Attachment Histories of Reception Class Children and Roles in Bullying Situations

Amanda Potter 2006

Acknowledgements

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all of the parents, children, teachers and Head teachers for their involvement and co-operation throughout the data collection phase of this research. I would also like to thank my supervisory team; Mike for his incredible patience and encouragement and to Liz for her empathetic support and guidance. My appreciation and thanks go to Philip and my Mum for their financial support and to my friends and my family for their constant love, belief, reassurance and help over the last ten years of studying – without them I could not have got this far. Finally, I would like to thank Lauren and Ben for their tolerance and patience and for the help and the support that they have given me for as long as they can remember!

Disclosure

I confirm that this thesis, which I have submitted, apart from the contributions of my supervisors, is all my own work, and the source of any information or material I have used (including the internet) has been fully identified and properly acknowledged as required in the Departmental guidelines I have received.

Signed..Date ....

Dedicated to my Dad

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

CONTENTS

ABSTRACT

.

1

Abstract

Bullying research has provided a wealth of information and a depth of understanding that has led to the development of intervention strategies in schools. However, despite this extensive research, bullying continues to be a significant problem. It has been suggested that working with children or with schools may not be enough to solve the problem and that it may be necessary to include parents as part of the solution, especially if the antecedents originate and are consistently reinforced at home. Research that has considered factors relating to family functioning and the relationship between the caregivers and their children provide support for this argument, but research in this area is scarce. The main aim of the present research was to investigate family backgrounds, parenting styles and the personal characteristics of parents and children involved in bullying situations in order to identify effective routes for intervention. More specifically, it focused children's attachment styles and the roles they adopted in bullying situations at school. A longitudinal design with mixed methods was adopted involving 28 pre-school children and their caregivers. The children were 'new starters' at one of three schools and at the start of the investigation they were aged 4 years - 4 years and 11 months and their primary caregiver's ages ranged between 29 and 53 years. Primary caregivers participated in interviews and exercises about themselves and their families and observations of the children occurred in different settings at school during their first year. It was predicted that a link between the childrens' attachment type and the roles they adopted in bullying situations would be found. However, no evidence was found to suggest a link between childrens' attachment style and bullying. Despite this, interesting trends were found. These are considered and the difficulties and limitations of the investigation are discussed.

Chapter 1

PREFACE

PREFACE

.

Prevalence studies have revealed the extent of the problem of childhood bullying across the UK and other studies have identified the specific behaviours involved with bullying and victimisation. The differing characteristics between bullies and victims have been revealed and it is acknowledged that there are different types of bully and victim. The realisation that bullying is a group process (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman and Kaukiainen, 1996) has forced research to evolve further, by identifying the additional participants in bullying scenarios to the bully and the victim. The short-term and the long-term effects of bullying have also been recognised and attempts had been made to identify possible causes of the problem. However, despite extensive research, bullying continues to be a significant problem in schools. Due to time and money constraints, schools have found it difficult to implement all of the anti-bullying policies set by the Department for Education or DFE (Eslea and Smith, 1998) and even the most successful of the schools have not completely eradicated the bullying problems. Smith and Myron-Wilson (1998) suggested that this might be because bullying behaviour has its origins in parenting as well as in the school environment. Furthermore, the same authors (2001) suggested that the reasons why some children continue to bully, despite intervention strategies, might lie in their personal characteristics or family backgrounds. They explained that these experiences might shape the child before they even enter school and therefore make it harder for the child to respond to conventional intervention strategies. Research supports these suggestions and shows the family to be a key context for understanding the origins of bullying problems (e.g. Bowers, Smith and Binney, 1994; Hazler, 1996) and it has also been found that children who become involved in bullying

are more likely to have insecure attachment styles (Troy and Sroufe, 1987; Myron-Wilson and Smith, 2001).

The aim of the present investigation was to investigate children's attachment styles and the roles they adopted in bullying incidences at school. It also considered their temperament types, their parent's attachment styles, personality characteristics and parenting styles and the childrens' family backgrounds. Additionally, the research focused on the intergenerational transmission of attachment relationships between the parents and their children.

The first phase of the research consisted of a Preschool Assessment which determined the children's attachment styles, their temperament types and the attachment styles, personality characteristics and parenting styles of their parents. It also obtained relevant information about the children's family backgrounds. The second phase of the research included an interview with the caregivers to assess the childrens' adjustment to starting school and observations were taken of the children during periods of free-play in their classrooms. The third phase of the research was primarily concerned with identifying the roles that the children adopted in bullying situations. It involved the use of three measures, including teacher and parent reports and observations of the children at school, during periods of free play in the classroom and on the playground at lunchtime.

The present investigation was considered to be unique and unusual for a number of reasons; not only did it focus on the mother-child attachment relationship in children of a preschool age it also studied their participant roles in bullying situations during their time in Reception Class. Additionally, it considered potential influences on the mother-child attachment relationship and on bullying behaviours by measuring many factors at the

5

Preschool Assessment. Furthermore, to allow clearer inferences of causality to be drawn, this assessment occurred prior to the children's first interactions with each other.

The ultimate aim of the research was to highlight routes of intervention that would significantly reduce the behaviours that contribute to a bullying situation. It was believed that one possible route for intervention would be identified if a link were found between attachment style and subsequent roles in bullying situations. Furthermore, if evidence of an intergenerational transmission of attachment style was also revealed, it was believed that another route for intervention would have been identified. At the very least, this research attempted to provide a greater understanding of the effects that family backgrounds, family relationships and personal characteristics of children and their parents have on bullying behaviours at school.

Overview of the Thesis

Chapter 1 introduces the research and provides an overview of each of the chapters of the thesis. Chapter 2 considers the existing literature relating to bullying research and provides information regarding the nature and extent of bullying in schools. It discusses the characteristics of the individuals involved in bullying and the effects of bullying for victims and bullies. It also considers factors found to be antecedents of bullying and factors found to be unrelated to bullying. Finally, this chapter looks at the success of the intervention strategies adopted in schools. Chapter 3 discusses the rationale behind the research and states the predictions and hypotheses. These included a prediction that bullies and victims would be more likely to have insecure attachments than the other children. Bullies would have a more negative attitude about going to school than non-

6

victims. However, they would have a more positive attitude about attending school than

the victims did. Additionally, they would be more likely to have fewer friends than the

non-victims, but would be likely to have more friends than the victims did. Furthermore,

it was predicted that associations between the childrens' attachment styles and their

temperament types would be revealed and that an intergenerational transmission of

attachment type would be evident. Chapter 4 focuses on methodology and Chapter 5

provides an extended description of the Method, describing the techniques and measures

used during the three phases of the investigation and providing the rationale behind them.

Chapter 6 focuses on the preliminary analysis required for some of the measures used in

the research and Chapter 7 details the findings of the research. The similarities between

the children identified in each of the participant roles are highlighted and the children's

family backgrounds are considered using a case study approach. Finally, Chapter 8

discusses the findings in relation to the hypotheses and the existing literature and includes

implications for intervention and suggestions for further researching the area.

Additionally, the limitations of the study are discussed, including the difficulties

associated with the existing attachment and bullying measures.

Chapter 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

BULLYING

This chapter provides a comprehensive account of the existing literature and research on bullying in schools. In particular, it focuses upon work conducted in the UK, but relevant studies from other parts of the world have also been included. The chapter initially describes the nature and the extent of the bullying problem in schools and it goes onto describe typical bullying behaviours and the characteristics of those involved. It examines the short-term and the long-term effects of these behaviours and it considers, in detail, possible antecedents of bullying and the factors that have been found to be unrelated to bullying. Finally, it looks at the intervention strategies adopted by schools and the help that childrens' charities and the UK Government have provided in an attempt to reduce the problem in this country.

2.1 The Nature and Extent of Bullying in School

This section provides a widely accepted definition of bullying; it describes the actual behaviours involved in bullying situations and reports the current prevalence statistics.

2.1.1 Definition of Bullying

Systematic research into peer harassment began in Scandinavia in the 1970s (e.g. Olweus 1973) and during the 1980s research into bullying among schoolchildren started to spread throughout Europe, Canada, USA, Japan and Australia. It soon became evident that peer harassment in schools was a common and a widespread phenomenon. However, minor

9

debate regarding semantics and the translation of the words involved (e.g. 'mobbing' and 'bullying') was necessary, before it was universally accepted that a definition of bullying should emphasise the following factors. Firstly, an imbalance of power must be evident, whereby the victim feels inferior in some way to the bully or bullies. There may be one or a number of bullies, but there is usually only one victim. The victim must experience the harassment repeatedly, the bully must intend to cause fear and/or harm to the victim and the act must produce its desired effect. Furthermore, the bullying behaviours may be direct (e.g. pushing, punching etc.) or indirect (e.g. exclusion, rumour mongering, etc.) and the bullying episode may include one or more of these behaviours. Finally, none of these behaviours are provoked by the victim. For example, Olweus (1993a) defined bullying or victimisation in the following general way: "*A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students.*" (p. 9). Whereas, Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman and Kaukiainen, (1996) provided a more detailed definition. They stated that bullying occurs when "*One child is repeatedly exposed to harassment and attacks from one or several other children; harassment and attacks may be, for example, shoving or hitting the other one, calling him/her names or making jokes about him/her, leaving him/her outside the group, taking his/her things, or any other behaviour meant to hurt the other one.*" (p. 4). Both of these definitions are useful and are generally accepted by researchers of bulling in schools.

2.1.2   Prevalence of Bullying

Bullying is a problem for a significant percentage of children and adolescents across

cultures. Between April 2003 and March 2004, the children's charity 'ChildLine' received over 30,000 telephone calls from children who were being bullied and 63% of these children were being bullied at school (www.childline.org.uk/factsandfigures). Furthermore, in November 2005, the NSPCC reported that a child is bullied every 7 seconds (GMTV 21.11.05).

Survey data from around Europe revealed between 7% and 73% of school children were involved in bullying and/or victimisation problems, at least 'sometimes', 'now and then' or 'occasionally' (e.g. Olweus, 1989 and 1993a; Stevenson and Smith 1989; Boulton and Underwood, 1992; Boulton and Smith, 1994; Byrne, 1994; Borg, 1999). More specifically, the largest survey in Britain (funded by the DFE) focused on 6,000 pupils in the Sheffield Local Education Authority (LEA). It involved 17 junior/middle schools and 7 secondary schools and revealed over a quarter (27%) of junior/middle schoolchildren and 10% of secondary schoolchildren reported that they had been bullied at least 'sometimes' in the that particular school-term. Furthermore, 10% of junior/middle schoolchildren and 4% of secondary schoolchildren reported that they were being bullied at least once a week (Whitney and Smith, 1993). Similarly, Smith and Levan (1995) found 10% of children aged 6-7 years (Year 2) had been bullied that day, 23% that week and 43% that term. However, it has been found that the percentage of pupils who are bullied steadily decreases with age and this is the same for both boys and girls (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius and Piha, 2000). Kochenderfer and Ladd (1996a and 1996b) found 20.5% - 54% of the kindergarten children in their samples had been exposed to victimisation at least 'sometimes' and Whitney and Smith (1993) found junior/middle schoolchildren who had reported that

they were bullied 'sometimes' or more often, fell from 35% in Year 3 to approximately 17% in Year 7. Likewise, the incidence of pupils who were bullied 'once a week' or more fell from 19% in Year 3 to 6% in Year 7. This pattern was also seen in the Secondary schools. Pupils who had reported that they were bullied 'sometimes' or more often fell from 14% in Year 7 to zero in Years 12 and 13 and those pupils who were bullied 'once a week' or more fell from 6% in Year 7 to zero in Years 12 and 13. Nevertheless, the number of 'frequent' bullies remained quite constant, with percentages fluctuating between 2% and 4% in junior/middle schools and between 1% and 2% at Secondary school.

