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Developmental model of bullying, sexual harassment & dating violence
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**THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK**

- Bullying can be broadly construed as social interactions (or social dynamic) that are influenced, maintained or mitigated by relationships in the *school, peer, and familial contexts* (Pepler et al., 2006; Espelage, 2016).

- **Social interactional learning model** - family violence serves as an important context for understanding the relation between bullying perpetration and involvement in anger, alcohol use, and delinquency as predictors of sexual harassment perpetration and teen dating violence (Espelage et al. 2014; Rinehart, Espelage, & Bub, 2017).

- **Gendered harassment** (sexual harassment, homophobic name-calling) - reinforces traditional masculinity that is emotionally restrictive, competitive, and aggressive (Levant, 1996; Pleck, 1995; Meyer, 2008).
Definition of Bullying
(CDC; Gladden et al., 2014)

Bullying is unwanted aggressive behavior(s) among school-age children that has a high likelihood of causing physical or psychological harm or injury and is characterized by:

1) an imbalance of **real or perceived power** that favors the aggressor(s);

2) is **repeated** or has a **high likelihood** of being repeated;

3) The victim(s) of bullying may feel **intimidated, demeaned**, or humiliated as a result of the aggression.
Homophobic Name-Calling

- **Homophobic name-calling**: a form of gender-based harassment, consisting of pejorative labels or denigrating phrases aimed at youth perceived to be sexual or gender minorities (Meyer 2008).

- Large percentage of bullying among students involves the use of homophobic teasing and slurs, called homophobic teasing or victimization (Espelage et al., 2012; Poteat & Espelage, 2005; Poteat & Rivers, 2010).

- The pervasiveness of anti-gay language in schools suggests that most school environments are hostile for LGBT students and create negative environments for their heterosexual peers as well (Espelage, 2016; Espelage & Poteat, 2012).
Sexual Harassment/Violence

• Sexual Harassment: “Unwelcome conduct of a sexual nature that may include unwelcome sexual advances, requests for sexual favors, and other verbal, nonverbal, or physical conduct of a sexual nature” (Title IX, 2011).

• Sexual Violence (SV) is any act of a sexual nature that is accomplished toward another without his/her consent. Sexual Violence is prevalent in the adolescent age group (CDC, 2012).
Longitudinal Study Participants

- Longitudinal data drawn from 4 Midwestern middle schools and 6 high schools from spring 2008 to spring 2013
  - Waves 0-3 (middle school) and waves 4 and 5 (high school) used in analysis
  - $n = 3,549$; $M$ age = 12.8 years
    - 32.2% white, 46.2% black, 5.4% Hispanic, and 10.2% other; 50.2% female
- Parent and student assent collected
- Teams of researchers administered self-report surveys
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Percentages of Youth who Bully

**Males**
- 12% Bully
- 88% Not Bully

**Females**
- 12% Bully
- 88% Not Bully
Percentages of Youth Who Engage in Homophobic Name-Calling

**Males**
- No Homophobic Teasing: 34%
- Homophobic Teaser: 66%

**Females**
- No Homophobic Teasing: 20%
- Homophobic Teaser: 80%
Bullying – Homophobic Teasing Perpetration

Model Fit:
RMSEA = .051 (.044 | .058)
NNFI/TLI = .964, CFI = .968

**Figure 1.** Standardized parameter estimates from the panel model of the relations among bullying and homophobic teasing.

