier for others to blame them. Once the student has been dehumanized or blamed for what has happened, it is easier to rationalize that the actions taken were justified. "He or she deserved it."

There has been limited application of Bandura's framework to the situation of bullying. However, research has demonstrates that both bullies and bully-victims show significantly higher levels of overall moral disengagement than young people do not engage in bullying.[29] It has also been found that young people who witness bullying, but did nothing and did not feel guilty for doing nothing, have higher levels of moral disengagement.[30]

Social Status and Potential of Embarrassment

The high social status of the student engaging in aggression and his or her allies can interfere with defending behavior by anyone who does not share this person's social status.[31] Most often the concerns are expressed are associated with the potential for retaliation and affiliation with the lower social status student targeted.

Connected to this is a factor that has not been fully investigated, which is the potential of embarrassment that is associated with social status. This is a combination of aspects of the bystander effect and mechanisms of disengagement, but associated with a student's social status.

Challenging a high status student who is aggressive or defending a low status student who was targeted has a significant potential for failure and humiliation. In the hyper-sexually-charged adolescent world, defending a low social status student could also lead some students to tease the defender about wanting a personal relationship with this student. Fear of embarrassment may be a significant factor that has not yet been explored.

School Rules, Staff Behavior, & Effectiveness

The issues raised by the aforementioned student bystander response in an emergency, the question of the potential of a barrier established based on school rules and staff behavior. Additionally, given that one of the recommendations for action provided to students is to report serious situations to the school, it is important to consider the effectiveness of the school's response. None of these issues have been adequately researched. There are several key factors that must be considered:

- **Staff Modeling.** As noted, witnesses pick up on the social cues from others in the environment and are likely very focused on how adult authorities react. If staff members see, but do not respond to, peer aggression, students are likely to interpret this as a situation where response is not warranted.

- **Diffusion of Responsibility**. If the school communicates the message that problems between students should be resolved by staff, students are less likely to perceive that they have any personal responsibility.

- **Conflict Between Following School Rules/ Expectations and Positively Intervening.** If the school rules and expectations set the standards that students should not "tattle," should mind their own business, and getting to class on time is imperative, what is most likely to happen if students are rushing to class and see a negative altercation that has the potential to get even more negative?

- **Effectiveness of School Intervention.** Research on bullying, has raised significant concerns about the effectiveness of school intervention. The Youth Voice Project found only 42% of students who were bullied at moderate to very severe level reported this to the school.[32] After reporting, things got better only 34% of the time. Things got worse 29% of the time. A significant majority of students (around 60%) believe school staff make things worse when they intervene in bullying situations, whereas very few school staff (under 7%) thought this.[33]

Perceived Peer Norms

Students' perspective of the predominant norms held by their peers appears to be a critically important factor.[34] Adolescents, especially, are very likely to behave in ways that are in accord with group norms, or what they perceive those norms to be.[35] When those norms discourage peer aggression and support positive peer intervention, the percentage of students who are willing to act in a positive manner increases. When students appear to endorse bullying, they send a message to their peers that bullying is considered acceptable and bullying behavior increases.[36]

Notably, the perceived perspective that peers expected people to intervene increased defending behavior over and above all personal, individual characteristics of the defenders.[37] There are only two studies that have focused on this aspect. One study found that when students believed that friends expected them to support those being hurt this was one of the most important predictor's of students' expressed intention to intervene.[38] Students' understanding of teacher's expectations had no positive impact. Thus, having adults tell students to intervene is unlikely to have a positive impact.

The other exceptionally important study found:

> Results on self-reported behaviors also pointed out that perceived peer normative pressure moderated the association between personal responsibility and behavior. High levels of perceived peer pressure were positively associated with defending behavior regardless of the level of personal responsibility for intervention. That is, even students' with low personal responsibility tend to defend the bullied peer when they believe that other classmates expect such prosocial behavior from them. In contrast, when the perception of pressure for intervention from classmates is low, the positive relation between personal responsibility and defending behavior becomes evident.[39]

This finding provides significant support for the expectation that the Be a Friend ~ Lend a Hand program will be effective as a major objective of the approach is to use local survey data to illustrate to the students that not only do their peers object to aggressive behavior, they think highly of those who seek to positively intervene.

An innovative and very effective positive norms intervention strategy demonstrated that when a school surveyed its own students and demonstrated to the students the fact that the majority of them did not approve of bullying, the rates of bullying significantly decreased.[40]

The "Whole Elephant"

To effectively encourage more students to be defenders, will require focusing both on personal factors, as well as important aspects of the social ecological environment, including values/ expectations and social norms.

