

Florida State University Libraries

2019

The Bystander Intervention Model: Teacher Intervention in Traditional and Cyber Bullying

Morgan Eldridge and Lyndsay Jenkins

The version of record can be found at <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42380-019-00033-7>



The Bystander Intervention Model: Teacher Intervention in Traditional and Cyber Bullying

Morgan Eldridge

Lyndsay Jenkins

Abstract

Bullying, both traditional and cyber, have been associated with several negative outcomes for students, but when bystanders, such as peers or teacher, intervene, bullying will often stop. Teachers are especially important adult bystanders because they are more likely than parents to witness or hear about bullying, but previous research has shown that teachers often do not intervene. Applying the Bystander Intervention Model (notice the event, interpret as an emergency, accept responsibility, know what to do, and act) to bullying in schools may help us understand why teachers may or may not intervene. This study examined associations among affective empathy, perceived bullying seriousness, and each step of the Bystander Intervention Model in Bullying for both traditional bullying and cyberbullying among 150 elementary-high school teachers. Results indicate a positive relation between affective empathy and engagement in each step of the Bystander Intervention Model for traditional bullying. Additionally, affective empathy was positively and significantly related to two of the steps (notice the event and take responsibility) for cyberbullying. There was also a positive relation between perceived bullying seriousness for two steps of the model (notice the event and interpret as an emergency) for traditional bullying. Implications for teacher involvement in bullying prevention and intervention are discussed.

Keywords: bullying, traditional bullying, cyberbullying, teachers, school, empathy, perceived seriousness

The Bystander Intervention Model: Teacher Intervention in Traditional and Cyber Bullying

Traditional (e.g., physical, verbal, relational) and cyber (e.g., inflicted through online mediums) bullying is the most prevalent form of violence in schools (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006) and is linked to many negative outcomes for children and adolescents (Hymel & Swearer, 2015; Kowalski & Limber, 2013; Gradinger, Strohmeier, & Spiel, 2009). However, when bystanders intervene to stop bullying, peer victimization and negative outcomes significantly decrease for victims (Espelage, Green, & Polanin, 2011). Peers and adults can both be bystanders that have a positive impact on preventing and intervening in bullying (Twemlow, Fonagy, & Sacco, 2004). Teachers are especially important adult bystanders, because they are more likely to see or hear about bullying occurring at school than parents (Yoon & Bauman, 2014). In fact, one study found that teacher personally witness or are told about the majority of bullying episodes in a school (Newman, Frey, & Jones, 2010). Unfortunately, researchers have found that teachers do not always intervene in bullying (Veenstra, Lindenberg, Huitsing, Sainio, & Salmivalli, 2014). Teachers seem to have a good understanding of the definition of bullying (Migliaccio, 2014), but often underreport the frequency of bullying (Naylor, Cowie, Cossin, Bettencourt, & Lemme, 2006) and do not actively try to stop bullying (Veenstra et al., 2014). Greater empathy for victims and perceived seriousness have been related to greater teacher intervention in bullying behaviors (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Boulton et al., 2014; Yoon, 2004), but in order to thwart bullying to the greatest degree possible, teachers must intervene more frequently. There is, however, very little information about the role of teacher bystanders in cyberbullying.

There are many reasons why teacher may not intervene in bullying, such as lack of knowledge and skills to intervene, assuming someone else will intervene, and personal

characteristics (e.g., lack of empathy; Yoon & Bauman, 2014). Two social psychologists, Latané and Darley (1968), first examined bystander behavior after the brutal murder of a young woman occurred while thirty-eight people watched from their apartments, but did not intervene. They examined inaction of bystanders and introduced the theory of the bystander effect, which suggests that when individuals are one of many bystanders witnessing an emergency, they become less likely to intervene. This may be because responsibility to intervene is distributed across all bystanders, so everyone assumes that someone else will act. In addition, people mimic the behaviors of others in unfamiliar situations, so if others do not act, they are less likely to act. This theory may also explain why many teachers do not intervene in bullying situations (Nickerson, Aloe, Livingston, & Feeley, 2014); thus, the goal of this study was to examine teacher intervention in traditional and cyber bullying and explore whether empathy and perceived bullying seriousness, may increase the likelihood of intervention in events of bullying (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Yoon, 2004).