(Espelage et al., 2016; Little, 2013)
Bully-Sexual Violence Pathway
(Middle School)

- Bullying Perpetration Wave 0
- Homophobic Teasing Perpetration Wave 0
- Sexual Harassment Perpetration Wave 0

Controlling for:
- Sexual Harassment Perpetration Wave 0

(Espelage, Basile, & Hamburger, 2012; Espelage, Basile, & De La Rue, 2015)
Take-Away Messages

• Strong longitudinal associations among bullying, homophobic name-calling, and sexual harassment perpetration across the middle school years.
• Homophobic name-calling moderated bully-sexual violence association, only for boys.
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BULLY-SEXUAL VIOLENCE PATHWAY
(HIGH SCHOOL)

This study intended to replicate and extend Espelage et al. (2015) with the addition of two hypotheses:

1. Early middle school homophobic name-calling perpetration (grades 5–7) would moderate the association between early middle school bullying perpetration (grades 5–7) and high school sexual violence perpetration (grades 9–11), only among males.

2. Both homophobic name-calling victimization and perpetration in later middle school (grades 7–8) would mediate the relationship between early bullying perpetration (grades 5–7) and sexual violence perpetration in high school (grades 9–11).

3. Homophobic perpetration and victimization would be significant mediators between bullying perpetration and sexual violence perpetration for males but not females.
MODERATION EFFECT - MALES
MULTI-MEDIATION EFFECT

- Bullying Perpetration
  - Homophobic Perpetration: $B = 0.41 (0.03)$
  - Sexual Violence Perpetration: $B = 1.9 (0.16)$, AOR = 6.73
- Homophobic Victimization
  - Bullying Perpetration: $B = 0.13 (0.01)$
  - Sexual Violence Perpetration: $B = -0.67 (0.18)$, AOR = 0.51

- OR = 3.31


1. Findings suggest that male and female students who perpetrated bullying or homophobic name-calling in early middle school had higher odds of perpetrating sexual violence in high school, but that homophobic name-calling perpetration only moderated the bully-sexual violence perpetration pathway for males.

2. Male and female students who perpetrated bullying or homophobic name-calling in middle school had higher odds of perpetrating sexual violence in high school.

3. Both late middle school homophobic name-calling perpetration and victimization mediated the relationship between early middle school bullying and sexual violence perpetration in high school but victimization actually slightly reduced the odds of sexual violence perpetration.

4. These findings suggest that prevention of sexual violence perpetration among high school students should begin to address bullying and homophobic name-calling during the middle school years.
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2. Social dominance – Linked to bullying & sexual harassment (McMaster et al., 2002; Pellegrini, 2001; Volk, Camilleri, Dane, & Marini, 2012)

3. Dismissive attitudes toward sexual harassment – Associated with greater sexual violence perp and victimization (Charmaraman, Jones, Stein, & Espelage, 2013; Rogers et al., 2017)
DISCUSSION

• The findings of this study suggest the importance of a multicomponent approach to prevention of adolescent sexual violence.

• Prevention programs should include content on bullying and homophobic name-calling, but also the harmful norms and attitudes regarding masculinity and victim-blaming.

• A comprehensive approach that addresses the climate that may give potential perpetrators the license to perpetrate is important and may diffuse risk for sexual violence perpetration later in high school and emerging adulthood.

• Another important piece of prevention programming suggested by this research is counteracting perceptions of gender non-conformity (Messerschmidt, 2000; Meyer, 2008).
Social-Ecological Perspective

(Bronfenbrenner, 1979; Espelage & Horne, 2007; Espelage, 2014)
Individual Correlates of Bullying Involvement

- Depression/Anxiety
- Empathy
- Delinquency
- Impulsivity
- Other forms of Aggression
- Alcohol/Drug Use
- Positive Attitudes toward Violence/Bullying
- Low Value for Prosocial Behaviors
  - For review (Espelage & Horne, 2007; Espelage & Holt, 2012)
Family & School Risk Factors

- FAMILY
  - Lack of supervision
  - Lack of attachment
  - Negative, critical relationships
  - Lack of discipline/consequences
  - Support for violence
  - Modeling of violence

- SCHOOL
  - Lack of supervision
  - Lack of attachment
  - Negative, critical relationships
  - Lack of discipline/consequences
  - Support for violence
  - Modeling of violence

For review (Espelage, 2012; Espelage & Horne, 2007)
Social Network Studies: Peers Matter