Conversely, research (e.g. Olweus 1978; Roland and Galloway 2002) has found that location of school (e.g. inner city), size of school and class-size has no significant effect on the prevalence of bullying. However, attitudes, routines and behaviours of the school personnel, particularly teachers help to prevent and control activities as well as to redirect such behaviours into socially acceptable channels. Additionally, the number of adult supervisors (usually Welfare Officers) has an impact on bullying on the playground. Bullying behaviours significantly reduce with an increase of supervision (Sharp and Smith, 1994). Furthermore, Olweus (1990 and 1993a) explained that although children can get bullied on the way to school and on the way home, the majority of children get bullied at school and those who are bullied on the way to and from school tend to be bullied at school too.

Observation methods are also useful in providing a deeper understanding of the problem. For example, in one study researchers compared the frequency, duration and nature of

12

direct, indirect, physical and verbal bullying on playgrounds and in classrooms (Craig, Pepler and Atlas, 2000) and in another study, Boulton (1993) used a structured observation method called 'focal individual sampling' to observe bullying behaviour at school. As a result, it has been found that bullying most often occurs on the playground and the classroom is the next popular place for bullying to take place, especially for secondary school pupils (Whitney and Smith, 1993; Borg, 1999; Smith and Shu, 2000; Craig et. al., 2000). Additionally, direct bullying was more prevalent in the playground (Craig et al., 2000) and indirect bullying was more prevalent in the classroom (Rivers and Smith, 1994; Craig et al., 2000). Furthermore, aggressive children were more likely to bully in the classroom and non-aggressive children were more likely to bully on the playground.

Finally, although victims are more likely to tell someone at home rather than a teacher (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Eslea and Smith, 1998; Smith and Shu, 2000), it was discovered that both bullies' and victims' parents were relatively unaware of their bully/victim problems at school (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Smith and Shu, 2000). Furthermore, the pupils revealed that their teachers did relatively little to put a stop to bullying when they were made aware of it (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993). However in later studies, Smith and Shu (2000) found that if teachers knew about the problems they were perceived as very likely to do something about it and if victims told a teacher or someone at home and they did something about it, this improved matters more than half of the time. However, if a victim told a classmate and they tried to help, the most common outcome was that nothing changed, but classmate

13

intervention was seen as the least risky in terms of the bullying getting worse, whereas

teacher intervention the most risky. Fekkes, Pijpers and Verloove-Vanhorick (2005)

revealed that 75% of victims told at least one adult, with 53% of those who were bullied

regularly telling a teacher and 67% telling their parents. Of those people who were made

aware of bullying, including classmates, the majority made an effort to stop the bullying,

but teachers were significantly more likely to make an effort to stop the bullying than

parents or classmates. It can be argued that being in a position of authority at school and

knowing all of the children and their parents, teachers are in a better position to intervene.

According to the children being bullied, however, teacher intervention was successful in

49% of cases, parental intervention was successful in 46% of cases and classmate

intervention was successful in 41% of cases.

2.1.3   Bullying Behaviours

Bullying in schools is considered to be one of the most malicious and malevolent forms

of adolescent behaviour (Tattum & Lane, 1989). It can be physical, verbal or

psychological in nature and older boys and girls tend to bully and be bullied in different

ways (Rivers and Smith, 1994; Owens, Slee and Shute, 2000). Survey studies (e.g.

Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Smith and Shu, 2000) have revealed that boys

tend to be bullied more than girls and they tend to suffer more direct and physical forms

of bullying (e.g. pushing, kicking and taking away personal belongings), whereas girls

tend to be more exposed to indirect and more subtle forms of bullying (e.g. rumour

mongering, manipulation of friendship relationships and exclusion). However, the

percentage of boys who are bullied indirectly is similar to that of girls. Archer and

Westeman (1981) explained that girls display similar levels of aggression to boys, but the differences lie in the types of aggressive behaviour they adopt. It has also been found that boys tend to bully both boys and girls, but girls usually only bully other girls and rarely bully boys (e.g. Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Smith and Shu, 2000). Table 1.1 shows the percentages (averaged by class and school) of male and female bullies as revealed in Whitney and Smith's 1993 survey.

Table 1.1: Percentages of Boys and Girls who were Bullies (Whitney and Smith, 1993)

	Junior/Middle Schools		Secondary Schools	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Who Does The Bullying? N=	734	728	689	529
Mainly one boy	55	27	47	21
Several boys	30	13	43	15
Mainly one girl	1	23	1	25
Several girls	2	15	1	16
Both boys and girls	12	22	8	21

Whitney and Smith (1993) revealed that most of the bulling took the form of general name-calling (i.e. as reported by 50% of bullied children at the junior/middle schools and 62% of bullied children at the secondary schools). The next most frequent forms of bullying were being physically hit, being threatened and being the target of rumour mongering. Table 1.2 shows the percentages (averaged by class and school) for types of reported bullying behaviour.

15

Table 1.2: Percentages of Bullying Behaviour (Whitney and Smith, 1993)

	Junior/Middle Schools		Secondary Schools	
	Boys	Girls	Boys	Girls
Types of Bullying Behaviour N=	722	718	719	546
I was called nasty names about my colour or race	19	13	10	9
I was called nasty names in other ways	51	53	57	71
I was physically hurt (e.g. hit and kicked)	40	33	34	16
I was threatened	36	27	26	24
No one would talk to me	12	25	4	12
I had rumours spread about me	24	29	20	30
I had my belongings taken away from me	15	18	10	7

Smith and Shu (2000) reported the results of a survey of 2,308 pupils aged 10-14 years from across England. They found that 75% of all *victims* reported having experienced nasty forms of name calling, 38% reported to have had lies or rumours spread about them, 31% were excluded from social groups, 21% were physically bullied and 8% reported that they had had money or personal belongings taken from them or damaged. Furthermore, 71% of all *bullies* in this survey reported nasty forms of name calling as their most common form of bullying, followed by excluding someone from their social groups (29%), spreading lies or rumours (17%), hitting or physically bullying (16%) and racial name calling (13%). Finally, only 3% of bullies reported taking money or belongings.

With the advances of technology, computers and mobile phones have become more affordable and more available for school aged children. In turn, this has led the emergence of new forms of bullying behaviours and techniques. ChildLine reported a 50% rise in calls from bullied children in 2004, with abusive texts and emails partly responsible for the increase. At the start of Bullying Week 2005, news reports revealed 14% of 11- to 19-year-olds had been bullied or threatened via text message, almost three

times more than those who have been bullied over the internet and nearly four times as

many as those bullied by email. Additionally, one in 10 children felt threatened or

embarrassed by bullying carried out with a camera phone and 17% of those affected in

this way said they believed that the images were also sent to other people. Furthermore,

more than one in 10 young people admitted they had sent a bullying or threatening text

message to someone else (gm.tv, 21st November 2005).

2.2 Characteristics of the Individuals Involved in Bullying

In any bullying scenario, there will always be a bully and a victim. However, research has

shown that there are actually two types of bully and two types of victim (e.g. Olweus

1973 and 1978). Furthermore, an episode of bullying could involve a number of children,

each with a role to play (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman and Kaukiainen,

1996). These roles include the Victim, Defenders of the victim, the Bully, Reinforcers of

the bully, Assistants to the bully and Outsiders who are not directly involved. All of these

roles are discussed in more detail below.

2.2.1 Victims

Victimised children have several traits that differentiate them from non-victims

(Bernstein and Watson, 1997). Although it is not always clear whether some of the traits

are a cause or a result of the bullying, potential victims of bullying tend to display a

distinct pattern of behaviour involving submissiveness and passivity, even before they are

victimised (Schwartz, Dodge and Coie, 1993). Additionally, teachers and peers can

identify which children are victims of bullying even when they have not witnessed an aggressive act (Smith, 1991).

Olweus (1973 and 1978) described the most common type of victim in schools as *Passive/Submissive Victims*. He explained that these children are more anxious and insecure than students in general. They are often cautious, sensitive and quiet and commonly react by crying (especially when younger). These children also tend to have a lower self-esteem than non-victims and bullies (Smith, 1991; Sharp, 1996). Victims tend to have poor interpersonal skills, poor self-concept and fears of personal inadequacy (Hazler, Carney, Green, Powell and Scott-Jolly, 1997). They have lower self-esteem, they tend to be rejected by peers (Hodges and Perry, 1999) and they are less socially adjusted (Smith, Shu and Madsen, 2001). Olweus (1973 and 1978) further explained that these children are non-assertive and are very unpopular and very often have a negative view of themselves and their situation. They look upon themselves as failures and feel stupid. They also feel ashamed, unattractive, and lonely at school and they tend not to be aggressive or teasing in their behaviour and have a negative view of violence. Victims have been found to be significantly more neurotic than bullies and they were often worried, unhappy and fearful of new situations (Byrne, 1994). Furthermore, they dislike school and learn to avoid it (e.g. Hodges and Perry, 1999; Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996b) and a number of studies (e.g. Björkqvist, Ekman and Lagerspetz, 1982) have found victims to have more 'negative' physical features, for example, spectacles, language problems, red hair, obesity, etc. However, Olweus (1993a) argued that victims were no more 'externally deviant' (using 14 external characteristics assessed by teacher ratings) than a control group who had not been bullied. However, he did find that victims

18

tended to be weaker than average; bullies were stronger than average and in particular they were stronger than the victims were. He explained that a bully may 'pick on' and make use of a victim's external deviation, but the external deviation was not necessarily the cause of the bullying. Furthermore, external deviations may be important in individual cases, but they actually play a much smaller role in the origin of bully and victim problems than is generally assumed.

Hodges and Perry (1999) found children who displayed internalising difficulties (i.e. children who were manifestly anxious, displayed sadness, were prone to crying and were socially withdrawn) were targeted for victimisation because their behaviours signalled that they would not be able to defend themselves successfully against attacks. These authors suggested that depressed/fearful children were probably less capable than other children of planning and executing organised, assertive counterattacks that ward off aggressors. Furthermore, it has been shown (e.g. Perry, Williard and Perry, 1990; Hodges and Perry, 1999) that aggressive children view victims as more likely to provide rewards for their aggressive behaviour (e.g. continued or increased status in the peer hierarchy, possessions, money and signs of suffering, pain and submission) which in turn reinforces the aggressors for their attacks. Additionally, losing to a victim threatens the aggressor's status much more than losing to a non-victim. Non-aggressive children seem to have a similar view of victims as bullies do. Perry, Williard and Perry (1990) found children who were not bullies or victims displayed little aggression overall, but when they were aggressive; they tended to direct it towards victims.