Bystander Intervention Model

The Bystander Intervention Model (Latané & Darley, 1970) consists of five sequential steps for intervention: Notice an event, Interpret it as an emergency, Take responsibility, Know how to intervene, and Act. There can be barriers to intervention at each step and understanding teacher behavior at each step may help us to understand why some teachers fail to intervene to help victims of bullying. The first step of the model is noticing an event; if an individual does not notice, they will not intervene (Burn, 2009). The second step is to interpret the event as an emergency that warrants an intervention (Latané & Darley, 1968).

The third step is to accept personal responsibility for intervening. Researchers have shown that the more people that are present, the less likely an individual is to take responsibility

and intervene, or diffusion of responsibility (Machackova, Dedkova, & Mezulanikova, 2015; Obermaier, Fawzi, & Koch, 2014). Next, the individual must know what actions to take to intervene, which can be inhibited by the individuals' lack of skills or perceived unpreparedness. Individuals may be less likely to intervene in a situation if they feel they do not possess the necessary skill set to do so effectively (Burn, 2009). The final step is intervention in the situation (Latané & Darley, 1968). The current study examined teacher's engagement in each step of this model for both traditional and cyberbullying and whether certain characteristics (i.e., empathy and perceived bullying seriousness) enhance an individual's use of these five steps.

Empathy and Perceived Seriousness

Many factors contribute to why an individual intervenes actively in events of bullying. Empathetic responsiveness and perceived bullying seriousness are two of these factors. Empathy is a predictor of prosocial helping behavior (Newman, Frey, & Jones, 2010) and appears to be a major contributor to intervening behavior (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006), which makes empathetic individuals more likely to engage in the five steps of the Bystander Intervention Model (Yoon, 2004). Empathy allows teachers to share common feelings and understanding towards victims of bullying, which makes them more likely to attempt to intervene in bullying behavior (Boulton, Hardcastle, Down, Fowles, & Simmonds, 2014). The current study is the first to examine the relation of empathy with each step of the Bystander Intervention Model in Bullying with teachers.

Empathy is not the only factor that impacts teachers' ability and willingness to intervene in bullying (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Boulton et al., 2014; Yoon, 2004). Perceived bullying seriousness may be another characteristic that makes teachers more likely to intervene in bullying. Researchers have shown that perceptions of seriousness predicted teacher involvement

in bullying incidents (Ellis & Shute, 2007), but the association between perceived seriousness and engagement in bystander intervention steps has not been explored. Directly witnessing the event and the type of bullying occurring influences the perceived seriousness and subsequent intervention (Newman et al., 2010). Both empathy and perceived seriousness of bullying may impact an individual to want to help and to successfully intervene in events of bullying (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Boulton et al., 2014; Yoon, 2004).

Current Study

The overall aim of this study was to examine teacher bystander intervention and the extent to which empathy and perceived bullying seriousness predict each step of bystander intervention model (notice, interpret as emergency, accept responsibility, knowledge, and intervene) for both traditional and cyberbullying. In order to examine this potential relationship, three fundamental research questions were posed. The first question was: do teachers intervene more often in traditional bullying or cyberbullying? It was hypothesized that teachers would intervene more often in instances of traditional bullying than cyberbullying because it is more easily noticed (Dooley, Pyzalski, & Cross, 2009), more direct, and perceived as a more dangerous form of bullying (Boulton et al., 2014). Further, research has shown that teachers tend to notice direct forms of bullying more often than indirect forms and perceive them as more dangerous (Migliaccio, 2014), and noticing an event and interpreting it as an emergency are necessary steps for intervention to occur (Latané & Darley, 1970). Teachers may not intervene in cyberbullying as often because they are unaware of it unless students report it to them (Newman et al., 2010).

The second question was: to what extent does each teacher empathy and perceived seriousness predict the likelihood that they engage in the five bystander behaviors in traditional

bullying? Several studies have examined teacher intervention in bullying events and found a positive relationship between these teacher characteristics and intervention in bullying (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Boulton et al., 2014; Yoon, 2004). Specifically, teachers who were more likely to intervene reported greater empathy for victims of bullying (Boulton et al., 2014; Dedousis-Wallace, Shute, Varlow, Murrihy, & Kidman, 2013; Yoon, 2004). Additionally, research has shown that teachers witness events of traditional bullying more often than parents, which is related to perceived seriousness (Newman et al., 2010), and teachers consider traditional bullying to be more serious in nature (Boulton et al., 2014; Ellis & Shute, 2007). This could explain why teachers who think bullying is serious are more likely to intervene in traditional bullying situations (Dedousis-Wallace et al., 2014; Yoon, 2004). It was hypothesized that teachers with greater empathy and perceived bullying seriousness would have a higher likelihood of engaging in the steps of the bystander intervention model.

