

# **Student Attitudes and Perceptions of Teacher Responses to Bullying: An Experimental Vignette Study**

Karliën Demol, Karine Verschueren, Marie Jame, Chloë Lazard and Hilde Colpin,

*Faculty of Psychology and Educational Sciences, KU Leuven, Leuven, Belgium*

*Belgium, 2021*

Correspondence to: Karliën Demol, [karlien.demol@kuleuven.be](mailto:karlien.demol@kuleuven.be)

*This is a post-peer-review, pre-copyedit version of an article published in European Journal of Developmental Psychology. The final authenticated version is available online at:*  
<https://www.tandfonline.com/doi/full/10.1080/17405629.2021.1896492>

### **Abstract**

Although teachers are key in bullying intervention, little is known about their responses to bullying and how students perceive them. This study investigated whether experimentally manipulated teacher responses in vignettes (i.e., non-response, comforting victim, correcting bully, both comforting victim and correcting bully) predict differences in student attitudes and perceptions (i.e., students' bullying attitudes, empathy toward victims, perception of teacher bullying attitudes, response evaluations). Fourth-to-sixth graders ( $N = 251$ , 44.2% boys,  $M_{\text{age}} = 10.86$ ) read a bullying incident vignette that differed regarding the teacher's response, before completing questionnaires. Analyses of variance demonstrated no differences in students' bullying attitudes and empathy between conditions. The multiple response was evaluated as more appropriate than the single active responses. Correcting bully was perceived as the most appropriate single response and was associated with more perceived teacher anti-bullying attitudes, indicating that students deduced beliefs from teacher behavior. Non-response was associated with the most negative student perceptions.

*Keywords:* bullying, teacher responses, student attitudes and perceptions, experimental vignettes

## Introduction

A recent UNESCO (2019) study showed that worldwide, one child in three reported being bullied at school in the last month, i.e., was the target of repeated and intentional aggression by more powerful peers (Olweus, 1993). Considering the associated difficulties, effective interventions must be identified (Arseneault, 2018). Although teachers are expected to tackle bullying, little is known about teacher responses to bullying and student perceptions of them (Brendgen & Troop-Gordon, 2015).

Social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) suggests that people learn from observing and imitating others' behavior. Further, social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) suggests that people think about the meaning behind others' behavior. Building on this, students are likely to observe and think about teacher behavior which, in turn, can influence their own behavior. Additionally, according to moral domain theory (Smetana, 2010; Turiel, 1983), people's understanding of moral issues such as bullying originates from their own direct experience with harm, their observations of harm caused to others, and others' communication underscoring the harm (Campaert et al., 2017; Thornberg et al., 2017). Based on these theories, students are likely to observe and think about teachers' management of harmful situations such as bullying (Bandura, 1977, 1986) which can contribute to their understanding of bullying (Campaert et al., 2017). Therefore, through their responses to bullying, teachers can model acceptable behavior and set expectations for students' mutual interactions (e.g., Yoon & Bauman, 2014). For instance, by responding actively, teachers show that bullying is not tolerated. This, in turn, is expected to decrease bullying. Contrarily, by ignoring bullying, teachers may provide the signal that it is accepted and this may reinforce the behavior (Van der Zanden et al., 2015).

In line with this theorizing, studies found links between teacher responses to bullying, on the one hand, and bullying, on the other (e.g., Campaert et al., 2017; Veenstra et al., 2014;

Wachs et al., 2018). However, studies investigating whether and how teacher responses predict student attitudes and perceptions regarding bullying are scarce. That is striking since these attitudes and perceptions may operate as mechanisms between teacher responses and student behavior. This vignette study aims to fill this gap by investigating whether experimental manipulation of teacher responses to bullying predicts differences in student attitudes and perceptions.