Schwartz, Proctor and Chien (2001) described a sub-group of victims who were more aggressive and hostile. These children have been referred to as 'provocative whipping

19

boys' (Olweus, 1978); 'aggressive victims' (Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit and Bates, 1997); 'inaffectual aggressors' (Perry, Perry and Kennedy, 1992); 'provocative victims' (Olweus, 1993); and 'bully/victims' (Mynard and Joseph, 1997). Although it is known that there are fewer provocative victims than there are the more typical passive/submissive victims, the actual amount of children who fall into this category is unclear. Studies that have attempted to measure prevalence have used different methods (i.e. self-report questionnaires, peer nominations, parent reports and teacher reports) and the results do not necessarily identify equivalent subgroups. However, as an example, Borg (1999) found 60.5% of his sample of Maltese schoolchildren were self-declared victims, 48.9% were bullies and 35.3% reported to be both bullies and victims at least once since the beginning of the school year.

Olweus (1993) explained that these victims could be characterised by both an anxious and an aggressive reaction pattern. They have problems with concentration, perhaps are even hyperactive and they behave in ways that cause irritation and tension around them (provoking negative reactions from many of the students in the class). Furthermore, these children tend to display internalising responses that invite and reinforce aggression. For example, they cry easily, their aggression tends to be ineffectual and they lose disputes (Hodges and Perry, 1999). However, they tend to be stronger and more assertive than victims, but they are also the least popular and least accepted children at school (Baldry and Farrington, 1998). In her study involving Greek children aged 12 years, Andreou (2000) found these children suffered low social acceptance and she also found that high Machiavellianism and negative self-esteem set bully/victims apart from bullies or victims. Borg (1999) suggested that some children try to cope with the unpleasant

experience of being victimised by displacing their frustrations on other pupils.

2.2.2 Bullies

Olweus (1993) explained that a distinctive characteristic of bullies was their aggression towards peers and adults (usually parents and teachers). They had a more positive attitude towards violence and the use of violent means than other students did and they could usually be characterised by impulsivity and a strong need for power and to dominate others; they seemed to enjoy being 'in control' and needed to subdue others. They had little empathy with victims and hade a relatively positive view of themselves. Boy bullies were physically stronger than boys in general and the victims in particular. Using personality tests and by testing stress hormones, Olweus found nothing to support the common view that bullies have an underlying insecurity. Instead, he found them to either show average or little anxiety and insecurity and he found that they did not tend to suffer from poor self-esteem. Furthermore, bullies tended to have average popularity and were usually liked and supported by two or three friends. However, this popularity tended to decrease with age, but bullies never became as unpopular as victims. Additionally, bullies enjoyed the rewards victims had to 'offer', for example prestige and things of value coerced from the victims. Byrne (1994) also found bullies to be significantly stronger than victims and controls. They were the most likely to retaliate if necessary (whereas victims were the least likely to retaliate) and they had higher levels of self-esteem than victims did, but lower self-esteem than the controls. Furthermore, they were more hostile and aggressive and they showed less restraint than the victims did. It has also been shown that bullies have an idealised and an inflated, positive view of themselves (i.e. they

21

believe they are more dominant, brave, tough, successful and capable than they really are (Hughes, Cavell and Grossman, 1997; Hazler, Carney, Green, Powell and Scott-Jolly, 1997).

2.2.3   Participant Roles Involved in Bullying

In the mid 1990s, bullying research started to acknowledge the presence and influence of peers in bullying situations (e.g. Craig and Pepler, 1995). A Canadian study revealed 90% of children said bullying was unpleasant to watch and over a third of these children believed something should be done to stop it, but did nothing to stop it themselves (Charach, Pepler and Ziegler, 1995). Furthermore, Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman and Kaukiainen (1996) provided evidence to suggest that bullying is actually a group phenomenon, in which most of the children of a school class have a definable Participant Role. They asked 573 Finnish students aged 12-13 years to complete a questionnaire and through peer- and self-nomination, the authors were able to assign a Participant Role to 87% of the pupils. In addition to Bullies and Victims, the most common Participant Roles they found were Outsider, Reinforcer of the bully and Defender of the Victim. Sutton and Smith (1999) provided support for the Participant Role approach to understanding bullying as a group process.

These Participant Roles include:

Bully – a child who starts to harass or attack another child, by shoving, hitting, calling him/her names, making jokes of him/her, leaving him/her outside the group, taking his/her things, or any other behaviour meant to hurt him/her. This child may also get

22

other children to join in the harassment. They always find new ways of harassing the victim and they stop others from being friends with the victim. They may even convince others that the victim 'deserves' to be picked on and will make things awkward for those who do not join in the harassment (i.e. start calling them names too).

Victim – a child who is exposed repeatedly to harassment and attacks from one or several other children.

Reinforcer – a child who provides support and encouragement for the bully. They do not tend to actually bully the victim directly, but they may invite others to come and watch the bullying episode.

Assistant – a child who joins in the bullying when someone else has started it, they assist the bully by catching and perhaps even holding the victim when he/she is harassed.

Defender – a child who tries to stop the bully or the others from bullying the victim. They may try to arbitrate the differences by talking and may involve others or an adult in order to stop the bullying episode. They defend and support the victim and if not already friends with the victim, they may play or spend time with them at break-times. They may encourage the victim to seek help from an adult and they will comfort the Victim after an episode of bullying. They may even take revenge on the bully themselves.

Outsider - a child who either does not know about the bullying or does not get involved

23

in the bullying scenario, by pretending not to notice what is happening. This child does

not take sides with anyone, but does not do anything about it either.

Salmivalli et al. also found highly significant gender differences in the distribution of the

Participant Roles. There were far more defenders and outsiders among the girls and far

more reinforcers and assistants among the boys. The number of victims was about the

same for boys and girls, but more children were designated as bullies among the boys.

Although the Participant Roles, by definition are considered as mutually exclusive,

Salmivalli et al. were able to examine the secondary roles of the victims. They found

(compared with non-victimised children) that victims were significantly more likely to be

defenders too. Furthermore, one girl (3% of all female victims) and three boys (8.8% of

all male victims) had a secondary role of bully and this, therefore, provides support for

the bully/victims found in other studies (e.g. Olweus, 1978; Perry, Perry and Kennedy,

1992; Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit and Bates, 1997; Mynard and Joseph, 1997).

Research by Olweus provides support for Salmivalli et al.'s Participant Roles as he

identified two types of bully: the (previously discussed) typical bully and the *Passive

Bullies*. He described these children as 'henchmen' who follow the bully around and

participate in the bullying, but they did not take the initiative. He also suggested that

these children might have insecure and anxious behaviour patterns.

Salmivalli et al. also measured social acceptance and social rejection of the Participant

Roles. They found both male and female victims scored low on social acceptance and

high on social rejection – clearly rejected children. Male bullies, female reinforcers, and

female assistants also achieved similar scores (i.e. low social acceptance and high social

rejection). However, female bullies scored above average on both social acceptance and social rejection. Male reinforcers were seen as popular (i.e. high acceptance, low rejection), while male Assistants scored near average on both social acceptance and social rejection. The students (male and female) who scored highest on social acceptance (with low social rejection scores) were the Defenders of the Victim. The Outsiders of both sexes scored below average on both social acceptance and social rejection.

To regard bullying as a 'group interaction' in this way can lead to an understanding of bullying from a different perspective. For example, it becomes clearer why, over time, an observer's perception of a victim may change and how, after repeated attacks and degrading comments, a victim will gradually be perceived as a worthless person by more children than just the bully. This would also explain why some victims are bullied by different people and perhaps even over a long period.

2.3   The Effects of Bullying

Despite the identification of the Participant Roles in bullying situations, most research regarding the effects of bullying concentrates on the bullies and the victims. Immediate, short-term and long-term negative consequences have been revealed for both parties. However, most of the research regarding the effects of bullying has been cross-sectional and so it is not clear whether the suggested effects were actually causes in the first place. For example, some authors suggest that victims suffer from depression because they have been bullied, but it can be argued that victims become targets of bullying because they display depressive traits (e.g. low self esteem, and cry easily) that become signals to others, in particular to bullies, that they are 'easy prey'. However, a few longitudinal

studies have attempted to deal with this issue of causality. For example, Kochenderfer

and Ladd (1996b) found victimisation to be a precursor of children's loneliness and

school avoidance. They found that not only were feelings of loneliness more pronounced

during periods of victimisation, but there were delayed effects for school avoidance.

Furthermore, the duration of victimisation experiences were related to the magnitude of

children's school adjustment problems. Additionally, Hodges and Perry (1999) found that

the characteristics typical of a victim (e.g. internalizing problems, physical weakness and

peer rejection) not only caused a child to be victimisation in the first place, it also

contributed to it over time. These authors suggested the existence of a vicious cycle that

supported the stability of peer victimisation.

With the issue of causality noted, this following section highlights the suggested effects

of bullying behaviours for both the victims and the bullies.

2.3.1 Victims

Victimisation undermines children's feelings of security and safety in school

(Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a); it causes stress and affects victims' general well-being

(Olweus, 1990). It can effect children's adjustment at kindergarten, it tends to lead to

negative attitudes about school (Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a), it can lead to a fear of

going to school (Bernstein and Watson, 1997) and can cause a child to avoid school

altogether (Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a and 1996b). Victims have been found to be

lonelier than their non-victimised classmates (Boulton and Underwood, 1992;

Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a) and girls tend to report more feelings of sadness and

misery (Rigby, 1997). Victimisation can also affect a child's academic work and

achievements (Hoover, Oliver and Hazler, 1992), as they find it difficult to concentrate (Bernstein and Watson, 1997). It can also affect their personal relationships and victims tend to have lower self-esteem (e.g. Olweus, 1993; Boulton and Smith, 1994; Hugh-Jones and Smith, 1999) and suffer greater anxiety and depression than non-victims (Slee, 1995; Hugh-Jones and Smith, 1999; Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpelä, Marttunen, Rimpelä and Ratenen, 1999). Furthermore, victimisation is associated with psychological disturbance and can lead to referrals to child and adolescent psychosocial services (Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius and Piha, 2000). Victims were also found to suffer from physical ailments, such as headaches and stomachaches (Williams, Chambers, Logan and Robinson, 1996). Victims regularly 'lose' money and belongings to the bully and may even suffer injuries and damage to their property.

As previously mentioned, verbal harassment has been identified as the most common form of bullying (Whitney and Smith, 1993) and victims report rumour mongering as more stressful than the physical forms of victimisation (Sharp, 1995). Kochenderfer and Ladd (1996a) suggest that verbal victimisation transmits messages to the victims who often believe the messages about themselves (whether they are real or not) which has an affect on their behaviour and participation in activities at school. For example, they may not take part in games on the playground or sporting activities if they are told they are clumsy or overweight and they may not embrace academic tasks if they are told that they are stupid. Similarly, Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius and Piha (2000) found victimisation was strongly associated with long-term internalizing problems and Hodges and Perry (1999) explained that victimisation increased internalizing difficulties, rejection by peers and could lead children to develop friendships with other victimised, depressed and

27

withdrawn children. This, they suggested, was is likely to reinforce the personal social

conditions that supported victimisation. Hodges and Perry (1999) suggested that peer

rejection contributed to victimisation in several ways: Firstly, aggressive children fear

little retaliation or ostracism from the peer group for attacking a peer-rejected classmate;

Secondly, children who are rejected are likely to be alone more often and are more

available and salient as targets; Thirdly, rejected children are probably less able to profit

from peers' advice on how to handle conflicts and threats of victimisation. However, they

also found that having friends who exhibit externalizing behaviours helps to protect

children from becoming victimised, as these children are more likely to retaliate on

behalf of their friends and thus protect them from victimisation. Rigby (2001) also

explained that the effects of peer victimisation can be substantially reduced by high levels

of social support, however, many studies have revealed that victims receive very little

and inadequate social support from peers and that this may actually lead to poor mental

health (e.g. Cox, 1995).