The final question was: to what extent does each teacher characteristic (empathy and perceived seriousness) predict the likelihood that that individuals engage in the five bystander behaviors in cyberbullying? Although there is little research on how these characteristics affect intervention for cyberbullying specifically, there is some indication that higher levels of empathy and perceived bullying seriousness are related to greater likelihood of intervention in bullying situations (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Boulton et al., 2014; Yoon, 2004). It was hypothesized that teachers with greater empathy and perceived bullying seriousness would have a higher likelihood of engaging in the steps of the bystander intervention model.

Methods

Participants

There were 150 teachers in the study, (113 females and 37 males) and were 94.7% White and 5.3% Other. Participants taught elementary (48.7%), middle (16%), and high (35.3%) school. Of the teacher participants, 84.7% were regular education teachers and 15.3% were special education teachers, and 75.5% had a Master's Degree. The participants taught at suburban (53.3%), rural (25.3%), and urban (21.3%) schools.

Procedures

After obtaining IRB approval, teachers received an email requesting their participation in this study. The email contained a link to the survey, which took approximately ten minutes to complete. Data were collected on teachers' involvement in the bystander intervention steps for each type of bullying (traditional and cyber), empathy ratings, and perceived bullying seriousness ratings using Qualtrics, an online survey program. Teachers provided electronic consent before opening the survey.

Measures

Teacher Intervention in Bullying. For the measurement of teacher intervention in traditional and cyberbullying, an adapted version of the *Bystander Intervention Model in Bullying* (BIMB; Nickerson et al., 2014) was used. Nickerson et al. (2014) developed the survey to assess bystander intervention among high school students; therefore, items were changed to assess teacher bystander behavior in traditional and cyber bullying. More details about these modifications are below. This is a 16-item measure with a 5-point Likert scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. Each item is associated with one of the five bystander behaviors (notice the event, interpret as an emergency, accept responsibility, know how to help, intervene; Latané & Darley, 1970). For instance, "I am aware that students at my school are

bullied,” (Notice) and “I have the skills to support a student who is being treated disrespectfully” (Know how to Help).

There is evidence of reliability and validity for the original measure, for example, Nickerson et al. (2014) developed the BIMB survey based on the five steps of Latané and Darley’s (1970) bystander intervention model. Using a sample of 562 students (9th-12th grade), the authors conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) and structural equation modeling (SEM) and found evidence of reliability and validity of the measure. Jenkins and Nickerson (2017) adapted this measure for use with middle school students and the CFA and alpha coefficients for their measure was also good.

For the purpose of this study, the *Bystander Intervention in Bullying* measure was adapted for use with teachers. Items were altered to assess teacher’s point of view, e.g., “I would tell a group of my friends to stop using inappropriate language or behaviors if I see or hear them” became “I would tell a group of students to stop using inappropriate language or behaviors if I see or hear them”. Further, all 16 items were changed to assess both traditional bullying (e.g., “It is evident to me that someone who is being traditionally bullied needs help”) and cyberbullying (e.g., “It is evident to me that someone who is being cyberbullied needs help”). With the current sample, internal consistency coefficients for the traditional bullying measure were all above .80 for the subscales, with the exception of step two, interpret a traditional bullying event as an emergency (.60). For the cyberbullying measure, internal consistency coefficients were all above .85. For both scales, the five steps were positively related to one another.

Empathy. The 7-item Empathetic Concern subscale of the *Interpersonal Reactivity Index* (IRI); (Davis, 1980) was used, which measures the ability to share the feelings of others (e.g., “I often have tender, concerned feelings for people less fortunate than me”). The items are rated on

a 5-point Likert scale ranging from “does not describe me well” to “describes me very well” (Davis, 1980). The internal consistency alpha coefficient for the empathetic concern subscale was high (.81).

Using a sample of 1,161 university students, Davis (1980) conducted separate analyses on the data collected from male ($N = 579$) and female ($N = 582$) respondents. Factor analysis provided strong support for the four empathy subscales with all items loading significantly on only one factor, with the exception of item 10 (“I sometimes feel helpless when I am in the middle of a very emotional situation”), which loaded on two factors. This was further supported by Pulos, Elison, and Lennon’s (2004). Davis (1980) reported internal consistency coefficients were high, ranging from .70 to .78. Test-retest reliabilities ranged from .61 to .81, indicating stability in regards to the subscales (Davis, 1980).