### ***Student Attitudes and Perceptions***

Students' attitudes and perceptions regarding bullying are linked with their bullying behaviors. First, bullying attitudes, specifically "moral beliefs regarding the appropriateness or inappropriateness of bullying and related behaviors" (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004, p. 248) have been found to predict bullying (e.g., Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). Referring to moral domain theory (Smetana, 2010; Turiel, 1983) and goal-framing theory (Lindenberg, 2013), teachers can be expected to play a role in students' bullying attitudes. First, as described above, teachers' bullying management can be relevant for students' understanding of bullying (Campaert et al., 2017). Second, goal-framing theory (Lindenberg, 2013) suggests that, in order to affect behavior, goals have to be activated. Bullying has been found to be associated with goals to achieve and maintain high status in the peer group (Sijtsema et al., 2009). To inhibit activation of such goals, goal-framing theory suggests that an overarching goal to behave socially appropriately has to be activated in students. For bullying, the "normative goal" that this behavior is not acceptable can be activated when significant others stand for this norm. In classrooms, teachers can be significant others when students see them as authority figures who stand up against bullying (Veenstra et al., 2014). Thus, building on goal-framing theory, when teachers take an active stance against bullying, they may help inhibit goals that encourage bullying and strengthen students' anti-bullying attitudes

(Veenstra et al., 2014). Conversely, when teachers do not react, they may convey the impression that bullying is not a problem and thereby undermine anti-bullying attitudes.

Second, students' empathy toward victims has been found to predict defending (Nickerson et al., 2015) which, in turn, is related to less bullying (Saarento et al., 2015). Moreover, research indicated that students make sense of teacher responses in terms of their own morality and that this, in turn, predicts the level of bullying (Menesini, 2019). Based on social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) and moral domain theory (Turiel, 1983), active responses, especially those involving victim support, may reveal teachers' empathy which can increase students' empathy toward victims. Conversely, non-responding teachers do not show empathy toward victims which can decrease students' empathy toward them.

Third, studies showed that when students perceive stronger anti-bullying attitudes among teachers, they demonstrated lower bullying later on (Saarento et al., 2015). Based on social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986) and goal-framing theory (Veenstra et al., 2014), students are expected to perceive stronger anti-bullying attitudes in teachers using active responses, especially when directed to bullies, as this explicitly shows disapproval. Conversely, when teachers do not respond, students may think that they have less negative bullying attitudes.

Finally, this study examined students' evaluation of teacher responses. Although no literature was found, given that most students have attitudes opposed to bullying (e.g., Salmivalli, 2010), students are expected to judge active responses as more appropriate than non-response. Regarding active responses, responses directed to bullies are expected to be evaluated more appropriate as this shows more explicit disapproval.

### ***Teacher Responses to Bullying***

When teachers are confronted with bullying, they can respond in multiple ways (Campaert et al., 2017). Responses may differ according to the target (e.g., bully, victim, both) and

scholars distinguished supportive and controlling responses (Campaert et al., 2017; Wachs et al., 2018). Moreover, as teachers sometimes do not respond, non-response is a possible response (Campaert et al., 2017).

Inspired by this conceptualization, this study focused on four immediate teacher responses, i.e., (1) non-response, (2) comforting victim, (3) correcting bully and (4) both comforting victim and correcting bully. Non-response was contrasted with all three active responses to investigate the effect of responding at all. A response directed to the bully (correcting) respectively victim (comforting) was chosen to examine differences in effects regarding the target. Further, the active responses were combined to investigate effects of single versus multiple responses (Burger et al., 2015).

### ***Current Study***

This vignette study aimed to investigate whether four experimentally manipulated teacher responses to bullying, i.e., non-response, comforting victim, correcting bully, and both comforting victim and correcting bully, predict differences in students' bullying attitudes, empathy toward victims, perception of teacher bullying attitudes, and evaluation of teacher responses. Based on social learning, social cognitive (Bandura, 1977, 1986), moral domain (Turiel, 1983) and goal-framing theory (Veenstra et al., 2014) and the studies above, the following hypotheses were formulated.

First, we expected that when teachers do not respond, students would report less negative bullying attitudes and less empathy toward victims, perceive teachers to have less negative bullying attitudes and evaluate the response as less appropriate, compared to the active responses. Second, we hypothesized stronger effects from responses directed to bullies (i.e., correcting) compared to only comforting victims, except for students' empathy toward victims. For the latter, stronger effects were expected from responses directed to victims (i.e.,

comforting). Finally, we assumed that the multiple response would be evaluated as more appropriate than the single active responses.