Additionally, the peer rejection victims often experience is a strong predictor of later

adult disturbance, as victims find it difficult to trust others and as a result, they find

personal relationships problematic (Smith, 1991). In a retrospective study, Kidscape

(1999) questioned 1000 adults aged 18 – 81 years and found bullying had long-term

effects on self-esteem and adults' abilities to make friends and succeed in social

relationships. These adults were also less likely to succeed in education and at work.

Additionally, 46% of those bullied, compared to 7% of non-victims, had contemplated

suicide. Similarly, Ledley, Storch, Coles, Heimberg, Moser and Bravata (2005) studied

college students who had been bullied frequently at school and they found that these students were less comfortable with intimacy and closeness and they were less comfortable with trusting and depending on others, they also reported a greater degree of worry about being unloved or abandoned in relationships and they had poorer social self-esteem than college students who had not suffered frequent victimisation at school. Gilmartin (1987) found 80% of 'love-shy' heterosexual men found it difficult to have relationships with the opposite sex, to the point where they didn't even have the confidence to date. He also found that these men had learned early in life to perceive peer interaction as painful. Gilmartin suggested further reasons why these men would find it difficult to 'find' a partner. He explained that they may lack the necessary assertiveness and social self-confidence required for courtship and their unpopularity at school and low social acceptance meant that they did not belong to a peer network that could introduce them to potential partners. Additionally, he explained that women tend not to be trusting or open toward socially isolated men. With regards to attachment in adult relationships, Schäfer, Korn, Smith, Hunter, Mora-Merchán, Singer, and van der Meulen (2000) found former victims (especially those who were stable victims and/or were bullied at secondary school) were uncomfortable about getting close to others even though they wanted emotionally close relationships. They also found it difficult to trust others as they were worried that they would be hurt if they allowed themselves to become too close.

Other retrospective studies involving adults who suffered severe bullying at school have revealed further long-term negative effects. Olweus (1993) found boys who had been victims of bullying were more likely to be depressed and have poorer self-esteem than

29

non-victims at age 23. Further support for these findings include those of Sharp and Smith (1994) who also found former victims suffered from depression later in life and Matsui, Tzuzuki, Kakuyama and Onglatgo (1996) and Schäfer, Korn, Smith, Hunter, Mora-Merchán, Singer, and van der Meulen (2000) found former victims had lower self-esteem. Additionally, Hugh-Jones and Smith (1999) found former victims lacked confidence and Bernstein and Watson (1997) suggested that these problems could be a result of former victims internalizing the negative evaluations of their peers from childhood and continuing to criticize themselves in adulthood. Furthermore, Smith, Singer, Hoel and Cooper (2003) found a significant relationship between involvement in school bullying and experience of workplace victimisation with former bully/victims being most at risk. Schäfer et al. (2000) also found workplace bullying to be more common in former victims of school bullying. Furthermore, there is evidence of intergenerational continuity of victimisation; 32 year old men who had been victims at school (between the ages of 8 and 14 years) were significantly more likely to have children who were victims than were other men and social isolation and anxiety in childhood were found to be predictive of having children who were victims (Farrington; 1993).

Victims may develop strategies to cope with bullying situations (Smith and Shu, 2000). The most common strategy is to ignore the bully and if this method is used consistently, this can be a very useful approach. Salmivalli Karhunen and Lagerspetz (1996) also found that 12-13 year old Finnish students rated nonchalance as a more successful strategy than either helplessness or counter-aggression. However, this approach may be

more successful for overcoming certain forms of bullying (e.g. nasty teasing) than others (e.g. hitting, taking belongings). Sharp (1995) found high self-esteem, an assertive approach to social relationships, and good problem solving skills helped students to cope more effectively with bullying, but these strategies did not necessarily stop bullying and crying and running were the least successful methods of stopping bullying.

The most extreme consequence of bullying is suicide and at least 16 children who have been subjected to bullying at school commit suicide each year (NSPCC, 2005). For example, at age 16, Karl Peart from Northumberland took a mixture of painkillers and alcohol because he couldn't face returning to school after a half-term break following years of victimisation (BBC News, 06.06.03) and Denise Bailie from North Belfast took an overdose after being bullied at school (BBC News, 16.04.00). Barbara Coloroso (GMTV 22.11.05) referred to this extreme escape from bullying as 'Bullicide' and she explained that more and more children fall victims of bullicide because they realise that their teachers and parents are powerless to stop their suffering. For example, Chloe from Fulston Manor School in Sittingbourne took and overdose following severe bullying for 2 years. She described continuous name-calling that became too much to bear after she was chased around the playground and through school by over 30 children. She explained that even after running into the Liaison Teacher's office, with this teacher pushing the door shut, the children still taunted and struggled to get at her. Fortunately, Chloe survived and used her experiences to help others during Bullying Awareness Week 2005.

Rigby and Slee (1999) provided evidence to support the relationship between bullying and frequent thoughts of suicide (i.e. 'suicide ideation'). Furthermore, suicide ideation

31

was significantly related to peer victimisation even after controlling for depression and perceived social support (Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpelä, Marttunen, Rimpelä and Ratenen (1999).

An even more extreme measure taken by some victims to end their bullying is violent retaliation. Despite the fact that such actions are rarely premeditated, death can be the result. For example, bullied teenager Tommy Kimpton (aged 19) beat Ben Williams (aged 17) to death with a pool cue. Kimpton had been bullied at school about his weight, thick glasses and big ears for some time and was teased by Ben Williams immediately before the attack (BBC News, 20.11.2005).

2.3.2   Bullies

There are also long-term consequences for the bullies. They are at a higher risk than non-bullies of mental illness and psychological disturbance and in severe cases they may be referred to child and adolescent psychosocial services (Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius and Piha, 2000). They have low social support (Rigby, 2000) and they tend to have an above average risk of suicide ideation, especially female bullies (Rigby, 2001). School bullies also tend to suffer externalizing problems at age 16 years (Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius and Piha, 2000) and are more likely to continue to develop their antisocial behaviour (Sharp and Smith, 1994). From an early age, they learn power-assertive and even violent behaviour helps them to achieve their goals and they may continue to adopt such behaviours through to adulthood. As a result, they are more likely to bully others later in life (e.g. at work), they are more likely to live in abusive marital or family relationships and they are more likely to commit violent crimes and spend time in prison. For example,

Olweus (1989) found former bullies were nearly four times more likely than non-bullies to have had three or more court convictions, whereas former victims tended to have average or below average levels of criminality in adulthood (Olweus, 1993a). Former bullies may also suffer from poor mental health (Rigby 2001), especially depression (Slee, 1995), and are more likely to engage in alcohol abuse (Olweus 1993a).

Baldry and Farrington (1998) asked children aged 11-14 years at a middle school in Rome to complete questionnaires that measured bullying behaviour and determined personal characteristics, such as pro-social behaviour, self-esteem and self-efficacy (in terms of school achievement and self-competence). Children were also asked to provide information regarding their parents' styles of discipline, their support and involvement in schooling and levels of agreement between their parents. It was found that personal characteristics were related to only bullies or only victims whereas parental styles were more related to bully/victims (i.e. children who display the behaviours of both bullies and victims).

2.4   Antecedents of Bullying

Smith and Myron-Wilson (1998) suggested that the personal characteristics of the children involved in bullying situations, their family characteristics, attachment relationships and the parenting styles which they experience should all be considered as possible antecedents of bullying. The following section examines these potential antecedents of bullying and discusses the findings presented by researchers in these areas.

2.4.1 The Family Environment

The children's charity Kidscape received 16,000 calls in 2003 from parents who were worried about the effects that the bullying was having on their children (Lynch 2003). These parents may also feel helpless and frustrated at their inability to put an end to their child's problems. They may blame the bullies, the families of the bullies and even the school for their child's plight. However, as previously explained, the vast majority of schools in the UK are doing all they can to prevent bullying and the parents of bullies tend to refuse to accept responsibility for their child's actions whilst their child is at school.

Nevertheless, research findings have provided a deeper understanding of bullying behaviours and it has become more widely accepted that the family environment is a key context for understanding the origins of bullying problems. For example, Bowers, Smith and Binney (1994) found that bullies and bully/victims were significantly more likely not to have a biological father at home. Victims appeared to have an enmeshed family structure and perceived their fathers to be more powerful than their mothers, but they did not see their siblings as particularly powerful. They were also particularly close to another family member who was not a sibling or parent (e.g. a Grandparent or Aunt). The bullies revealed low overall family cohesion scores, perceiving their families as spread out which suggested a disengaged family structure. Like the victims, they tended to see their fathers as more powerful, but unlike the victims, they tended to regard their siblings and others as more powerful than they did themselves. Bully/victims did not reveal family cohesion scores as low as the bullies, but they did expose a similar structure that suggested that they also came from disengaged families. Where the father was present, he

34

was considered as particularly powerful compared to the mother. However, neither parent was considered as powerful as the self. These bully/victims also revealed the highest power scores for self and other family members were seen as weak. Finally, the control group perceived their families as moderately cohesive. Their parents were seen as quite powerful, but equally so and their siblings had relatively low power within the family.

The effect that the family environment can have on children's behaviour has recently been endorsed by the passing of legislation (mentioned above) and the following examples of research in this area reveal how significant the family environment is to the development of children's behaviour and their relationships at school. However, there are a number of aspects within the family environment that must be considered, including parenting styles and methods of discipline, the relationship between the parents and the child, the relationship between the child and siblings and the occurrence of major life events (e.g. divorce and death of a close family member). These areas are discussed in detail below.

Parenting Styles and Discipline

Parenting styles and the family environment have been found to be strong influences on competence with peers (Lieberman, 1977) and bullying and victimisation behaviours seen in school (Hazler, 1996; Baldry and Farrington, 1998; Duncan, 1999). Hazler (1996) described the family as a powerful force in a child's early life, as the children have little opportunity to compare their experiences with that of others and they are vulnerable to learning inappropriate behaviours while young. Bowers, Smith and Binney (1994) found children who became involved in bullying had problems with poor family functioning.

35

For example, children who frequently witness conflicts, discord and open arguments between parents may feel insecure. Interestingly, in Rigby's (1993) study, self-reported bullying correlated significantly with poorer family functioning for boys and self-reported victimisation correlated significantly with poorer family functioning for girls. This study was one of the first to suggest gender differences in victimisation. A later study conducted by Finnegan, Hodges and Perry (1998) involved American children aged 9-12 years. Victimisation was assessed by peer nomination and verbal reports were provided by the children about their mothers' and their own behaviour at home during periods of conflict and control. It was found that maternal over-protectiveness was associated with victimisation in boys when the boys felt afraid and compelled to submit to their mothers during conflicts. For girls, victimisation was associated with maternal hostility, especially for those who were considered physically weaker by peers. It was suggested that experiencing such hostility might lead to anxiety or depression which, in turn, could be evident in peer-interactions and influence victimisation (Smith and Myron-Wilson, 1998). Finnegan et al. noted that although the manifestation of maternal influence may be different for each gender, a common factor might be that when maternal behaviour affects a child's social and developmental progress peer victimisation may be more likely to occur. In other words, a mother's hostility may decrease their daughter's sense of connectedness in primary relationships and lead to anxiety and a mother's over-protectiveness may hinder their son's search for independence and autonomy.