Perceived Seriousness. To measure bullying seriousness, an adapted version of the *School Bullying Severity Scale* (SBSS; Chen, Cheng, & Ho, 2013) was used. The SBSS is a 17-item self-report measure in which respondents answer on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from not serious to very serious. Each item is associated with one of the four different types of bullying behaviors: physical (5 items, “Being shoved or tripped”), verbal (4 items, “Being cursed at”), relational (4 items, “Being ostracized”), and cyber (4 items, “Being teased online”). Chen et al. (2013) developed the survey to assess perceived seriousness of bullying occurrences among elementary school students, therefore, the wording was changed in order to assess perceived seriousness of bullying occurrences among teachers for the current study. This was done by altering wording common for students (e.g., “Having humiliating photos posted online”) to wording familiar to teachers (e.g., “A student having humiliating photos of them posted online”).

Internal consistency coefficients for perceived seriousness of traditional and cyberbullying were above .85.

Data Analysis

To answer the first research question (Do teachers intervene more often in traditional bullying or cyberbullying?), a *t*-test for dependent means was conducted to determine whether the average score for traditional bullying intervention differed significantly from the average score for cyberbullying intervention. This analysis was also conducted for each of the five steps of the bystander intervention model (notice, interpret as an emergency, take responsibility, know what to do, intervene) to determine if there were significant differences of teacher engagement at each step of the model for both traditional bullying and cyberbullying. To answer the last two research questions, two sets of regression models (one for traditional and one for cyberbullying) were tested with the outcome variable being each step of the bystander intervention model (notice, interpret as an emergency, take responsibility, know what to do, intervene), for both traditional bullying and cyberbullying. The predictor variables were empathy and perceived bullying seriousness and entered into a single step.

Results

Correlations among study variables, as well as means and standard deviations are presented in Table 1. In order to determine if there were significant differences in the frequency of teacher intervention between traditional bullying and cyberbullying occurrences, a *t*-test for dependent means was conducted with the average score for traditional and cyberbullying intervention, as well as each of the five steps of the bystander intervention model (Notice, Interpret, Responsibility, Know, Act).

The *t*-test for the total score of traditional bullying and cyberbullying indicated that teachers were significantly more likely to intervene in traditional bullying ($M = 67.59$, $SD = 6.19$) than cyberbullying ($M = 58.64$, $SD = 12.55$), $t(120) = -8.07$, $p = <.001$ (one-tailed). At each step of the bystander intervention model (Notice, Interpret, Responsibility, Know, Act), teachers were significantly more likely to engage in instances of traditional bullying than cyberbullying (see Table 2).

In order to determine the extent to which personal characteristics predicted the five bystander behaviors, regression analyses were conducted with each personal characteristic (empathetic concern and perceived seriousness) as predictors, and each step of the bystander intervention model as dependent variables, for both traditional bullying and cyberbullying (see Table 3).

The regression for Notice Traditional Bullying was significant, $F(2, 108) = 10.18$, $p < .001$. Personal characteristics accounted for a significant amount of variance (Adjusted $R^2 = .14$, $p < .001$). Empathetic concern and perceived seriousness of traditional bullying (e.g., physical, verbal, relational) were both significantly and positively related to Notice Traditional Bullying (see Table 3). The regression for Notice Cyberbullying was significant, $F(2, 108)$, $p < .01$. Empathetic concern was significantly and positively related to Notice the Event (see Table 4).

The regression for Interpret Traditional Bullying was significant, $F(2, 108) = 6.24$, $p < .01$. A significant amount of variance was accounted for by personal characteristics (Adjusted $R^2 = .09$, $p < .01$). Empathetic concern and perceived seriousness of traditional bullying were both significantly and positively related to Interpret as Emergency (see Table 3). There were no significant predictors for cyberbullying.

The regression for Accept Responsibility for Traditional Bullying was significant, $F(2, 108) = 8.70, p < .001$. A significant amount of variance was accounted for by personal characteristics (Adjusted $R^2 = .12, p < .001$). Empathetic concern was significantly and positively related to Accept Responsibility (see Table 3). The regression for Accept Responsibility for Cyberbullying was significant, $F(2, 108), p < .05$. Empathetic concern was significantly and positively related to Accept Responsibility (see Table 4).