Personal Factors

Personal factors include students' personal motivation, their social status, and social self-efficacy.

Motivation.

As noted, there appear to be one key factors that support students' motivation to want to intervene is a value of personal responsibility for the well-being of others. It is argued that another key factor is tolerance or acceptance of differences, however, currently research in the bullying prevention field is lacking to support this assertion.

It is significant to note that research findings have documented that a significant percentage of students either intervene, express an intent to intervene in a hypothetical situation, or express the fact that they know they should intervene but do not because of some barrier.[41] Thus, it appears that there is already sufficient motivation among many students to support a significant increase in defending behavior if other factors are more effectively addressed.

Be a Friend ~ Lend a Hand and *Cyber Savvy* programs reinforces this motivation through a positive norms approach.

Social Status

Research has documented that the social status of the potential defender appears to be a controlling factor.[42] Unfortunately, it is likely not possible to significantly modify a school's "social ladder" to raise the social status of more students. Therefore, three strategies are pursued through Be a Friend ~ Lend a Hand and *Cyber Savvy*:

- **Empower the High Status Students**. Make sure that those students who do have sufficient social status also have insight into effective strategies, are reinforced by their understanding of the positive peer norms related to defenders, and are not dissuaded by school rules or expectations.

- **Increase the Ranks of Defenders by Lowering the Social Status Barrier.** Research has demonstrated that when there is a perception that the school community, especially peers, support positive intervention, students with lower social status are more likely to also engage in intervention.[43] This is a significantly important finding. These students especially require an understanding of effective strategies that do not result in placing them at risk of failure or embarrassment, as well as ensuring they too are not dissuaded by school rules or expectations.

- **Undermine the Status of Those Who Engage in Aggression.** There is an obvious ""disconnect"" between the fact that those who engage in aggression are perceived to be popular, when the vast majority of students disapprove of their hurtful actions. By clearly demonstrating the positive norms towards aggression and, by extension those who engage in aggression, to the students this may help to reduce the social status of those who are hurtful.[44]

Social Self-Efficacy

As noted, social self-efficacy involves both the ability to act as well as the confidence to do so.[45] A student's degree of confidence is likely tied to their social status, but is also likely related to their experiences of success in intervening.

To increase effective skills will require a focus on strategies that are likely to be effective and that reduce the risks of failure and embarrassment. Watching demonstrations of these strategies and practice will be important, as are discussions of positive intervention in the context of studies in literature and history. Stan Davis's book *Empowering Bystanders in Bullying Prevention*, provides extensive examples of strategies teachers can use to provide insight into effective strategies.[46]

A challenge in developing effective strategies to recommend is that the research related to effective strategies is limited. There also appears to be disagreement in the bullying prevention field especially around the wisdom of suggesting that students tell the person being aggressive to stop.

In his book, *Empowering Bystanders in Bullying Prevention*, Stan Davis urges against advising student witnesses to directly confront the student engaging in aggression to stop. However, the *Expect Respect* program from Positive Behavior Interventions and Support directly teaches both those targeted and witnesses to tell the student being aggressive to stop in a very brief manner and then walk away so to provide no additional attention. The International Institute for Restorative Practices provides a series of recommended questions that witnesses can pose to the person engaging in hurtful behavior to help that person think more clearly about his or her actions.

The practical reality is that the way in which a defender might intervene is going to be determined by that student's relationships with the parties, their social status and skills, and the situation itself. Sometimes it is safest and best to simply walk away from the situation and promptly report to an adult, reaching out in private to the student who was targeted might be best in other situations, other times it would be most appropriate loudly and directly say, "stop," and yet other times, especially if they have a potentially influential relationship with the student

engaging in hurtful behavior, it may be best that they share their concerns in private after the incident.

Reinforcement of intervention efforts by important adults, school staff and parents, especially in situations where a student tried but failed to positively intervene, will also be important.

Socio-Ecological Factors

Values/Expectations

The environmental factors include parent values, society values, peer norms, and school climate.

- **Parent Values**. Likely the important factors related to motivation, an acceptance of differences and personal responsibility for the well-being of others, as well as the importance of treating others as you would like to be treated, are ground in the values imparted to students by their parents and other important adults. In many families, it is also likely that these values are reinforced by their spiritual or religious beliefs. Schools can encourage parents to reinforce the importance of these values to their children in the context of a school program to reduce bullying and peer aggression.

- **Society Values and the Media**. Schools do not have the power to influence social values, but they can help students investigate and evaluate the social messages they receive. This should especially focus on the messages adolescents receive from advertising and other media outlets that seek to inculcate them with values associated with needing to have certain things and act in certain ways to be considered "cool" and "popular."