## **Method**

### ***Sample***

Fourth-to-sixth graders of three Flemish elementary schools (18 classes) were asked to participate. Written parental permission was obtained for 251 students (71%). Due to absences, data were collected from 248 students (44.2% boys,  $M_{\text{age}} = 10.86$ ,  $SD_{\text{age}} = 0.89$ ). Of the students, 33.5%, 35.1%, and 31.5% were in grade 4, 5, and 6, respectively. For all students except one, Dutch was either the only or one of the home languages.

### ***Procedure***

Prior to data collection, ethical approval was acquired from the ethical review board of KU Leuven. A between-subjects 4x2 design (teacher response x gender of the story's victim and bully) with random assignment within classes was used. First, researchers explained bullying by reading aloud a definition (cf. Olweus, 1993). Students could reread this description at any time. Second, students read a vignette about a bullying incident that only differed in the teacher's response and gender of the bully and victim. The responses were (1) non-response, (2) comforting victim, (3) correcting bully and (4) both comforting victim and correcting bully. The bully's and victim's gender was manipulated to counteract possible gender effects. Both were either boys or girls. Mixed-gender versions were not developed because that would cause lower power and same gender bullying occurs more frequently (Baldry, 2004). The teacher's gender was not mentioned in the vignette. Third, after reading the vignette, students completed a first set of questionnaires measuring the outcome variables (student attitudes and perceptions). Fourth, after handing in the vignette and the first set of questionnaires, students completed three manipulation checks (described below) in a second set of questionnaires. Finally, researchers gave a debriefing.

### *Vignettes*

The vignettes were developed for this study, inspired by Bauman and Del Rio (2006). They were the same in all conditions, except for the teacher's response and the gender of the bully and victim. First, students had to imagine having changed schools. Then, it was stated that, in their new class, one classmate had been bullied by another since the beginning of the school year. Next, a bullying incident between these classmates at the playground during break was described. The incident met Olweus' (1993) definition, and comprised verbal, physical, and relational bullying (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006). Then, it was stated that the teacher of their new class was supervising at the playground and had seen what happened. Next, the teacher's response to the incident was presented. In condition 1, the teacher approached another group of students and asked which game they were playing. In condition 2, the teacher comforted the victim. In condition 3, the teacher told the bully that bullying is not accepted and that they will have a conversation to decide how the bully can make up with the victim. In condition 4, the teacher first comforted the victim and then corrected the bully as in condition 2 and 3 respectively.

### *Measures*

#### *Student Attitudes and Perceptions*

Students' bullying attitudes were measured by the validated questionnaire of Salmivalli and Voeten (2004), consisting of 10 items (5 reverse coded) measured on a 5-point scale (1: "not true at all" to 5: "completely true") (e.g., "Bullying makes the victim feel bad"). Cronbach's alpha (.67) was slightly lower than the .75 reported by Salmivalli and Voeten (2004). A CFA in Mplus 8 (Muthén & Muthén, 1998-2017) indicated good fit of the one-factor model ( $\chi^2(33) = 48.27, p = .04$ ; RMSEA = .04, RMSEA 90% CI = [.01-.07], SRMR = .05, CFI = .94) (Kline, 2005). Standardized loadings ranged from .311 to .521. For each student, an average score was calculated. Higher scores reflect stronger anti-bullying attitudes.



Students' empathy toward victims was measured with a Dutch adaptation (Veenstra et al., 2020) of the Empathy scale of Kärnä et al. (2011). Previous studies provided support for the factor structure (e.g., Kärnä et al., 2011; Nocentini & Menesini, 2016) and for the convergent validity (e.g., Salmivalli et al., 2011). The 5 items were applied to the vignette (e.g., "If I see that *name victim* feels sad, I would want to comfort *him/her*") and measured on a 4-point scale (1: "(almost) never" to 4: "(almost) always"). Cronbach's alpha was .67. A CFA indicated good fit of the one-factor model ( $\chi^2(4) = 2.07, p = .72$ ; RMSEA < .01, RMSEA 90% CI = [.00-.07], SRMR = .02, CFI = 1.00). Standardized loadings ranged from .340 to .468. For each student, an average score was calculated. Higher scores reflect more empathy.