From the work of Bandura (1973), it follows that a child who regularly witnesses aggressive behaviour will imitate this behaviour and in the absence of more positive behaviours, may become to believe that aggression is the only way to effectively interact with peers. The following findings provide support for this: Manning, Heron & Marshall (1978) reported that children with over-controlling or dominating parents were found to harass other children more often at school and Loeber & Dishion (1984) found that parents who practiced inconsistent or highly aversive discipline techniques with physical punishment were more likely to have a child who was more aggressive to others. Additionally, Pettit, Harrist, Bates and Dodge (1991) reported that aggressiveness in kindergarten children was related to high levels of coercive and intrusive family interactions and in a longitudinal study by Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit and Bates (1997), it was found that pre-school exposure to violence and marital conflict significantly predicted peer nominations of bullying at age 8-9 years. They also found that aggressive victims (bully/victims in other studies) were three times more likely to have experienced physical abuse from at least one family member. Schwartz et al. hypothesized that violent and aggressive family role models lead children to learn goal-oriented aggressive behaviours. Consequently, harsh discipline and physically abusive experiences might lead a child to view the world as a hostile, dangerous place and in turn develop hostile attributional biases that result in high rates of angry reactive aggression that leads to rejection by peers and nomination as aggressive victims.

Olweus (1993a) explained that victimised boys tended to have closer contact and relationships that are more positive with their parents, in particular their mother, than

37

boys in general. However, he argued that although there is nothing to indicate that the victims have lacked love or care, these overly close families with tendencies toward overprotection are both a cause and a consequence of the bullying. He stressed the importance of parenting and helping children toward greater independence, greater self-confidence and the ability to assert themselves among their peers. From his research involving boys, Olweus (1993a) described four factors that he believed were particularly important when considering the childhood conditions conducive to the development of an aggressive reaction pattern. The first factor involved the negative emotional parental attitude (mainly from the primary caretaker) toward the child during the early years, characterised by a lack of warmth and involvement. Olweus argued that this increased the risk of aggression and hostility towards others later in life.

The second factor focused on the increase of children's aggression levels when their primary caretaker was permissive and did not set clear limits regarding the child's behaviour, in particular their aggressive behaviour towards siblings, peers and adults. Olweus believed that this was a typical description of a bully's family. Furthermore, he explained that there was a negative basic attitude from the mother, also characterized by a lack of warmth and involvement, and these families may involve conflict-filled interpersonal relationships, especially between the parents. Furthermore, he explained that there may be divorce, psychiatric illness and alcohol and drug problems. He suggested that due to family conditions, bullies developed a certain degree of hostility toward their environment and such feelings and impulses made them derive satisfaction from inflicting injury and suffering on other individuals. Additionally, the parents of

children who became both a bully and a victim were more likely to expose their children to violence, marital conflict and physical abuse.

The third factor Olweus found to raise children's level of aggression was the parents' use of 'power-assertive' child-rearing methods such as physical punishment and violent emotional outbursts. Additionally, he explained that the parents of a child who becomes both a bully and a victim were more likely to expose their children to violence, marital conflict and physical abuse. Further evidence to support this was provided by Baldry and Farrington (2000) who found bullies to have authoritarian parents and Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit and Bates (1997) who found pre-school exposure to violence and marital conflict significantly predicted peer nominations of bullying where the aggressive non-victim group had the highest ratings of exposure to violence and the aggressive victim group (bully/victims) had the highest ratings of early exposure to marital conflict. Furthermore, the aggressive victims were also more likely to have experienced physical abuse from at least one family member. Similarly, Bowers, Smith and Binney (1994) found children who were involved in bullying (whether bullies or bully/victims) were less likely to have a father at home and were more likely to perceive family members as distant. Furthermore, bully/victims revealed the most troubled relationships with their parents. They perceived their parents as the lowest on accurate monitoring and warmth and the highest for both over-protection and neglect. The authors explained that this indicated inconsistent discipline/monitoring practices that were not tempered by warm affection. Furthermore, the bully/victims appeared to be more self-involved, seeing themselves as more powerful but also viewing themselves more negatively. Victims in this study

showed high and positive involvement with other family members without any separation. This, the authors explained, might indicate an enmeshed or over-protective family. On the other hand, the control children represented their families as cohesive but not over enmeshed and rated their parents high on accurate monitoring and low on both punitiveness and neglect.

The fourth factor Olweus found to be important in the development of an aggressive reaction pattern was the child's temperament and this is discussed in more detail below. He concluded by explaining that 'Love and involvement from the person(s) who rears the child, well-defined limits on which behaviours are permitted and which are not, and use of non-physical methods of child-rearing [i.e. discipline] create harmonious and independent children.' (p.40).

Intergenerational Continuity

Hazler (1996) provided support for these findings and suggested that poor parenting and poor family functioning may actually flow through the generations in a 'cycle of violence'. In other words, children learn to be aggressive and violent towards others from their parents and go onto teach their children in the same way. This has also been referred to as a cross- or intergenerational transmission of child maltreatment and research in this area has focused upon the transmission of attachment behaviours, as well as physical and sexual abuse. For example, fathers who had been bullied at school tended to have children who also bullied (Farrington, 1993) and children had similar attachment behaviour to their mothers and to some extent to their fathers (Van IJzendoorn, Duffer

40

and Duyvesteyn, 1995). Smith and Myron-Wilson (1998) also suggested that this might be a key to explaining the intergenerational transmission of the 'cycle of violence'. Furthermore, Green (1998) found 47-70% of mothers with a history of severe physical abuse later abused their children and many female survivors of child sexual abuse exposed their children to molestation by husbands and partners. Similarly, Ruscio (2001) suggested that sexual abuse in childhood might have negative consequences for the parenting practices of survivors, particularly for survivors' ability to provide their children with appropriate structure, consistent discipline, and clear behavioral expectations.

Relationships within the Family

Other aspects of the family environment that are influential in the development of a child's social skills with peers at school relate to the personal relationships within the family and characteristics of the individuals.

Bowers, Smith and Binney (1994) explained that bullies appeared to have negative relationships with siblings, they saw them as more powerful and expressed ambivalence towards them. The victims expressed very close relations with their siblings; however, the authors explained that these victims might actually have been repressing a normal level of negative feelings towards their siblings. Similarly, Smith and Myron-Wilson (1998) explained that family experiences involving powerful, intimidating and/or overprotective siblings might form a basis for similar behaviour in school and later in life, Therefore, the number of children within the family and the birth order of the child

41

might have an effect on bullying behaviours, but very little research has been done in this area. Furthermore, Miller and Maruyama (1976) provided evidence to suggest that later-born children tend to be more popular on average than firstborns. They suggested that later-borns become more popular than firstborns because they learn to defer and to negotiate with their older and more powerful siblings, thus acquiring cooperative and conciliatory interpersonal skills that serve them well during peer interactions. Berndt and Bulleit (1985) further suggested that those older siblings who use their greater power to dominate a younger brother of sister might learn to employ similar tactics with peers and as a result lessen their popularity or status.

2.4.2 Characteristics of the Children

Smith and Myron-Wilson (1998) suggested that besides working on parental attitudes and overt parenting behaviours, it is necessary to consider the deeper structure of relationships. However, studies that consider parental and/or children's personality characteristics and the children's bullying behaviour are scarce and research in this area tends to focus upon the caregiver-child relationship. One of the main theoretical models used to examine the caregiver-child relationship is that of attachment and this is considered below, followed by a discussion of the studies of bullying that have also focused on this attachment relationship. Additionally, although very few researchers consider childrens' temperaments in studies of bullying, there have been studies that have identified links between attachment and temperament. Therefore, the associations between childrens' attachment types and childrens temperament traits are considered

below with the findings of bullying research that have considered childrens'

temperaments.

Attachment

Attachment theorists believe that the relationship that develops between an infant and the

primary caregiver during the infants first months of life influences all of the infant's

future relationships. Bowlby first presented his Attachment theory in 1969 and in 1988,

he theorised that this emotional bond was the basis for the emotional responses for all

inter-personal relationships; it develops over the first few years of life and lays the

foundation for an internal working model (IWM). This IWM is essentially a schema for

social interactions and relationships and provides a foundation upon which the child can

build experience and explore life. The IWM influences the child's future development

and conduct in relationships throughout their life. For example, an insecure or

dysfunctional IWM developed in infancy may lead the child to behave in an insecure and

anxious manner in school, behaviour typical of that of a victim of bullying. It has been

shown that mothers and fathers (to a lesser extent) tend to pass on their attachment styles

to their children (Van IJzendoorn, Juffer and Duyvesteyn, 1995).

Ainsworth (1969) devised a measurement of infant attachment that they named *The

Strange Situation*. It consisted of a series of eight episodes in which the infant was placed

in a controlled environment (i.e. a playroom of toys) and was observed through a one-

way mirror. The episodes always follow the same order and are arranged so as to cause

the infant mild, but increasing, levels of stress (e.g. a brief separation from the primary

caregiver) to elicit attachment behaviours (i.e. behaviours which promote proximity to or contact with the primary caregiver). Three major attachment styles in infants were identified: *Secure, Anxious-avoidant and Anxious-resistant* (Ainsworth, Blehar, Waters and Wall, 1978). To summarise, the interaction history underlying a secure attachment style is characterised by the provision of responsive and consistent care by the caregiver. Consequently, these children feel confident that their primary caregiver is available and easily accessible, which allows them to explore the environment in a confident and competent manner. Expectations of caregiver availability also underlie the efficient and effective contact seeking of these infants when distressed. An anxious-avoidant attachment relationship, in contrast, is characterised by a pattern of rebuff by the caregiver in the face of expressed emotional or physical needs of the child, resulting in avoidant behaviour by the child. The most striking behaviour of these infants is that, when moderately stressed, they ignore, turn away, or move away from their caregivers. Finally, an anxious-resistant attachment relationship is generally characterised by insensitivity and inconsistent availability of the caregiver resulting in ambivalent contact seeking by the child. When distressed, they mix angry behaviour with comfort seeking behaviour and continue to fuss or pout rather than settle. These categories are continually found in attachment research, regardless of the age or culture of participants involved.

Attachment and Bullying

Although very few studies on attachment and bullying exist, definite links can be seen and further investigations are necessary if these findings are to be used to create intervention strategies that tackle the deeper structure of relationships, in particular

44

bullying interactions in childhood. Furthermore, working with children or with schools may not be enough to solve the problem, as it seems necessary to include parents as part of the solution. The bullying problem will not change if the antecedents originate, and are consistently reinforced at home.

Turner (1991) found insecure-anxious attachment predicted more aggressive and difficult peer relations in 4 year olds and in a longitudinal study where, Troy & Sroufe (1987) examined the relationship between preschool children's attachment history and victimisation, results showed that victimisation was clearly associated with attachment style. More specifically, they found that in every dyad in which there was victimisation, there was a victimiser with an avoidant attachment history and a victim with an anxious attachment history of some form or another (especially those with a resistant attachment history). Furthermore, children with an anxious-avoidant attachment history were found to be victims as well as victimisers (bully/victims in other studies) and were shown to be negative in their interactions, even when paired with a securely attached child.