*Homophily hypothesis* supported in social network studies – early adolescence:

- Bully perpetration – selection & socialization (Espelage et al. 2003; Merrin et al., in press)
- Homophobic name-naming/Sexual harassment – selection & socialization (Poteat, Espelage, & Green, 2007; Tucker et al., 2016)
- Willingness to Intervene – socialization (Espelage, Green, & Polanin, 2012)
Family X School Interactions
(Merrin, Espelage, & Hong, 2016)

Figure 1. Interaction among between-person dysfunctional family and between-person risky school. High = +1 SD, M = average, low = −1 SD. Simple slopes: High: $\beta = .18$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$; $M$: $\beta = .11$, $SE = .01$, $p < .001$; and low: $\beta = .03$, $SE = .01$, $p < .003$. 
Meta-Analytic Study

Cook, Williams, Guerra, Kim, & Sadek (2010)

- Reviewed 153 studies since 1970
- Youth who bully other students: have significant externalizing behavior, social competence and academic challenges, negative attitudes toward others, family characterized by conflict
- Peer Status & Bully varied by age: Adolescents who bully have higher peer status than children who bully others
Bystander Interventions
(Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2011)

• Meta-analysis synthesized the effectiveness of bullying prevention programs in altering bystander behavior to intervene in bullying situations.
• Evidence from twelve school-based interventions, involving 12,874 students, revealed that overall the programs were successful (ES = .21, C.I.: .12, .30), with larger effects for high school samples compared to K-8 student samples (HS ES = .44, K-8 ES = .13; p = .001).
• Analysis of empathy for the victim revealed treatment effectiveness that was positive but not significantly different from zero (ES = .05, C.I.: -.07, .17).
• Nevertheless, this meta-analysis indicated that programs were effective at changing bystander behavior both on a practical and statistically significant level.
# Bystander Interventions
(Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2011)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (DoP)</th>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>N (% male)</th>
<th>Grade range</th>
<th>Intervention Program</th>
<th>Intervention Type &amp; Duration (in months)</th>
<th>Research Design</th>
<th>Intervention E.S.</th>
<th>Empathy E.S.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andreou, Didaskalou, &amp; Vlachou (2008)</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>418 (60)</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Curriculum-Based Anti-Bullying</td>
<td>Group; 1</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental; one treatment and one control</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evers, Prochaska, Van Marter, Johnson, &amp; Prochaska (2007)</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Multiple US states</td>
<td>710 (41)</td>
<td>9&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-12&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Build Respect</td>
<td>Indiv.; 2</td>
<td>Quasi-experimental matched; two treatment only one control</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fonagy et al. (2009)</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>578 (46)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;-5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>CAPSLE</td>
<td>Group; 24</td>
<td>Experimental; matched school; two treatment and one control</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frey et al. (2005)</td>
<td>Journal</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>913 (51)</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;-6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Steps to Respect</td>
<td>Group; 12</td>
<td>Experimental; matched schools; one treatment and one control</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karna, Voeten, &amp; Little (2010)</td>
<td>Article</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>8166 (50)</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;-6&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>KiVa</td>
<td>Group, 9</td>
<td>Experimental; one treatment and one control</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rethinking Bystander Interventions

• Need to consider the following when considering a bystander intervention:
  • Age of target population
  • Gender of target population
  • Peer/adult norms around intervention: Including In-group and out-group norms, justification for bullying
  • Level of bullying and peer victimization experiences in the school
  • Length of intervention & who to deliver
  • Components of intervention (behavioral modification, modeling with media, awareness raising, parent training)
Developmental Lens

Meta-Analysis:
Yeager, Fong, Lee, & Espelage (2015)
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Program outcomes have shown:

- Increase in connectedness to adults
- Increase in school engagement
- Increase in likelihood to refer a suicidal friend to an adult
- Increase in positive perceptions of adult support
- Increased acceptability of seeking help
- Largest increases amongst students with a history of suicidal ideation