Students' perception of teacher bullying attitudes was measured by adapting an item from Saarento et al. (2013). Previous studies provided support for the convergent validity as it was found to longitudinally predict bullying and victimization (e.g., Saarento et al., 2015). The item was applied to the vignette: "What do you think the teacher in the story thinks of bullying?" and was responded on a 5-point scale (1: "good" to 5: "totally wrong").

Students' evaluation of the teacher's response was measured by an item developed for this study, i.e., "I think the teacher responded to the bullying incident in a good way".

Students responded on a 4-point scale (1: "not true" to 4: "true").

### *Manipulation Checks*

Three items checked whether the participants (1) perceived the incident as bullying ("In the story, a student was bullied by a classmate", true/not true), (2) identified the correct character as the victim and bully ("In the story, *name victim* was bullied by *name bully*", true/not true) and (3) identified the correct teacher response ("How did the teacher react to what happened in the story? Choose one of the four teacher responses.", options corresponded to the responses in the vignettes).

## ***Statistical Analyses***

### *Preliminary Analyses*

First, participants ( $N = 248$ ) were almost equally distributed over conditions (teacher response:  $N_1 = 60$ ,  $N_2 = 63$ ,  $N_3 = 63$ ;  $N_4 = 62$ ; characters' gender:  $N_{boys} = 123$ ,  $N_{girls} = 125$ ). Pearson's  $\chi^2$  tests showed no significant differences between conditions regarding grade ( $\chi^2(6) = 2.67$ ,  $p = .85$ ) and gender ( $\chi^2(3) = .75$ ,  $p = .86$ ).

Second, participants who had one or more missing responses on the manipulation checks (2%), and/or did not perceive the incident as bullying (2.4%), and/or misidentified the victim and bully (1.2%) were excluded from all further analyses ( $N = 12$ ). Further, more participants (19%) misidentified the teacher's response (especially the single responses were confused with the multiple response). Participants were excluded from the analyses depending on the hypotheses (Table 1). For the analyses regarding the response evaluation, all participants who misidentified the response were excluded as the hypotheses predict differences between all responses. For the analyses of the other outcomes, less participants were excluded as we did not expect differences between all responses. For instance, regarding attitudes, participants who confused response 3 and 4 were not excluded as no differences were expected between those responses.

### *Main Analyses*

IBM SPSS Statistics 26 was used to examine whether experimentally manipulated teacher responses in vignettes predict differences in students' (1) bullying attitudes, (2) empathy toward victims, (3) perception of teacher bullying attitudes and (4) evaluation of teacher responses. As students were nested in classes, we estimated intraclass correlations (resp.  $< .01$ ,  $.04$ ,  $< .01$ ,  $.07$ ) and design effects (resp. 1.01, 1.39, 1.01, 1.66) using Mplus 8. Multilevel modeling was not needed as little variance was explained by class and the effects of

dependence on standard error estimates were small (Peugh, 2010). One-way independent analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used.

Outliers within conditions were identified and analyses were executed with and without extreme outliers ( $|z| > 3.29$ ) (Table 2) (Field, 2017). When there were no differences in results, only the results from analyses with outliers were reported. As a sensitivity analysis concerning possible effects of heterogeneity of variance, parameter estimates with and without robust standard errors (HC4) were inspected (Field, 2017). When there were no differences in results, only the results from analyses without robust standard errors were reported.

First, the effects of background variables (i.e., grade, gender) and gender of story characters on the outcomes were examined. If the effect was significant, the variable was included in further analyses as a control variable. Second, the effect of teacher responses on the outcomes was examined. If the effect was significant, planned comparisons were executed to test the hypotheses (Field, 2017). Hypotheses concerning five planned comparisons were formulated (Table 1). Regarding contrast 1, non-response was expected to predict less negative bullying attitudes and less empathy toward victims, to be evaluated as less appropriate and associated with students perceiving the teacher as having less negative bullying attitudes compared to the active responses. Regarding contrast 2 and 3, higher scores were expected from responses directed to bullies except for empathy toward victims. Regarding contrast 4, more empathy was expected when the response was directed to the victim. Regarding contrast 5, a more favorable evaluation of multiple response was expected. Bootstrapping was used in the planned comparison analyses as the scores were not completely normally distributed within conditions and group sizes were not equal (Field, 2017). Further, the results of the contrasts not assuming equal variances were inspected and we controlled for multiple testing by Bonferroni correction (Field, 2017).