The regression for Know What to Do for Traditional Bullying was significant, $F(2, 108) = 6.10, p < .01$. Personal characteristics accounted for a significant amount of variance (Adjusted $R^2 = .09, p < .01$). Empathetic concern was significantly and positively related to Know What to Do (see Table 3). There were no significant predictors for cyberbullying.

The regression for Act on Traditional Bullying was significant, $F(2, 108) = 7.79, p < .001$. Personal characteristics accounted for a significant amount of variance (Adjusted $R^2 = .11, p < .001$). Empathetic concern was significantly and positively related to Act (see Table 3). There were no significant predictors for cyberbullying.

Discussion

The current study found that teachers intervene in traditional bullying more frequently than cyberbullying, as well as at each step of the Bystander Intervention Model. In general, teachers reported intervening more often in traditional bullying, which is likely due to traditional forms of bullying being better researched and understood by teachers (Dooley et al., 2009). Additionally, traditional forms of bullying, specifically physical forms, are more overt than cyberbullying, causing them to be more openly witnessed or noticed (Newman et al., 2010). Additionally, teachers are better at noticing direct forms of bullying rather than indirect (Migliaccio, 2014). Noticing an event of bullying is the first sequential step to intervening in

bullying behavior, therefore, the intervention rate for traditional bullying is likely higher due to its overt nature. Further, over half of the teacher participants in this study taught grades kindergarten through sixth, where the use of technology is likely less, lessening the likelihood that teachers have concerns about cyberbullying existing in their school and subsequently less opportunities to intervene in events of cyberbullying.

Affective empathy had multiple significant relationships. First, affective empathy was positively related to noticing both traditional bullying and cyberbullying. Teachers with higher affective empathy were more likely to recognize bullying when it was occurring than those individuals who had lower affective empathy. Affective empathy allows individuals to automatically respond to another's emotions because of shared feelings (Caravita, Di Blasio, & Salmivalli, 2009; Nickerson, Mele, & Princiotta, 2008). An individual who has high affective empathy likely automatically recognizes negative situations for others, making the identification of bullying events easier and more frequent. The current study's results are consistent with previous research that showed that teachers with greater empathy were more likely to intervene in events of bullying, as noticing bullying is the first step in the sequential process of total intervention (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Boulton et al., 2014; Yoon, 2004).

Consistent with the current study's hypothesis, affective empathy was also positively related to interpreting the event as an emergency. Teachers with higher affective empathy were more likely to see a traditional bullying event as an emergency than those individuals who had lower affective empathy. Affective empathy involves sharing another individual's feelings and experiencing their emotions vicariously (Caravita et al., 2009; Nickerson et al., 2008). When an individual with high affective empathy witnesses an event of bullying, they likely share the negative feelings that the victim experiences. Therefore, individuals with higher affective

empathy might be more likely to interpret events of traditional bullying as an emergency because they are taking the victim's perspective. There was not a significant association between affective empathy and interpreting cyberbullying as an emergency, indicating that higher levels of affective empathy was not related perceiving cyberbullying as an event needing intervention. Previous research suggests that witnessing bullying increases the likelihood of intervention by teachers (Newman et al., 2010); therefore, the covert nature of cyberbullying makes it difficult for teachers to witness and subsequently interpret as an emergency (Newman et al., 2010).

Affective empathy was positively related to accepting personal responsibility for assisting. Teachers with greater affective empathy reported a higher likelihood of accepting responsibility for intervening in events of both traditional bullying and cyberbullying. Affective empathy is related to the ability to perceive other's emotions and distress (Caravita et al., 2009; Nickerson et al., 2008). This suggests that teachers with high affective empathy may share victim's feelings of distress, which would likely increase their feelings of responsibility to intervene in order to alleviate that distress.

Further, affective empathy was positively related to knowing what to do when a traditional bullying event occurs. Teachers with greater affective empathy were more likely to know what to do when traditional bullying occurred. Teachers with greater empathy likely understand that they are an intervention source for bullying and may make the effort to have knowledge on intervention strategies for bullying. There was no significant interaction between affective empathy and knowing what to do when a cyberbullying event occurs. Cyberbullying being less widely understood, therefore, teachers have less knowledge, understanding, and training around what to do if they encounter an event of cyberbullying (Dooley et al., 2009).