Troy and Sroufe suggested that because of an early relationship marked by a consistent pattern of caregiver insensitivity, rejection and abuse, children with an anxious-avoidant attachment history had clearly internalized models of both exploiter and exploited and depending on the role they assumed they might organise their behaviour around the expression of their anger and hostility in the role of victimiser or around their sense of unworthiness and poor self-image in the role of victim. They also suggested that the anxious-resistant children were drawing on early relationships marked by disorganization and inconsistency, resulting in the caregiver being unable to meet the child's needs. Consequently, these children were motivated to make contact but were disorganised and

45

unskilled at meeting the developmental tasks involved in the formation of smooth peer

relationships. Like their caregivers, they would keep trying, however ineffectively, but

were consequently easily victimised.   .

The findings relating to the children with secure attachment histories were just as

remarkable in that, regardless of with whom these children were paired, they tended to

fill neither the role of the victimiser nor the victim. Troy and Sroufe suggested that this is

because their early relationship history was characterised by consistency, warmth and

respect and they carry into a new relationship a model of themselves as worthy and

potent, (i.e. they are influenced by their IWM) which precludes their filling the role of

victim. They further suggest that these children simply do not make themselves

vulnerable and so are not faced with the threat of victimisation and may substantively

control the relationship, making it as positive an experience for themselves as possible.

Alternatively, they may choose not to engage in the relationship at all, having the

independence and confidence to recognise that there are situations in which they are

better off on their own. The authors explained that in the rare instances when a partner

does attempt to bully or intimidate them, securely attached children are generally able to

counter such attempts early in the development of the relationship. For example, they

may meet aggression with just enough aggression or force to convince a potential

victimiser that they will not be an easy target. Similarly, because their representation of

relationships is based on positive and productive interactions, they are not motivated to

victimise a less competent child. Additionally, the productiveness of their relationships

46

with children with anxious attachment histories may be constrained by the limitations of their partners; their own sense of competency is not challenged or compromised.

As studies of attachment and bullying are so few, attachment and socialisation research provides further evidence to suggest that parent-child attachment is a powerful factor in the socialisation process. For example, studies have shown that securely attached nursery children (assessed at 15 months in a Strange Situation) were more likely to be social leaders; they initiated play activities more often and were generally more sensitive to the needs of others when compared to insecurely attached children. Instead, these latter children were more socially withdrawn, more hesitant to engage other children in play activities and were less curious and less interested in learning (Waters, Wippman and Sroufe, 1979). At 11-12 years of age, this same sample of securely attached children had better social skills, showed better peer relations and were more likely to have close friends (Elicker, Englund and Sroufe, 1992). Additionally, when compared to insecurely attached children, securely attached children were better at problem solving at 2 years of age (Frankel and Bates, 1990) and engaged in more complex and creative symbolic play (Pipp, Easterbrooks and Harmon, 1992) and children who were identified as disorganised/disorientated in a Strange Situation were more aggressive and hostile in pre-school and they were more likely to be rejected by peers in primary school (Lyons-Ruth, Alpern and Repacholi, 1993). Finally, longitudinal studies have shown links between family factors associated with insecure child-parent attachment and subsequent delinquent and criminal behaviour (e.g. West and Farrington, 1977).

Temperament

There are noticeable differences in state between newborns which have been shown to

persist after birth (Bremner, 1994). For example, some infants show more activity than

others and some are more irritable than others. It has been shown that differences in

temperament have their origins before birth (Eaton and Saudino, 1992) and are not a

result of differences in parental treatment. They also appear to be quite stable over the

early months and although there is very little evidence to support it, temperament traits

are quite often considered as an early manifestation of personality.

Temperament and Attachment

There has been considerable debate over whether infant temperament is an important

factor in predicting the type of attachment that the infant will form (Bremner, 1994).

Kagan (1984) believed it was an important factor and argued that it was the infants and

not their caregivers who determined their attachment classifications. He believed that the

attachment behaviours that they displayed were actually a reflection of their own

temperament and the Strange Situation was a measure of individual differences in

infants' temperament rather than the quality of their attachment to their primary

caregiver. As cited in Shaffer (1996), the majority of young infants display one of three

temperamental profiles: *easy, difficult* and *slow to warm up*. As can be seen in Table 1.3,

the percentage of 1 year-olds who have established secure, resistant and avoidant

attachments correspond closely to the percentages of classifiable infants who fall into the

easy, difficult and slow to warm up categories. Kagan believed that this was not a

coincidence and suggested that temperamentally 'difficult' infants who resisted changes

48

in routine and who were upset by novelty may have become so distressed by the Strange

Situations procedure that they were unable to respond constructively to their mother's

comforting and were, therefore, classified as *resistant*. By contrast, a friendly, easygoing

child may have been classified as *securely* attached and a shy or *slow to warm* child may

have appeared distant or detached in the strange situation and could have been classified

as *avoidant*.

Table 1.3: Comparison of the Percentages of the Temperamental Profiles of Young Infants and their

Attachment Classifications at 1 Year of Age

(Ainsworth, Blehar ,Waters & Wall, 1978; Thomas & Chess, 1977)

Temperamental Profile	% of Infants*	Attachment Classification	% of 1-year-olds
Easy	60	**Secure**	65
Difficult	15	**Resistant**	10
Slow to Warm Up	23	**Avoidant**	20

*These percentages are based only on the 65% of young infants who clearly exhibited one of the three temperamental profiles; hence, they exclude the 35% of Thomas and Chess' sample who could not be classified.

Shaffer (1996) explains that although some components of temperament, such as

irritability and negative emotionality do predict certain attachment behaviours (e.g.

intensity of separation protests) and have some bearing on the quality of an infant's

attachments (e.g. Vaughn, Stevenson-Hinde, Waters, Kotsaftis, Lefever, Shouldice,

Trudel and Belsky, 1992) most experts view Kagan's temperament hypothesis as far too

extreme and argue that many infants are securely attached to one caregiver and are

insecurely attached to another. This pattern should not be seen if attachment

classifications were merely reflections of the child's relatively stable temperamental characteristics (e.g. Sroufe, 1985). Furthermore, Bremner (1994) suggested that, although infant temperament may affect the infant's behaviour in the strange situation, it does not affect their overall classification and Vaughn, Lefever, Seifer and Barglow (1989) found no link between temperament and attachment security. However, further studies have shown links between the two constructs, for example, Calkins and Fox (1992) showed infants' temperament at two days (measured by their response to the withdrawal of their pacifier), predicted whether these infants would be securely or insecurely attached. Furthermore, after obtaining modest relationships between temperament and attachment Vaughn, et al. (1992) claimed that there was some overlap between measures of attachment and temperament, but they concluded that the focus should be on diagnosing the relative contribution of individual and social factors in determining infants' emotional responses, rather than on establishing whether or not there is a relationship between temperament and attachment (Bremner, 1994).

Despite this controversy, the links between attachment and temperament cannot be ignored and should always be considered in any research that aims to determine the nature of emotional responses in infants.

Temperament & Bullying

As previously mentioned, Olweus (1993a) believed that the child's temperament was one of the fundamental factors of the development of an aggressive reaction pattern. He argued that a child with an active and 'hot-headed' temperament was more likely to develop into an aggressive youngster than a child with an ordinary or quieter

50

temperament. Further research by Olweus (1993b) revealed a weak temperament predicted over-protectiveness in mothers, which in turn predicted victim status and negativism in fathers predicted a lack of identification with him, which in turn predicted victim status. Both of these pathways to victim status identified boys who had difficulties in asserting themselves with other boys of their age. Smith (1991) also suggested that the temperament of a child might be an important factor in bully and victim problems. He identified the impulsiveness and quick-tempered responses of bullying children and in contrast the withdrawal and lack of assertiveness of victimised children. However, he also suggested that cognitive and social skills might play a part too. For example, there is some evidence that highly aggressive children are more likely to attribute hostile intentions to others. He also explained that bullies tend to be less empathetic to the feelings of others and view the playground as a tough place where you need to dominate or humiliate others in order not to be so treated yourself. However, very few studies of bullying have considered the temperament profiles of the children and fewer have considered both the temperamental profiles and the attachment classifications of children. This is quite surprising as links between these constructs are obvious, for example, a child with a difficult temperament could provoke less responsive care giving from his/her mother which in turn would lead to an insecure mother-child attachment relationship. It is suggested that both of these constructs must be considered, if the antecedents of bullying behaviours are to be fully understood.

2.5   Factors Unrelated to Bullying

Conversely, there are a number of family factors that have been found to be unrelated to bully and victim problems. These include overall family income, length of parental education, standard of housing, socioeconomic conditions of the family (Olweus, 1993a), parental educational level, socioeconomic status and family composition (Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius and Piha, 2000).

Additionally, Olweus (1983 and 1993) explained that there was no supporting evidence to suggest that the behaviour of aggressive boys is a consequence of poor grades or failure at school. Both bullies and victims achieve lower-than-average marks, particularly bullies in Secondary School. Furthermore, the size of the class or school appears to be of negligible importance for the relative frequency or level of bully/victim problems. Olweus explains that the common assumption that bullying occurs primarily in big-city schools is a myth. Instead, there appears to be a greater awareness of bullying problems in city schools and as there are slightly lower percentages of children who are bullied or who bully others in the city. Furthermore, it has been found that the teachers and parents from the city schools talked more often with the students involved in bully/victim problems than was the case for schools in other parts of the country.

The identification of factors unrelated to bullying is just as important as identifying the antecedents as they provide a deeper understanding of the problems and allow for the design of effective intervention strategies that can be implemented appropriately.

2.6   Intervention Strategies

The findings of research into bullying and incidences of suicide publicised by the media

have provided an impetus for some countries to tackle bullying at a national level. As a

result in the UK, intervention strategies have been designed and implemented in schools;

children's charities offer help to children experiencing bullying and the government has

passed legislation to encourage parents to help tackle the problem. All of these

approaches to reducing bullying behaviours in schools are discussed in detail below.

An extensive intervention programme was carried out in Norway by the Ministry of

Education in 1982 and the Sheffield Anti-Bullying Project (1991-1993 Smith and

colleagues) demonstrated how schools could reduce the problem of bullying using a

whole-school anti-bullying approach. Additionally, the Department for Education (DFE)

published an intervention pack in 1994, entitled *'Bullying: Don't Suffer in Silence'*, to all

schools in the UK and Sharp and Smith (1994) provided advice, guidance notes and a

framework to help all school personnel combat bullying at a very local level. The authors

highlighted a number of areas within schools for teachers to focus upon, emphasising the

whole-school approach to anti-bullying. They suggested group role-play exercises in the

classroom and changes on the playground, including changes to the environmental layout

and to the teachers' attitudes towards the Welfare Assistants. They also stressed the

importance of individual work with the children, including assertiveness training for

victims.