## Results

Table 2 displays the descriptive statistics, over and within conditions. Participants' gender significantly predicted their bullying attitudes ( $F(1, 203) = 4.99, p = .027, \omega^2 < .01$  (negligible) (Kirk, 1996);  $M_{\text{girls}} = 4.66, SE_{\text{girls}} = .32, M_{\text{boys}} = 4.55, SE_{\text{boys}} = .43$ ) and empathy ( $F(1, 206) = 21.54, p < .001, \omega^2 < .01$  (negligible);  $M_{\text{girls}} = 3.26, SE_{\text{girls}} = .54, M_{\text{boys}} = 2.90, SE_{\text{boys}} = .55$ ) in the analyses with outliers. Hence, gender was included in the analyses of these outcomes. No other significant effects of the control variables were observed in the analyses with and without outliers.

Regarding students' bullying attitudes and empathy toward victims, no significant differences between conditions appeared. However, a significant effect of teacher responses was found for students' perception of teacher attitudes and response evaluation (resp.  $F(3, 204) = 89.98, p < .001, \omega^2 = .05$  (medium);  $F(3, 190) = 61.79, p < .001, \omega^2 = .07$  (large)). Planned comparisons revealed that less negative bullying attitudes were perceived for the teacher in the non-response condition compared to the active response conditions ( $t(73.72) = 6.22, p = .001, r = .85$  (large) (Cohen, 1988)). Further, less negative bullying attitudes were perceived for the teacher in the comforting victim condition compared to the correcting bully conditions (with and without comforting victim) (resp.  $t(83.86) = 2.876, p = .004, r = .30$  (medium);  $t(70.14) = 3.17, p = .005, r = .35$  (medium)). Next, students in the non-response condition considered this response less appropriate compared to the active response conditions ( $t(69.28) = 5.17, p = .001, r = .79$  (large)). Also, students considered the response less appropriate in the comforting victim condition compared to the correcting bully conditions (with and without comforting victim) (resp.  $t(92.80) = .78, p = .001, r = .46$  (medium);  $t(80.60) = 1.51, p = .001, r = .52$  (large)). The single active responses were considered less appropriate than the multiple response ( $t(99.24) = .67, p = .004, r = .27$  (medium)). As 11 tests were carried out (4 ANOVA, 7 contrasts), the Bonferroni correction

resulted in an alpha of .005. Each reported effect remained significant at this level of significance.

## **Discussion**

Studies investigating the effects of teacher responses to bullying on students' attitudes and perceptions regarding bullying are scarce. This is remarkable since student attitudes and perceptions may explain the link between teacher responses and bullying behavior (e.g., Campaert et al., 2017). This experimental study used vignettes to provide insight in whether different teacher responses (i.e., non-response, comforting victim, correcting bully, comforting victim and correcting bully) predict differences in student attitudes and perceptions.

Building on goal-framing theory, Veenstra et al. (2014) stated that when teachers clearly stand up against bullying, they can strengthen students' anti-bullying attitudes. Similar to previous studies, students' attitudes were strongly opposed to bullying (e.g., Salmivalli, 2010). However, in contrast with the hypothesis, they were not stronger after active response. Inspired by social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1977, 1986) and available evidence (Menesini, 2019), active responses, especially those involving comfort to victim, were expected to be associated with higher empathy toward victims. Overall, students felt empathy for the victim, but this was not stronger when the teacher had comforted the victim.

How can these findings be explained? Students' strong anti-bullying attitudes and high empathy in all conditions are in line with studies showing that most students have strong anti-bullying attitudes (e.g., Salmivalli, 2010), judge bullying as much more wrong than conventional transgressions (e.g., swearing) and justify their moral judgment of bullying by referring to the harm caused to victims (e.g., Thornberg et al., 2017). As a result, possibly, there was little room to affect students' attitudes and empathy due to ceiling effects.