Lastly, as predicted, affective empathy was positively related to acting or intervening in an event of traditional bullying. Teachers with higher affective empathy were more likely to intervene in traditional bullying situations. Empathy guides defending or intervening behaviors (Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007), specifically, affective empathy, or sharing the individual's feelings, is highly related to intervention (Pölyhönen, Juvonen, & Salmivalli, 2010). This is consistent with previous research that suggests that teachers with high affective empathy are more likely to intervene in events of bullying (Bauman & Del Rio, 2006; Boulton et al., 2014; Yoon, 2004). There was not a significant relation between affective empathy and intervening in cyberbullying, which may be because teachers receive less training in how to intervene in cyberbullying (Dooley et al., 2009).

Perceived bullying seriousness was only positively related to two of the bystander behaviors (notice the event and interpret as an emergency) for traditional bullying. Teachers who felt that traditional bullying was more serious were more likely to notice the bullying and subsequently interpret it as an emergency. Traditional forms of bullying are more likely to be witnessed and historically perceived more seriously by teachers (Veenstra et al., 2014), which explains why teachers whom perceived bullying as more serious were more likely to engage in intervention for traditional bullying. This is consistent with previous research that suggested that the seriousness of a bullying event to be influences whether or not they engage in intervention efforts (Ellis & Shute, 2007; Yoon & Kerber, 2003; Yoon, 2004). There was no significant relation between seriousness of cyberbullying and intervention. This is likely due to cyberbullying being a covert or indirect form of bullying, which is reportedly perceived as being less serious (Veenstra et al., 2014). Additionally, it could be due to cyberbullying being a relatively new construct that is not as widely researched or understood (Dooley et al., 2009);

therefore, teachers do not yet understand the seriousness of negative outcomes for victims associated with cyberbullying events.

Limitations

There are limitations of the current study that should be noted and addressed in future research. Although participants were from various geographical locations, almost all of the participants were Caucasian; therefore, including ethnic and racial diversity in future research is important. Further, all data were collected through self-report, which relies on individual's perceptions and is subject to social desirability. Additionally, while the characteristics in the current study accounted for a significant amount of variance, there was variance left unaccounted. That suggests that other variables are contributing to the variance as well, such as self-efficacy, and should be examined in the future. For example, one study found that teachers with greater self-efficacy are more likely to intervene in bullying than those with low self-efficacy (Yoon, 2004). Finally, over half of the participants taught kindergarten through sixth, where technology may be less commonly accessed or utilized. This creates a limitation when examining teacher bystander behavior of cyberbullying.

Conclusions and Implications

Overall, teachers were more likely to intervene in traditional bullying than cyberbullying in general, as well as at each step of the Bystander Intervention Model. Further, empathy and perceived bullying seriousness accounted for a significant amount of variance for each of the five bystander behaviors (notice, interpret as emergency, take responsibility, know what to do, act). Affective empathy was positively related to each of the five bystander behaviors for traditional bullying and seemed to be key to predicting bystander behaviors in teachers. Affective empathy was also positively related to noticing and taking responsibility to assist in events of

cyberbullying. Further, perceived bullying seriousness was positively related to noticing traditional bullying and interpreting it as an immediate emergency. Based on these data, it would make sense to directly teach aspects of affective empathy to teachers, such as training them to recognize signs of distress in others, and what to do in these situations. Additionally, it would be advantageous to determine the specific steps of the Bystander Intervention Model that teachers are not engaging in and provide explicit teaching of strategies necessary to complete each step and lead to ultimate successful interventions of bullying. For example, if a teacher is not aware of what traditional bullying and cyberbullying look like, they would be explicitly taught, which would increase their likelihood of noticing bullying as it occurs. The explicit teaching of these necessary skills will likely lead to an increase in their proactive bystander behaviors.