Sources of Strength Evaluation: SV Outcomes

[(CDC Grant #1 U01 CE002841 - Espelage (PI)]

$N = 4600$
Sources of Strength Evaluation: Sexual Violence Perpetration

[(CDC Grant #1 U01 CE002841 - Espelage (PI)]

TREATMENT

SH Help Attitudes W1

0.38*** (.02)

SH Help Attitudes W2

R² = .149

-0.034* (.015)
0.034* (.016)

SH Help Intentions W2

R² = .168

0.41*** (.02)

Sexual Violence Perpetration W2

R² = .132

0.32*** (.06)

Sexual Violence Perpetration W1

N = 4600
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Social-Emotional Learning (SEL)

• SEL focuses on the systematic development of a core set of social and emotional skills that help youth more effectively handle life challenges, make better decisions, and thrive in both their learning and their social environments.

• A meta-analysis of 213 programs found that if a school implements a quality SEL curriculum, they can expect better student behavior and an 11 percentile increase in test scores (Durlak et al., 2011).

• 2017 meta-analytic review of 82 different interventions involving more than 97,000 students from K-12: Participants fared significantly better than controls in social-emotional skills, attitudes, and indicators of well-being.
Social-Emotional Learning

- **Self-awareness:** Ability to *accurately* recognize one’s own emotions/thoughts and how their emotions/thoughts influence their behavior.

- **Social awareness:** Ability for *perspective taking* and *empathy* with others of diverse cultures and backgrounds in one’s own family, school, and community.

- **Self-management:** Ability to *regulate* one’s own emotions, thoughts, and behaviors *effectively* in different situations.

- **Relationship skills:** Ability to *establish* and *maintain* healthy and rewarding relationships with diverse individuals and groups.

- **Responsible decision-making:** Ability to make *constructive* and *respectful* choices about personal behavior and social interactions.

- The core five social emotional learning competencies as identified by the **Collaborative for Academic, Social, and Emotional Learning** (CASEL, 2013). See: http://www.casel.org
Program Goals

• Research Foundations
  • Risk and Protective Factors
  • Bullying
  • Brain Research
  • Positive Approaches to Problem Behavior
  • Developmental Needs of Young Adolescents
Grade Levels & Lessons

50 minutes to teach a complete lesson
Each lesson is divided into two parts that can be taught separately

Grade 6
Stepping Up
Handling new responsibilities
15 lessons

Grade 7
Stepping In
Decision making, staying in control
13 lessons

Grade 8
Stepping Ahead
Leadership, goal setting
13 lessons
Major Study Objective

To rigorously evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Second Step: Student Success Through Prevention program on impacting bullying behavior, peer victimization, homophobic name-calling and sexual harassment/violence among a large sample of 6th graders in a nested cohort longitudinal design.
## Study Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intervention Schools</th>
<th>6th Graders</th>
<th>7th Graders</th>
<th>8th Graders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>O₁ X₁</td>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>O₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>X₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comparison Schools

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6th Graders</th>
<th>7th Graders</th>
<th>8th Graders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>O₁</td>
<td>O₂</td>
<td>O₃</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>O₄</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
<th>Fall</th>
<th>Spring</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>O</strong></td>
<td><strong>Year 1</strong></td>
<td>(2010-11)</td>
<td><strong>Year 2</strong></td>
<td>(2011-12)</td>
<td><strong>Year 3</strong></td>
<td>(2012-13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>X</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**O = Assessment**