Additionally, whereas students' attitudes and empathy can be influenced by their actual

teachers when they consistently respond to bullying, especially in the context of other preventive interventions at the class and school level (e.g., anti-bullying policy, curricula) (National Academies of Sciences & Medicine, 2016), the story's teacher may have been less able to affect students' attitudes. The vignette showed only one response to one incident by a teacher about whom students have no other information. As a result, the vignette may not have been sufficient in demonstrating teachers' roles and their abilities to shape students' attitudes.

As expected based on social cognitive theory (Bandura, 1986), goal-framing theory (Veenstra et al., 2014) and available evidence (Saarento et al., 2015), in the non-response condition, students perceived less negative bullying attitudes from the teacher, and mostly had the impression that the teacher did not matter about bullying. After active response, students perceived more anti-bullying attitudes with, as expected, stronger effects when the teacher corrected the bully, compared to only comforted the victim. Thus, by correcting the bully, it seems that the teacher showed disapproval of bullying more strongly.

In line with the hypotheses and previous research (e.g., Laupa & Turiel, 1986; Weston & Turiel, 1980), non-response was judged to be the least appropriate, correcting the bully to be the most appropriate. Also, the combination of comforting and correcting was evaluated as more appropriate than the single responses.

To conclude, first, this study showed that students can think of an imaginary teacher, can assess teacher responses to bullying and even can deduce teacher beliefs from behavior. Second, teacher non-response was considered as inappropriate and students got the impression that the teacher did not care about the bullying. Third, a response directed to the bully (correcting) had a stronger effect on students' perceptions than a response directed to the victim only (comforting). Students evaluated correcting the bully as more appropriate and

perceived to a stronger degree that the teacher was opposed to bullying. The multiple response was judged to be more appropriate than the single responses.

### ***Strengths, Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research***

A major strength of this vignette study is its experimental design, allowing to manipulate teacher responses and investigate differences between responses regarding students' attitudes and perceptions. However, the study also had some limitations generating ideas for future research.

First, each vignette described one out of four teacher responses to one incident. In reality, it is important that teachers flexibly respond to bullying with a variety of strategies (Burger et al., 2015). Also, it is important that the findings are not generalized to responses that are, for instance, focused on the same target but different in form (e.g., working with the victim). Future studies could focus on other responses (e.g., involving others), investigate responses in a more differentiated way (e.g., different responses targeting the bully), or describe one teacher responding to multiple incidents.

Second, this study assessed students' *hypothetical* attitudes and perceptions. It is unclear whether students perceive actual bullying similarly. However, the vignettes allowed us to let students consider varied preselected teacher responses when doing so in actuality is neither possible nor ethical. Future studies should include credibility and reality checks. If students consider the incident and responses as credible and realistic, their attitudes and perceptions are more likely to reflect real life attitudes and perceptions.

Third, although participants were almost equally distributed over conditions, within classes, some conditions were slightly over- and underrepresented. As a result, class-related effects were possible (e.g., influence of actual teachers). Further, students' answers may be influenced by individual factors, such as personal definitions of bullying, own bullying experiences and their ability to imagine. Although these possible influences were minimized

by randomly assigning students to conditions, it would have been stronger to include individual factors as moderators.

Fourth, future studies may focus on constructs that are more closely related to teacher responses, such as students' ideas of the effectiveness of the response and willingness to report bullying to this teacher.

Lastly, this study used single items to measure students' perceptions. To enhance validity, future studies are recommended to use multiple-item measures.

### ***Practical Implications***

Based on the findings, teachers are encouraged to be aware that students can observe and evaluate their responses to bullying and also deduce beliefs regarding teachers' bullying attitudes from these responses. When teachers do not respond, students can get the impression that the teacher does not care about the bullying. This, in turn, might predict more bullying (Saarento et al., 2015), but also more negative outcomes for victims. For instance, victims might be more reluctant to seek help from teachers whom they perceive to have less negative bullying attitudes (Blomqvist et al., 2020). Contrarily, when teachers actively respond and especially when they use responses in which bullies are corrected, students can perceive stronger anti-bullying attitudes from teachers. This, in turn, has been shown to be related with less bullying (Saarento et al., 2015).



**Acknowledgments:** This work was supported by the Research Foundation Flanders (G071317N). The authors thank the participants of the study.