  Recently, however, we are seeing many new positive social messages related to the importance of peer intervention in bullying and peer aggression situations. These include the Lady Gaga's Born This Way Foundation, a new Ad Council/Free to Be Foundation ad reinforcing the importance of personal responsibility for the well-being of others, and others.[47] Many adolescents are also producing their own positive messaging and distributing these messages through YouTube and on other web sites. Schools can seek out and reinforce these positive messages from the wider society.

- **School Climate**. To encourage positive peer intervention, it is necessary for schools to carefully consider a variety of aspects of their school climate. Addressing these factors should be considered foundational to support the implementation of the Be a Friend ~ Lend a Hand program.

- Kindness and Respect. The overall message of the school must reinforce the importance that everyone, staff and students, deserves to be treated with, and will teat others with, kindness and respect -- regardless of perceived differences.

- Social Cues. If a negative situation does occur with the clear knowledge of a staff member, who fails to intervene, students should know to report this to a responsible adult in the school. Further, if a staff member engages in hurtful behavior targeting any student, it is imperative that students know this should be reported. It is equally imperative that school leadership respond to such reports in an appropriate and responsible manner.

- Diffusion of Responsibility. Students must understand that they are equally important players in responding to hurtful situations involving students that occur on or off campus. They must recognize that while staff may be present, they may not detect a negative situation.

- Conflict Between School Rules/Expectations and Positive Intervention. Students must know that if there is ever a situation where there is a conflict between school rules, such as getting to class on time, and responding to a situation where a student is being hurt, they should seek to intervene by confronting the person causing harm, if this would be safe, or by reporting to a responsible adult. Students should be asked to identify other rules or expectations that they perceive to present barriers to positive intervention so these can be effectively addressed.

- Effective School Intervention. If we expect students to report more serious situations to school staff, it is imperative that this make things better for the student who has been targeted. Setting up a system where an evaluation of effectiveness is conducted after every reported incident, an evaluation that seeks feedback from those engaging in or targeted by hurtful behavior, and respective parents can help schools recognize what intervention strategies are working effectively or not.

Positive Peer Norms

• While research has documented that the vast majority of students disapprove of bullying and peer aggression and think very highly of those who positively intervene, in too many schools, these exceptionally important norms may not be known. It is imperative to make such norms clearly visible. The Be a Friend ~ Lend a Hand and

Cyber Savvy programs use a local survey to obtain data that reinforces positive norms.

Evidence-Based Programs in the Digital Age

Evidence-Based or evidence-Grounded

Risk prevention professionals are strongly encouraged to implement programs that are "evidence-based," that is programs that have been determined to be effective through rigorous evaluation.

While this is a noteworthy objective, conducting such evaluations can take a very long time. Further, after a specific program has been determined to be "evidence-based," it can be difficult to update this "proven" program with new insight. Fidelity to the program in a local implementation is also an important factor.

The perspective of Embrace Civility in the Digital Age is that the emergence of new challenges associated with digital technologies, the extended time it takes to conduct and publish research on these challenges, and the speed of change, requires a change in approach.

The most significant initial objective must be that programs are evidence-grounded and have a Likelihood of Success.

The former U.S. Department of Education Office of Safe and Drug Free Schools required use of evidence-based programs.[48] Recognizing that districts might want to address a new concern or want to implement an innovative new approach, the program had a mechanism that districts could use to request a waiver from this requirement if they wanted to implement an innovative new approach.

The critical factors that OSDFS requested that districts document when making a request for a waiver are essentially the factors that are necessary to consider to ensure that a new program has a substantial likelihood of success.

Evidence-Grounded with a Likelihood of Success

Embrace Civility in the Digital Age recommends the following standards to ensure a likelihood of success, and has developed the Be a Friend ~ Lend a Hand and *Cyber Savvy* programs are in accord with these standards:

• **Research Insight.** Identification of the research insight that has been relied upon to more fully understand the concern, including a discussion of the most significant risk and protective factors the program or activity is designed to target.

• **Effective Intervention Strategies**. A description of the intervention activities. The rationale for how the planned intervention activities have been

designed to incorporate approaches that have been found to be effective in risk prevention.

- **Comprehensive Plan of Action.** A detailed description of the implementation plan, which should include:

  - A needs assessment based on objective local data that investigates the concerns and identifies risks and protective factors related to this concern.

  - Identification of the objectives the program seeks to accomplish.

  - A description of the activities, who will be responsible for these activities, and a timeline.