Since 1998, every school in the UK has been legally obliged to have an anti-bullying

policy in place and in November 2003, an anti-bullying charter was launched whereby all

53

of the schools in England were expected to sign it. The education watchdog Ofsted monitors each school's success in this area as part of the overall analysis of school performance (BBC news, 19.11.03). The charter suggests that schools should provide schoolchildren with 'safe places' to go at break-times and each school should have 'anxiety boxes' where children can make anonymous complaints. It also suggested children should be encouraged to become 'buddies' of their victimised peers, but (as mentioned previously) this does not always stop the bullying (Smith and Shu, 2000) and teacher and/or parental intervention can be more effective (Fekkes, Pijpers and Verloove-Vanhorick, 2005). However, classmate intervention is considered by victims as the least risky in terms of the possibility of the bullying getting worse and teacher intervention the most risky (Smith and Shu, 2000). Coloroso (2005) argues that one of the most effective ways to combat bullying is for bystanders to defend the victim either directly, by standing up to the bully, or indirectly, by telling a teacher or their parents (using Salmivalli et al's. definitions, Coloroso would be referring to the 'Defenders' and the 'Outsiders'). However, Coloroso admits that most children are afraid to stand up to the Bully for fear of retaliation (both immediate and later). These fears are understandable following the case of the 12-year-old girl, Shanni Naylor, who intervened when another child was being picked on and needed 30 stitches in her face after being slashed by the bully with a pencil-sharpener blade.

It is acknowledged that although children find it difficult to get help when they are being bullied, they do want to share their experiences with others who may be able to offer suggestions of help. Consequently, steps have been taken to help victims in other ways.

Children's charities in the UK (e.g. ChildLine Bullying, NCH, etc.) have expanded their web sites to provide information and advice about bullying for children, parents and teachers and some even offer 'a listening ear' to victims who need to talk to someone. The Red Balloon School in Cambridge is a secondary school that has been set up to offer a safe learning environment for pupils who have been forced to leave their regular schools because of bullying. It also ensures that these severely victimised children receive the necessary time and care that they need to recover from their experiences. As an example, most of these pupils find it very difficult to concentrate in a large class of children and so the Red Balloon School offers schooling in small groups and on a one-to-one basis if necessary. Furthermore, it offers counselling, advice on assertiveness, coping skills and confidence building during lesson time. The founder, Carrie Hebert explained that the main aim of the school was to provide a learning environment where all of the children could heal and recover from the trauma they had suffered and then go onto achieve their potential before -they either moved back into mainstream education or moved onto college with GCSE passes. She went onto explain that she was hoping to help set up similar schools in Hertfordshire, Suffolk, Norfolk, north-west London and the Eastern Counties were (GMTV, 21.11.05).

Furthermore, the BBC advertised the largest and most recent campaign against bullying in the UK. It launched an 'anti-bullying blue wristband' to coincide with the first anti-bullying week, in November 2004. The wristbands were worn by prominent children's television presenters, pop stars and sportsmen and women (e.g. Olympian Kelly Holmes, footballer Rio Ferdinand and pop star Natasha Bedingfield) who lent their voices and wore the bands to support the campaign that had been organised by over 50 childrens'

organisations. Their aim was to incite support and encouragement from schoolchildren across the UK and ultimately to reduce bullying in schools (BBC news, 04.02.05). Finally, to coincide with Bullying Awareness Week 2005, the Government passed legislation that targeted the parents of children who attack or threaten classmates, in order to make them more responsible for their children's behaviour. Minister Jaqui Smith explained that bullying would not be tolerated in schools, no matter what its motivation and children would now know of the consequences for their parents if they crossed the line. These consequences involve court-imposed parenting orders and parenting classes, with fines of up to £1,000 if they do not comply. (BBC News, 20.11.05).

Prevalence studies since 1994 have been compared with previous studies to measure the effectiveness of the intervention programs (e.g. Smith and Madsen, 1997; Eslea and Smith, 1998; Salmon, James and Smith, 1998; Smith and Shu 2000). More specifically, Salmon, James and Smith (1998) used the adapted Olweus questionnaire (as was used by Whitney and Smith, 1993) to survey two Oxfordshire Secondary schools. They found 4.2% of pupils reported being bullied 'sometimes or more often' and 3.4% of pupils reported to bully others 'sometimes or more often'. Smith and Shu (2000) explained that as the students from the study of Salmon et al. were older the approximate equivalent figures from Whitney and Smith's survey would be at least 8% for being bullied and about 6% for bullying others. Salmon et al. suggested that their results were a reflection of the effectiveness of the anti-bullying interventions in place at the two schools. Additionally, when Smith and Shu surveyed 2308 pupils aged 10-14 years, from 19 schools across England, they found a decrease in rates of reported victimisation and

bullying. Like Salmon et al., Smith and Shu suggested that these results could be attributable to the anti-bullying activity in England during the 1990s. The majority of children at schools where intervention strategies had been adopted recognised the efforts their schools had made regarding bullying and teachers in these schools reported that the work had been beneficial (Eslea and Smith, 1998) and had reduced bullying (Smith and Madsen, 1997). However, due to time and money constraints schools find it difficult to implement all of anti-bullying policies (Eslea and Smith, 1998) and even the most successful of schools have not completely eradicated their bullying problems.

2.7 Summary

Although interventions have been successfully implemented in schools in the UK and children's charities and the Government have provided further strategies to reduce bullying problems, the prevalence of bullying in schools is still far too high and its damaging effects are extensive and in some cases even fatal. Researchers are beginning to realise that the family environment and the relationships within the family could highlight other worthwhile targets for intervention, but more research is required if effective intervention strategies are to be found.

Considering that the mother-child attachment relationship is one of the most fundamental relationships a child will have, very little research has considered the links it has with bully and victim behaviours at school and it is suggested that research of this nature would be very useful. Additionally, a number of other factors would also need to be examined and considered alongside the attachment and bullying data, including the temperament of the child, the personality of the caregivers, their parenting styles and the

family background in general. This would add an extra dimension to research which would not only supply data that had not been considered before, but also it would provide a more complete representation of children involved in bullying at school.

Finally, a comprehensive study of bullying would also need to view bullying as a group process. Very few studies have considered the presence and influence of peers in bullying situations and tend to focus only on the bullies or those who are being victimised. The identification of the participant roles in bullying situations, described by Salmivalli et al., would provide the existing literature with a deeper understanding of the antecedents of the individual behaviours that are associated with bullying situations in school.

Chapter 3

RATIONAL & HYPOTHESES

RATIONALE & HYPOTHESES

This chapter explains the motives behind the research by drawing on the existing knowledge described in chapter 2.

3.1   The Aims of the Investigation

Despite the lack of research, links have been found between childrens' attachment styles and bullying (e.g. Troy & Sroufe, 1987; Turner, 1991) and the main aim of the present investigation was to explore this association further. It concentrated on the relationship between the attachment styles of pre-school children and the extent to which they participated in bullying situations twelve months later at school. Furthermore, it attempted to provide a more detailed and comprehensive picture of the antecedents of childhood bullying. This involved taking a number of measures at the same time as the children's attachment styles were assessed.

The first of these additional measures related to the childrens' temperament. This was chosen because of the potential indirect influence of temperament on attachment and because research that revealed links between temperament and attachment (e.g. Calkins and Fox, 1992) and between temperament and bullying (e.g. Smith, 1991; Olweus, 1993a and 1993b).

Additionally, parents' attachment style and personality characteristics were also assessed. These measures were considered important to the investigation for two reasons, firstly, as research had shown an intergenerational transmission of attachment type (e.g. Farrington,

1993; Van IJzendoorn, Duffer and Duyvesteyn, 1995) and had implied an intergenerational 'cycle of violence' (e.g. Hazler, 1996; Smith and Myron-Wilson, 1998), these measures were to be compared with the childrens' attachment styles and temperaments. Furthermore, this information would also be useful when examining the childrens' family backgrounds. The intention was to combine this data with information relating to parenting styles, family environment and family functioning, as all of these factors had been associated with childrens' bullying behaviours in one way or another. For example, poor family functioning and parenting styles had been seen as strong influences on competence with peers (Lieberman, 1977) and on bullying and victimisation behaviours seen in school (Rigby, 1993; Bowers, Smith and Binney, 1994; Hazler, 1996; Baldry and Farrington, 1998; Duncan, 1999). Furthermore, children who became involved in bullying had been found to have over-controlling or dominating parents (Manning, Heron & Marshall, 1978). The assessment of the parenting styles also included questions about parental methods of discipline and reward systems. This was included because studies had found a relationship between children who were aggressive towards others and inconsistent or aversive discipline techniques involving physical punishment (e.g. Loeber & Dishion, 1984; Schwartz et al., 1997). In addition, the nature of the relationship between the primary caregiver and the child was also assessed and would be assessed throughout the study, so that changes in response could be used as an indicator of other changes in the childrens' behaviour.

The questionnaire also asked about the primary caregiver's occupation. This information was considered as important because research had found children of working mothers tended to enjoy higher self-esteem and be more independent (e.g. Hoffman, 1989) and

would therefore react differently with peers than children with lower self-esteem who were still quite dependent on their mothers.

The childrens' experience of major life events was also assessed throughout the study (e.g. death of a close family member, divorce etc.) as it was believed that fundamental changes in a child's life could have an affect on their behaviour at school. For example, it had been found that children who frequently witnessed conflicts, discord and open arguments between parents felt more insecure (Bowers, Smith and Binney, 1994) and pre-school exposure to violence and marital conflict significantly predicted peer nominations of bullying at age 8-9 years (Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit and Bates, 1997).

As the study was ultimately concerned with the mother-child attachment relationship, it was considered important to identify any probable influences on that relationship. Therefore, all primary caregivers were asked if they had suffered from postpartum depression following the birth of their child. This information was considered important as research had shown postpartum depression to be associated with negative affects on children's mental and motor development (Cohn, Campbell, Matias and Hopkins, 1986). Furthermore, comparisons could be made between this data and the child's and the primary caregiver's attachment data, as it was believed that these factors could affect the child's attachment relationship and therefore, have an affect on their relationships with peers (Troy and Sroufe, 1987).

In addition, details regarding the childrens' siblings and their birth order were obtained at this time. This information was regarded as relevant to the research because it had been found that bullies tended to have negative relationships with their siblings (Bowers, Smith and Binney, 1994) and Smith and Myron-Wilson (1998) suggested that family

experiences involving powerful, intimidating and/or overprotective siblings might form a basis for similar behaviour in school. Furthermore, evidence suggests that later-born children tend to be more popular on average than firstborns (Miller and Maruyama, 1976) and older siblings who tend to use their greater power to dominate a younger brother of sister may replicate this behaviour at school (Berndt and Bulleit, 1985).

Another fundamental aim of the investigation was to examine the participant roles in bullying situations (Salmivalli et al., 1996). The intention was to study bullying as a group process with much younger children than had been studied previously and planned to make observations of the behaviour as it occurred. For reliability purposes, three measures of bullying were taken and a triangulation method was adopted to provide a comprehensive representation of the bullying behaviours found in reception class children.

Finally, the ultimate aim behind the research was to highlight routes of intervention that could significantly reduce the behaviours that contribute to bullying in schools. It was believed, that if links were found between children's attachment styles and the roles they adopt in bullying situations, then one route for intervention would have been identified. Furthermore, if an intergenerational transmission of attachment style were found, then it could be argued that intervention could also involve the caregivers. Additionally, with its unusual case study approach to assessing the antecedents of bullying behaviour at school, the present investigation would provide a deeper understanding of the effects that family relationships can have on bullying behaviours found in schools.