**X = Intervention**
Results – Middle School

- Reductions in physical aggression, bullying, cyberbullying, homophobic name-calling, & sexual harassment across three-year middle school study (Espelage et al., 2014, 2015, 2016).
- Greater reductions when teachers implemented with fidelity & engaged with program as they would academics (Polanin & Espelage, 2015).
Individuals in the treatment group reported significantly higher levels of growth in school belonging from T1 – T4, growth in school belonging was in turn associated with reductions in growth in sexual harassment victimization and homophobic name-calling (Espelage et al., under review).
Teacher/Staff Perceptions of School Culture: Links to Student Reports of Bullying, Victimization, Aggression, & Willingness to Intervene
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Joshua Polanin, Ph.D.
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School Culture Matters

“school policies, attitudes and behaviors of teachers, administrators and the student body, and the overall atmosphere or school ethos, determine the internal life or social, emotional, and motivation climate of the school.” (Kasen et al., 2004).
School Environment Scale

Six scales emerged from factor analyses, measuring teacher/staff PERCEPTIONS OF:

- Student intervention (5 items; $\alpha = .83$)
- Staff intervention (5 items; $\alpha = .89$)
- Aggression being a problem (5 items; $\alpha = .80$)
- School is doing professional development/administrator support (8 items; $\alpha = .90$)
- Positive school climate overall (7 items; $\alpha = .85$)
- Gender Equity/Intolerance of Sexual Harassment (7 items; $\alpha = .79$)
## Final Multi-level Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Bullying Perpetration</th>
<th>Peer Victimization</th>
<th>Physical Aggression</th>
<th>Willingness to Intervene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \beta ) (SE)</td>
<td>( B )</td>
<td>( \beta ) (SE)</td>
<td>( B )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intercept</strong></td>
<td>.39 (.03)**</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.96 (.04)**</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Individual</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.03 (.02)</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.05 (.03)</td>
<td>-.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mother’s Education</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01 (.03)</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>.17 (.02)**</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.11 (.05)**</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>-.17 (.02)**</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>-.23 (.05)**</td>
<td>-.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>-.22 (.04)**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.13 (.07)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bi-racial</td>
<td>.11 (.03)**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01 (.08)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>School-level</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student Intervention</td>
<td>.15 (.14)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03 (.18)</td>
<td>-.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Intervention</td>
<td>.15 (.10)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.30 (.22)</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggression Problem</td>
<td>-.07 (.08)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.14 (.12)</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School Commitment to Bully Prevention</td>
<td>-.20 (.06)**</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.42 (.09)**</td>
<td>-.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Teacher-Staff-Student Interactions</td>
<td>-.01 (.11)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.14 (.16)</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equity/intolerance of sexual harassment</td>
<td>-23 (.10)*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.71 (.20)**</td>
<td>-.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State</td>
<td>.05 (.05)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.04 (.03)</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free/Reduced Lunch</td>
<td>.01 (.01)</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01 (.01)*</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Female</td>
<td>-.66 (.29)*</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.71 (.32)*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% White</td>
<td>.17 (.11)</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.49 (.15)**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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What about Homophobic Name-calling?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Homophobic Name-calling Perpetration</th>
<th>Homophobic Name-calling Victimization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
<td>β (SE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender equity/intolerance of sexual harassment</td>
<td>-.40 (.11)**</td>
<td>-.36 (.12)**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rhinehart & Espelage, 2015
Next Steps

• NIJ-funded meta-analysis to examine sexual violence outcomes (#2016-CK-BX-0012)

• NIJ-funded meta-analysis of programs to reduce cyberbullying/cybersex (Grant No. 2017–CK–BX–0009)

• NSF – funded study to create Bystander Bot (Grant No. 1720268)

• Bullydown Text-Messaging SEL middle school program (Ybarra, Prescott, & Espelage, 2016)
Conclusions

• Strong support for the Bully-Sexual Violence Pathway (homophobic name-calling mediator & moderator)

• Traditional masculinity and dismissiveness of sexual harassment – moderators

• Peer norms matter - need to target these in programs

• Perceptions of staff matter – intolerance for sexual harassment is critical to reduce gender-based bullying and other forms of aggression.

• Social-emotional learning program – promise for reducing bullying and sexual violence perpetration