  - An evaluation plan utilizing a number of objective means that addresses changes in attitudes and behavior and that includes how the results of the evaluation will be used to modify the approach and will be reported.

Validity of the Survey Questions

Legitimate questions can be raised about the validity of the responses to some of the survey questions. Every survey raises questions about whether the respondents might give the "socially desirable" response. There is every reason to believe that on the Be a Friend ~ Lend a Hand and *Cyber Savvy* surveys, students may provide the socially desirable response to the questions that relate to values or intended actions. Because the use of the answers to these questions is to promote positive peer norms, the fact that students may provide a more "socially desirable" response is not considered to be problematical. The responses to incident-related questions will likely not present such concerns.

About the Author

Nancy Willard, M.S., J.D. is the director of Embrace Civility in the Digital Age, a program of the Center for Safe and Responsible Internet Use. She has degrees in special education and law, taught "at risk" children, practiced computer law, and was an educational technology consultant before focusing her professional attention on issues of youth risk online and management of student Internet use.

Nancy is author of: *Cyber Savvy: Embracing Digital Safety and Civility* (2011, Corwin Press), *Cyberbullying and Cyberthreats: Responding to the Challenge of Online Social Cruelty, Threats, and Distress* (2007, Research Press), *Cyber-Safe Kids, Cyber-Savvy Teens, Helping Young People Use the Internet Safety and Responsibly* (2007, Jossey Bass).

Endnotes

1 Salmivalli, C, (2010) Bullying and the Peer Group: A Review. Aggression and Violent Behavior. 15, 112-120.

2 Salmivalli, C., & Peets, K. (2008). Bullies, victims, and bully–victim relationships. In K. Rubin, W. Bukowski & B. Laursen (Eds.), Handbook of peer interactions, relationships, and groups (pp. 322–340). New York: Guilford Press; Salmivalli, C, (2010) supra.

3 Atlas, R. & Pepler, D. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. Journal of Educational Research. Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1997). Observations of bullying and victimization in the school yard. Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13, 41–59.; Hawkins, D. L., Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer interventions in bullying. Social Development, Henderson, N. R., & Hymel, S. (2002). Peer contributions to bullying in schools: Examining student response categories. Poster presented at the National Association of School Psychologists Annual Convention, Chicago, February;; O'Connell, P., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: Insights and challenges for intervention. Journal of Adolescence

4 O'Connell, supra.

5 Hodges, E. V. E., & Perry, D. G. (1999). Personal and interpersonal antecedents and consequences of victimization by peers. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 76, 677–685.

6 Simona, et. al., supra.

7 Rodkin, P., Farmer, T., Pearl, R., & Van Acker, R. (2006). They're cool: Social status and peer group supports for aggressive boys and girls. Social Development, 15, 175–204; Simona, et. al., supra; Salmivalli (2010), supra.

8 Rodkin, P.C. & Hodges, E.V.E. (2003) Bullies and Victims in the Peer Ecology: Four Questions for Psychologists and School Professionals, School Psychology Review, 2003, Volume 32, No. 3, pp. 384-400; Rodkin , P.C. (2011) Bullying and Children's Peer Relationships. In Whitehouse Conference on Bullying. http://www.stopbullying.gov/references/white_house_conference/index.html.

9 Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1991). Bullying among Australian school children: Reported behavior and attitudes toward victims. Journal of Social Psychology, 131, 615–627; Rigby, K., & Johnson, B. (2006). Expressed readiness of Australian schoolchildren to act as bystanders in support of children who are being bullied. Educational Psychology,

10 Rigby & Slee, supra; Rigby, K., & Johnson, supra.

11 Hawkins, et. al., supra.

12 Sainio, M., Veenstra, R., Huitsing, G., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). Victims and their defenders: A dyadic approach. International Journal of Behavioral Development, vol. 35 no. 2 144-151; Salmivalli (2010), supra.

13 Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 215–221; Salmivalli (2010), supra.

14 Pozzoli, T. & Gini, G. (2010) Active defending and passive bystanding behavior in bullying: the role of personal characteristics and perceived peer pressure, Journal of Abnormal CHild Psychology, Aug;38(6):815-27; Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviors associated with bullying in schools. International Journal of Behavioral Development, 28, 246–258; Caravita, et. al. , supra; Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoe, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending behavior? Aggressive Behavior, 33, 467–476; Pöyhönen, V., Juvonen, J., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). What does it take to stand up for the victim of bullying? The interplay between personal and social factors. Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, Merrill-Palmer Quarterly: Vol. 56: Iss. 2, Article 4;

15 Fogelman, E. (1994) Conscience and Courage: Rescuers of Jews during the Holocaust, New York, Anchor Books.

16 Pozzoli & Gini, supra; Menesini, E., Codecasa, E., & Benelli, B. (2003). Enhancing children's responsibility to take action against bullying: Evaluation of a befriending intervention in Italian middle schools. Aggressive Behavior, 29, 10–14.