References

- Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98*, 219. doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.98.1.219
- Boulton, M. J., Hardcastle, K., Down, J., Fowles, J., & Simmonds, J. A. (2014). A comparison of preservice teachers' responses to cyber versus traditional bullying scenarios similarities and differences and implications for practice. *Journal of Teacher Education, 65*, 145-155. doi.org/10.1177/0022487113511496
- Burn, S. M. (2009). A situational model of sexual assault prevention through bystander intervention. *Sex Roles, 60*, 779–792. doi:10.1007/s11199-008-9581-5
- Caravita, S., Di Blasio, P., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Unique and interactive effects of empathy and social status on involvement in bullying. *Social Development, 18*, 140-163. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00465.x
- Chen, L. M., Cheng, W., & Ho, H. C. (2013). Perceived severity of school bullying in elementary schools based on participants' roles. *Educational Psychology, 35*, 484–496. doi:10.1080/01443410.2013.860220
- Davis, M. H. (1980). A multidimensional approach to individual differences in empathy. *JSAS Catalog of Selected Documents in Psychology, 10*, 85.
- Dedousis-Wallace, A., Shute, R., Varlow, M., Murrihy, R., & Kidman, T. (2013). Predictors of teacher intervention in indirect bullying at school and outcome of a professional development presentation for teachers. *Educational Psychology, 34*, 862–875. doi:10.1080/01443410.2013.785385

- Dooley, J. J., Pyzalski, J., & Cross, D. (2009). Cyberbullying versus face-to-face bullying. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie / Journal of Psychology, 217*, 182–188. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.182
- Ellis, A. A., & Shute, R. (2007). Teacher responses to bullying in relation to moral orientation and seriousness of bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 77*, 649–663. doi:10.1348/000709906x163405
- Espelage, D., Green, H., & Polanin, J. (2011). Willingness to intervene in bullying episodes among middle school students: Individual and peer-group influences. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, 32*, 776–801. doi:10.1177/0272431611423017
- Flaspohler, P. D., Elfstrom, J. L., Vanderzee, K. L., Sink, H. E., & Birchmeier, Z. (2009). Stand by me: The effects of peer and teacher support in mitigating the impact of bullying on quality of life. *Psychology in the Schools, 46*, 636–649. doi:10.1002/pits.20404
- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoè, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending behavior? *Aggressive Behavior, 33*, 467-476. doi: 10.1002/ab.20204
- Gradinger, P., Strohmeier, D., & Spiel, C. (2009). Traditional bullying and cyberbullying. *Zeitschrift Für Psychologie / Journal of Psychology, 217*, 205–213. doi:10.1027/0044-3409.217.4.205
- Hymel, S., & Swearer, S. M. (2015). Four decades of research on school bullying: An introduction. *American Psychologist, 70*, 293–299. doi:10.1037/a0038928
- Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2013). Psychological, physical, and academic

- correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*, S13–S20. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.09.018
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10*, 215-221. doi:10.1037/h0026570
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Machackova, H., Dedkova, L., & Mezulanikova, K. (2015). Brief report: The bystander effect in cyberbullying incidents. *Journal of Adolescence, 43*, 96–99. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2015.05.010
- Migliaccio, T. (2014). Teacher Engagement with bullying: Managing an identity within a school. *Sociological Spectrum, 35*, 84–108. doi:10.1080/02732173.2014.978430
- Naylor, P., Cowie, H., Cossin, F., Bettencourt, R., & Lemme, F. (2006). Teachers' and pupils' definitions of bullying. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 553-576. doi.org/10.1348/000709905x52229
- Newman, J. B., Frey, K. S., & Jones, D. C. (2010). Factors influencing teacher interventions in bullying situations. *Handbook of Youth Prevention Science*. doi:10.4324/9780203866412.ch11
- Nickerson, A. B., Aloe, A. M., Livingston, J. A., & Feeley, T. H. (2014). Measurement of the bystander intervention model for bullying and sexual harassment. *Journal of Adolescence, 37*, 391–400. doi:10.1016/j.adolescence.2014.03.003

- Nickerson, A. B., Mele, D., & Princiotta, D. (2008). Attachment and empathy as predictors of roles as defenders or outsiders in bullying interactions. *Journal of School Psychology, 46*, 687-703. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2008.06.002
- Obermaier, M., Fawzi, N., & Koch, T. (2014). Bystanding or standing by? How the number of bystanders affects the intention to intervene in cyberbullying. *New Media & Society*. doi:10.1177/1461444814563519
- Pölyhönen, V., Juvonen, J., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). What does it take to stand up for the victim of bullying? *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly, 56*, 142-163.
- Pulos, S., Elison, J., & Lennon, R. (2004). The hierarchical structure of the Interpersonal Reactivity Index. *Social Behavior and Personality: an international journal, 32*, 355-359. doi:10.2224/sbp.2004.32.4.355
- Twemlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., & Sacco, F. C. (2004). The role of the bystander in the social architecture of bullying and violence in schools and communities. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1036*, 215–232. doi:10.1196/annals.1330.014
- 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. doi:10.1037/a0036110
- Yoon, J. S. (2004). Predicting teacher interventions in bullying situations. *Education and Treatment of Children*, issue, 37-45.
- Yoon, J., & Bauman, S. (2014). Teachers: A critical but overlooked component of bullying prevention and intervention. *Theory into Practice, 53*, 308-314. doi:10.1080/00405841.2014.947226