**Disclosure of interest:** The authors report no conflict of interest.

## References

- Arseneault, L. (2018). Annual research review: The persistent and pervasive impact of being bullied in childhood and adolescence: implications for policy and practice. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 59, 405-421. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jcpp.12841>
- Baldry, A. C. (2004). 'What about bullying?' An experimental field study to understand students' attitudes towards bullying and victimisation in Italian middle schools. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74, 583-598. <https://doi.org/10.1348/0007099042376391>
- Bandura, A. (1977). *Social learning theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: a social cognitive theory*. Prentice Hall.
- Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 98, 219-231. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.219>
- Blomqvist, K., Saarento-Zaprudin, S., & Salmivalli, C. (2020). Telling adults about one's plight as a victim of bullying: Student- and context-related factors predicting disclosure. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 61, 151-159. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sjop.12521>
- Brendgen, M., & Troop-Gordon, W. (2015). School-related factors in the development of bullying perpetration and victimization: Introduction to the special section. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 43, 1-4. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-014-9939-9>
- Burger, C., Strohmeier, D., Spröber, N., Bauman, S., & Rigby, K. (2015). How teachers respond to school bullying: An examination of self-reported intervention strategy use,

- moderator effects, and concurrent use of multiple strategies. *Teaching and Teacher Education*, 51, 191-202. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tate.2015.07.004>
- Campaert, K., Nocentini, A., & Menesini, E. (2017). The efficacy of teachers' responses to incidents of bullying and victimization: The mediational role of moral disengagement for bullying. *Aggressive Behavior*, 43, 483-492. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.21706>
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Erlbaum.
- Field, A. (2017). *Discovering statistics using IBM SPSS statistics* (Fourth edition ed.). Sage.
- Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Little, T. D., Poskiparta, E., Kaljonen, A., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). A large-scale evaluation of the KiVa antibullying program: Grades 4-6. *Child Development*, 82, 311-330. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/29782833>
- Kirk, R. E. (1996). Practical significance: A concept whose time has come. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 56, 746-759.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0013164496056005002>
- Kline, R. B. (2005). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (Second ed.). The Guilford Press.
- Laupa, M., & Turiel, E. (1986). Children's conceptions of adult and peer authority. *Child Development*, 57, 405-412. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8624.1986.tb00040.x>
- Lindenberg, S. (2013). Social rationality, self-regulation, and well-being: The regulatory significance of needs, goals, and the self. In R. Wittek, T. A. B. Snijders, & V. Nee (Eds.), *The handbook of rational choice social research* (pp. 72-112). Stanford University Press.
- Menesini, E. (2019). Translating knowledge into interventions: An 'individual by context' approach to bullying. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 1-23.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/17405629.2018.1564273>
- Muthén, L. K., & Muthén, B. O. (1998-2017). *Mplus User's Guide*. (Vol. Eighth Edition).

National Academies of Sciences, E., & Medicine. (2016). *Preventing bullying through science, policy, and practice*. National Academies Press.

<https://doi.org/10.17226/23482>

Nickerson, A. B., Aloe, A. M., & Werth, J. M. (2015). The relation of empathy and defending in bullying: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Review*, 44, 372-390.

<https://doi.org/10.17105/spr-15-0035.1>

Nocentini, A., & Menesini, E. (2016). KiVa anti-bullying program in Italy: Evidence of effectiveness in a randomized control trial. *Prevention Science*, 17, 1012-1023.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11121-016-0690-z>

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd.

Peugh, J. L. (2010). A practical guide to multilevel modeling. *Journal of School Psychology*, 48, 85-112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2009.09.002>

Saarento, S., Boulton, A. J., & Salmivalli, C. (2015). Reducing bullying and victimization: Student- and classroom-level mechanisms of change. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 43, 61-76. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10802-013-9841-x>

Saarento, S., Kärnä, A., Hodges, E. V. E., & Salmivalli, C. (2013). Student-, classroom-, and school-level risk factors for victimization. *Journal of School Psychology*, 51, 421-434. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2013.02.002>

Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15, 112-120. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007>

Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviour in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28, 246-258. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01650250344000488>

- Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child & Adolescent Psychology*, 40, 668-676.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/15374416.2011.597090>
- Sijtsema, J. J., Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Empirical test of bullies' status goals: Assessing direct goals, aggression, and prestige. *Aggressive Behavior*, 35, 57-67. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20282>
- Smetana, J. G. (2010). *Adolescents, families, and social development: How teens construct their worlds*. John Wiley & Sons.
- Thornberg, R., Pozzoli, T., Gini, G., & Hong, J. S. (2017). Bullying and repeated conventional transgressions in Swedish schools: How do gender and bullying roles affect students' conceptions? *Psychology in the schools*, 54, 1189-1201.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.22054>
- Turiel, E. (1983). *The development of social knowledge: Morality and convention*. Cambridge University Press.
- UNESCO. (2019). *Behind the numbers: Ending school violence and bullying*. Author.
- Van der Zanden, P. J., Denessen, E. J., & Scholte, R. H. (2015). The effects of general interpersonal and bullying-specific teacher behaviors on pupils' bullying behaviors at school. *School Psychology International*, 36, 467-481.  
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034315592754>
- Veenstra, R., Huitsing, G., Oldenburg, B., Van der Ploeg, R., Rambaran, J. A., Lodder, G. M. A., & Berends, S. M. T. (2020). *The KiVa anti-bullying program in the Netherlands: Waves 1-5. DataverseNL*, VI, <https://hdl.handle.net/10411/0UVNDN>.
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Huitsing, G., Sainio, M., & Salmivalli, C. (2014). The role of teachers in bullying: The relation between antibullying attitudes, efficacy, and efforts

to reduce bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 106, 1135-1143.

<https://doi.org/10.1037/a0036110>

Weston, D. R., & Turiel, E. (1980). Act-rule relations: Children's concepts of social rules.

*Developmental Psychology*, 16, 417-424. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.16.5.417>

Yoon, J. S., & Bauman, S. (2014). Teachers: A critical but overlooked component of bullying prevention and intervention. *Theory Into Practice*, 53, 308-314.

<https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2014.947226>

**Table 1**

*Planned Comparison Hypotheses: Expected Differences in Effects of Teacher Responses on Student Attitudes and Perceptions*

Contrast	Bullying attitudes	Empathy toward victims	Perc. of teacher bullying attitudes	Response evaluation
1. Non-resp. vs. active resp. (1 vs. 2, 3, 4)	↓	↓	↓	↓
2. Comfort victim vs. correct bully (2 vs. 3)	↓	↑	↓	↓
3. Comfort victim vs. correct bully (w./w.out comfort victim) (2 vs. 3, 4)	↓	-	↓	↓
4. Correct bully vs. comfort victim (w./w.out correct bully) (3 vs. 2, 4)	-	↓	-	-
5. Single vs. multiple resp. (2, 3 vs. 4)	-	-	-	↓
Total number of excluded participants	43	40	43	56

*Note.* Perc. = Perception, resp. = response, 1 = non-response, 2 = comforting victim, 3 = correcting bully, 4 = comforting victim + correcting bully.

**Table 2***Descriptive Statistics of Dependent Variables Over and Within Conditions*

Condition	Total		Non-response		Comfort victim		Correct bully		Comfort victim + correct bully	
Variable	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>N</i>	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>N</i> ( <i>Out.</i> )	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )	<i>N</i> ( <i>Out.</i> )	<i>M</i> ( <i>SD</i> )
1. Bullying attitudes	208	4.62 (.37)	53	4.58 (.40)	48	4.70 (.32)	56	4.60 (.42)	51 (1)	4.61 (.32)
2. Empathy toward victims	211	3.11 (.57)	53	3.24 (.54)	57	3.12 (.59)	50	3.07 (.55)	51	3.01 (.57)
3. Perc. of teacher bullying attitudes	208	4.12 (1.23)	53	2.57 (.99)	48	4.33 (.91)	56 (1)	4.80 (.65)	51 (1)	4.80 (.66)
4. Response evaluation	194	2.78 (1.18)	53	1.53 (1.10)	48	2.75 (.81)	49 (1)	3.53 (.71)	44	3.48 (.63)

*Note.* Perc. = Perception, *Out.* = number of outliers.