17 Simona, C.S., Caravits, P.D., & Silmivalli C. (2008) Unique and Interactive Effects of Empathy and Social Status on Involvement in Bullying Social Development, Vol. 18, No. 1., pp. 140-163

18 Pöyhönen, et. al. supra; Gini, et. al., supra; Simona, et. al., supra.

19 Caravita, et. al supra; Pöyhönen, et. al. supra.

20 Salmivalli, C., Lappalainen, M., & Lagerspetz, K. (1998). Stability and change of behavior in connection with bullying in schools: A two-year follow-up. Aggressive Behavior, 24, 205–218; Rigby & Johnson, supra; Henderson & Hymel, supra; O'Connell, et. al supra; Salmivalli (2010), supra.

21 Bandura, A. (1995). Self-efficacy in changing societies. New York: Cambridge University Press;, Pozzoli & Gini, supra.; Gini, et. al., supra.

22 O'Connell, supra; Henderson & Hymel, supra; Salmivalli (2010), supra.

23 Pöyhönen, et. al. supra; Pozzoli & Gini, supra, Sainio, et. al, supra.

24 Salmivalli (2010), supra.

25 Latane, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10, 215–221; Latane', B and Nida, S (1981) Ten years of research on group size and helping, Psychological Bulletin Vol 89, No 2 308-324.

26 Thornberg, R, (2007) A classmate in distress: schoolchildren as bystanders and their reasons for how they act, Social Psychology of Education, Vol. 10, No. 1. pp. 5-28.

27 Id at page 11.

28 Bandura, A. (1991). Social cognition theory of moral thought and action. In W. M.Kurtines & J. L. Gewirtz (Eds.), *Handbook of moral behavior and development* (Vol. 1, pp. 45-96). Hillsdale, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum.

29 Obermann, M.-L. (2011). Moral disengagement in self-reported and peer-nominated school bullying. Aggressive Behavior, 37, 133–144; Pozzoli & Gini, supra.

30 Pozzoli & Gini, supra.

31 Pöyhönen, et. al. supra; Simona, et. al., supra; Salmivalli (2010), supra.

32 Stan Davis & Clarisse Nixon. (2010) Preliminary results from the Youth Voice Research Project: Victimization & Strategies. Youth Voice Project. http://www.youthvoiceproject.com.

33 Bradshaw, C.P., Sawyer, A.L. & O'Brennan, L.M. Bullying and Peer Victimization at School: Perceptual Differences Between Students and School Staff. School Psychology Review, Volume 36, No. 3, pp. 361-382 (2007).

34 Pozzoli & Gini, supra.; Rigby & Johnson, supra. Salmivalli (2010), supra.

35 Espelage, D., Holt, M., & Henkel, R. (2003). Examination of peer-group contextual effects on aggression during early adolescence. Child Development, 74, 205–220

36 Kärnä, A., Salmivalli, C., Poskiparta, E., & Voeten, M. J. M. (2008, May). Do bystanders influence the frequency of bullying in a classroom? The XIth EARA conference, Turin, Italy; Pozzoli & Gini, supra.; Rigby & Johnson, supra.

37 (Pozzoli & Gini, supra.; Rigby & Johnson, supra.

38 Rigby & Johnson, supra.

39 Pozzoli & Gini, supra at 826.

40 Perkins, H. W, Craig, D.W. & Perkins. J.M. (2011) Using Social Norms to Reduce Bullying: A Research Intervention in Five Middle Schools. Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 14(5):703-722, 2011.

41 Salmivalli, et. al; (2008), supra; Rigby & Johnson, supra; Henderson & Hymel, supra; O'Connell, et. al, supra; Salmivalli (2010), supra.

42 Pöyhönen, et. al. supra; Simona, et. al., supra; Salmivalli (2010), supra.

43 Pozzoli & Gini, supra.

44 Perkins, st. al., supra.

45 Pozzoli & Gini, supra.

46 S. Davis & J. Davis, (2007) Empowering Bystanders in Bullying Prevention. Research Press; Champaign, Ill,

47 http://bornthiswayfoundation.org/; http://www.educationnews.org/ parenting/anti-bullying-campaign-airs-its-first-ad-targets-parents/.

48 Title IV, Part A, Safe and Drug-Free Schools and Communities, Principles of Effectiveness (Section 4115).