Yoon, J., & Kerber, K. (2003). Bullying: Elementary teachers' attitudes and intervention strategies. *Research in Education*, 69, 27-35. doi.org/10.7227/rie.69.3

Table 1. *Descriptive statistics.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>)
1. Serious Traditional	-													57.33 (5.41)
2. Serious Cyber	.74**	-												17.14 (2.71)
3. Empathetic Concern	.31**	.29**	-											22.45 (4.43)
4. Cyber Notice	-.05	-.10	-.29**	-										9.05 (3.09)
5. Cyber Interpret	.08	.02	.13	.10	-									12.45 (3.36)
6. Cyber Responsibility	.12	.09	.22*	-.09	.68**	-								11.17 (3.31)
7. Cyber Know	.01	-.02	.15	-.03	.25**	.54**	-							9.87 (3.18)
8. Cyber Act	.13	.09	.14	.01	.81**	.79**	.41**	-						16.10 (4.67)
9. Traditional Notice	.21	.17	-.25**	.41**	.09	-.08	-.01	.02	-					9.51 (2.62)
10. Traditional Interpret	.26**	.10	.27**	-.08	.18	.22*	.19*	.16	.03	-				13.43 (1.43)
11. Traditional Responsibility	.19	.10	.37**	-.09	.12	.26**	.26**	.16	-.10	.60**	-			13.59 (1.72)
12. Traditional Know	-.03	-.09	.31**	-.13	.13	.26**	.45**	.16	-.05	.29**	.49**	-		11.96 (2.41)
13. Traditional Act	.11	.12	.35**	-.03	.12	.22*	.19*	.23*	-.02	.39**	.66**	.37**	-	18.95 (1.63)

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

Table 2. Means and standard deviations of five step bystander intervention model and results of dependent means test.

	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>p</i>
Total (Traditional)	67.59	6.19	-8.070	120	.000
Total (Cyber)	58.64	12.55			
Notice (Traditional)	9.46	2.63	-1.452	120	.149
Notice (Cyber)	9.05	3.09			
Interpret (Traditional)	13.54	1.36	-3.541	120	.001
Interpret (Cyber)	12.45	3.36			
Accept (Traditional)	13.69	1.70	-8.411	120	.000
Accept (Cyber)	11.17	3.31			
Know (Traditional)	11.91	2.45	-7.448	120	.000
Know (Cyber)	9.87	3.18			
Act (Traditional)	18.98	1.65	-6.920	120	.000
Act (Cyber)	16.10	4.67			

Table 3. Regression results for personal characteristic for five steps of bystander intervention in traditional and cyberbullying.

		B	SE	β	<i>p</i>	β Lower	β Upper	B	SE	β	<i>p</i>	β Lower	β Upper
Traditional Bullying							Cyberbullying						
Notice	EC	-.21	.06	-.36	<.001	-.32	-.10	-.21	.07	-.30	.002	-.34	-.07
	Serious	.16	.05	.32	.001	.07	.25	-.02	.11	-.02	.86	-.23	.20
Interpret	EC	.06	.03	.20	.04	.00	.12	.11	.08	.14	.16	-.05	.26
	Serious	.05	.02	.19	.05	.00	.10	-.03	.13	-.02	.84	-.28	.23
Responsibility	EC	.13	.04	.34	<.001	.06	.21	.17	.08	.22	.03	.02	.32
	Serious	.03	.03	.08	.39	-.03	.09	.03	.12	.02	.81	-.21	.27
Know	EC	.19	.05	.33	.001	.08	.29	.13	.07	.17	.09	-.02	.27
	Serious	-.06	.04	-.13	.17	-.15	.03	-.09	.12	-.07	.47	-.32	.15
Act	EC	.13	.04	.36	<.001	.06	.20	.15	.12	.14	.17	-.06	.36
	Serious	<.001	.03	.001	.99	-.06	.06	.09	.18	.05	.61	-.26	.44

Note. EC = Empathetic Concern, Serious = Perceived Seriousness of Bullying