3.2   Hypotheses

Based on the findings of Troy and Sroufe (1987) and Turner (1991), it was predicted that the analysis of the children's participant roles in bullying episodes at school, when compared to their attachment styles, would reveal bullies and victims as being more likely to have insecure attachments than the other children. The analysis of the attachment styles of the other four participants' roles would be of an exploratory nature. Additionally, and based on previous findings, it was expected that the analysis of the participant roles data and the details from the case studies would reveal that bullies would have a more negative attitude about going to school than non-victims. However, they would have a more positive attitude about attending school than the victims did (e.g. Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a and 1996g; Bernstein and Watson, 1997). They would be more likely to have less friends than the non-victims (Rigby, 2000), but would be likely to have more friends than the victims did (Boulton and Underwood, 1992; Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a). It was also predicted that the comparisons made between the teacher and parent reports of bullying would be very similar and the results of the observations would add detail to these findings, including the very important information relating to the other participants' roles found in bullying situations (i.e. Defenders, Outsiders, Assistants and Reinforcers).

Based on the findings of research that had revealed links between temperament and attachment (e.g. Calkins and Fox, 1992) it was predicted that associations between the childrens' attachment styles and their temperament types would be revealed. For example, it expected that children with insecure attachments to their primary caregivers

would have difficult temperaments and children with secure attachments to their primary caregivers would have easy temperaments. During this stage of the analysis, the caregivers' personality dimensions, their parenting styles and the family backgrounds would be explored and compared with the childrens' attachment styles and temperament types using a qualitative, case study approach. Additionally, based on the research findings where an intergenerational transmission of attachment type had been identified (e.g. Van IJzendoorn, Duffer and Duyvesteyn, 1995) it was predicted that that primary caregivers with insecure attachment styles would have children with insecure attachment styles and primary caregivers with secure attachment styles would have children with secure attachment styles.

Chapter 4

METHODOLOGY

METHODOLOGY

This longitudinal investigation adopted a mixed methods design to obtain a deeper insight into the backgrounds and relationships of children involved in bullying. The use of questionnaires and interviews completed by the childrens' primary caregivers and observations taken in the classroom during periods of free play and on the playground during the lunch-playtime allowed the advantages of each method to be harnessed, whilst addressing and counteracting their disadvantages, and therefore, enhancing the reliability and validity of the research evidence.

4.1 Mixed Methods Design

Qualitative research provides a depth and richness of insight that quantitative cannot and is considered by some researchers (e.g. La Fontaine, 1991) as an important and necessary complement to quantitative research. Torrance (2000) explained that research has started to focus on addressing bullying rather than simply studying its existence. She believed that to develop an in-depth understanding of bullying within a social setting, a greater emphasis needed to be placed on qualitative research, especially if findings were to lead the development of effective intervention strategies. However, qualitative research concerning bullying is scarce.

4.1.1 Questionnaires and Structured Interviews

Questionnaires and structured interviews offer similar advantages when used in research. They are objective, can be used with a larger sample and are relatively inexpensive

methods when compared to qualitative methods. Furthermore, the imposed structure

provides mainly quantitative data which can be analysed statistically.

Questionnaires have additional advantages, they allow a lot of data to be collected very

quickly and can be organised in such a way that the important items can be hidden. For

example, some teachers do not accept that bullying occurs in their school and would not

receive a questionnaire about the topic well. However, they may be happier to complete a

questionnaire that appeared to focus on childrens' behaviour in general and may gladly

answer the 'hidden' items, relating to bullying. There are disadvantages to this technique.

It is very difficult to get a truly representative of the entire population of interest as not

everyone who is asked to complete a survey will agree to do so. Those who do volunteer

to complete the questionnaire may be different from non-volunteers. They may be more

interested in a topic or have stronger opinions on the topic. Consequently, if the opinions

of volunteers are different from those of the population they are supposed to represent,

this introduces a source of error into the research. This source of error is referred to as

volunteer bias. Another source of bias or error comes from the natural tendency that

people have to describe themselves as being better than they actually are. When people

are asked to rate themselves as below average, average, or above average on desirable

traits, the average person has been shown to rate himself or herself as "above average"

and this source of error is referred to as *self-report bias*.

The structured interview technique provides realistic answers that can be moulded to suit

the individual, situation and content. They can provide richer fuller information (with the

use of some open-ended questions) and the interviewee may feel more relaxed and not under any pressure of assessment. However, there are disadvantages to this method. Interviews without structure can be unsystematic and can provide different information from different participants, they can be difficult to analyse as a variety of information may have been gathered and they can be influenced by interpersonal variables and have low reliability and generalisability.

With respect to bullying research, Crothers and Levinson (2004) explained that teacher ratings (gained by interview or questionnaire) were valuable in identifying bullies and victims, however other researchers believe that teachers may grossly underestimate the amount of bullying that actually takes place at school. Despite the findings that peers and teachers reports of bullying have been found to correlate well, the authors suggest that teacher questionnaires are best used in conjunction with interviews and observations.

4.1.2   Observations

Observation consists of watching and recording behaviour and interactions as they occur. There is no attempt to participate as a member of the group or setting, although there will usually be some negotiation regarding the access to the setting and the terms of research activity. The observer watches the course of interaction, taking care not to disturb the behaviour of the participants. However, it very difficult for observers not to make some impact on the observations and so it is necessary that observers maintain self-awareness about how they impact the environment they are researching and to take account of it in their data collection. Audio-visual recordings can be taken (as discretely as possible), but note-taking is essential where recording equipment will disturb the observed behaviour.

The observer must record as much factual information as possible and capture an insider view of the setting. The more common, general observation technique is to write objective notes and code them afterwards. The observer must 'blend into the background' so that his or her presence as an outsider has no direct effect on the phenomena under study. Observational techniques, a form of naturalistic inquiry, allow investigation of phenomena in their naturally occurring settings. They can be used to collect in-depth information providing detailed, rich insights. Observational techniques are also useful when one has to observe a situation about which there is little knowledge. When properly employed as a non-intrusive technique, observation can be used to observe the spontaneous behaviour of populations who are reluctant to complete questionnaires or who are unable to or provide reliable information. Observational techniques can serve to reveal the discrepancy between other methods, they allow data to be gathered in difficult situations where other survey techniques cannot be used and they can capture unexpected data which other methods could miss.

Time, point and event sampling methods can be used to make observations easier and more reliable when it it not possible or appropriate to record complete sequences of behaviour and interaction using a video (Coolican, 1994). If an observation session has to be observed 'live' and only one or two observers are available, time sampling techniques can be useful. For example, each observation of an individual may be made for several short periods within the session. A time limit would be set for each observation and kept to with the use of a stop watch. If a number of individuals were to be observed within the session, it may also be appropriate to randomise the order of the observations to control observer bias (i.e. observing 'interesting' individuals too often or when they perform the

70

desired behaviour). Point sampling involves observing an individual in a group just long enough to record the category of their current behaviour before going onto the next person in the group. In event sampling observations are made of a specific event each time it occurs and which is operationally defined for the research in progress.

There are disadvantages to this method. The technique is time-consuming and generates a lot of data that requires detailed processing and analysis, making it an expensive method. However, the use of structured observational frameworks can help to overcome this limitation, and permit data to be aggregated or corroborated and generalisations made. The technique also requires considerable skill on the part of the researcher to absorb and reflect accurately the behaviour of the key participants, and it may take time for the researcher to 'blend into the background' before the participants to behave in a normal way. Furthermore, the reliability of the observation depends on the experience of the observer and inter-rater reliability checks help to increase the reliability of the findings. Generalisation of findings is difficult and as the observer has relatively little control over the behavior and the environment, they may not be aware of all of the factors that are affecting behavior. Therefore, care must be taken not to draw incorrect conclusion.

With respect to bullying research, Crothers and Levinson (2004) explained that the simplest method of assessing bullying was the unstructured observation and that the most functional observations took place where bullying behaviours were known to occur most often (e.g. the playground, the lunchroom, school bus). They believed that direct observational methods were useful in providing unbiased analyses of focal participants' behaviour in certain circumstances and methods were most objective when definitions were clearly articulated and inter-rater reliability was established. These authors also

71

explained that this method could yield significant information about participants, settings,

forms and frequency of bullying. However, they warned that these measures may not

measure the true prevalence and magnitude of the problem as bullying is so often covert.

4.1.3   Case Study Method

The case study method is a generic method that involves the collection, interpretation and

comparison of data. It involves an in-depth study of one individual or a small number of

individuals and typically involves interviews with the person, their friends and family and

biographical research. Psychological tests or measures may also be used to gain further

information about the individual or individuals in the study and where the participants are

young, observations may play a large part in the collection of information. The case study

method allows psychologists to research individuals who are unique in some way, where

there might not be enough people in the group to use other forms of research and where

there more knowledge about a topic is required to devise different research methods.

Case studies provide rich data and provide an avenue of enquiry that other methods

cannot. The case study approach has its disadvantages. There is a high degree of

unreliability involved with case studies, they are unreplicable and the findings may not be

generalisable. However, Bromley (1986) has argued that case studies are 'the bedrock of

scientific investigation'. He argues that many psychological studies are difficult to

replicate and that case studies can highlight the interesting, unpredictable cases which

spur changes in paradigm and theoretical innovation (Coolican 1994). Furthermore, the

reliability of case studies can be checked by comparing information gained from different

sources. This is similar to the method of *triangulation* whereby different methods are

used to research the same issue (e.g. interview data, observational data and questionnaire

data that have measured the same behaviours). By cross-checking one result against

another the reliability of the result is increased and contradictory results often highlight

issues to be addressed.

4.2 The Measures of the Investigation

Most of the measures used in the present study were established questionnaires and

exercises to be completed by the primary caregiver (i.e. the childrens' attachment and

temperament measures and the adult attachment and personality measures). Additionally,

structured face-to-face and telephone interviews were designed for the primary caregivers

to provide the family background data.

It was considered very important that the initial assessment should took place before the

children experienced the major event of starting school, before they met their new peer

group and, obviously, before any bullying behaviours could begin to occur between them.

This was done to ensure that these experiences could not confound the measurements

taken of their personal characteristics. The assessment of intergenerational transmission

of attachment type between the parents and their children involved a comparison of the

results of the child attachment measure and the adult attachment measures, which were

the established questionnaires (as previously discussed). Furthermore, records of the

childrens' family conditions, including their adjustment to starting school were taken two

weeks after they had attended school full-time and again at the end of the study. These

measures were taken during telephone interviews with the primary caregivers that had

been designed specifically for this study.

Additionally, bullying behaviour was measured using three methods (i.e. observations, parent reports and teacher reports) and these took place during the children's first year at school. The first set of observations took place after the children had attended school full-time for two weeks. This allowed the children time to realise that they would have to attend school every day, it gave them time to settle into the routine of school and to get to know their peers better and form new friendships. These observations took place in the classroom during periods of free play. The second set of observations took place towards the end of the childrens' first year at school and as visual and audio recording equipment was considered as intrusive and inappropriate, purely factual and descriptive narratives were written during both sets of observations. These were transcribed and then coded to identify the participant bullying roles (please note that for reliability purposes, the coding process involved at least two independent raters, see page 138 for further details). For example, a focal child was highlighted as a potential bully if, during the minute of observation, they started to harass or attack another child (by shoving, hitting, calling him/her names, making jokes of him/her, leaving him/her outside the group, taking his/her things, or any other behaviour meant to hurt him/her). A focal child was highlighted as a potential victim if, during the minute of observation, they were exposed repeatedly to harassment and attacks from one or several other children. A focal child was highlighted as a potential reinforcer if, during the minute of observation, they provided support and encouragement for the bully (they did not need to actually bully the victim directly, but could invite others to come and watch the bullying episode). A focal

74

child was highlighted as a potential assistant if, during the minute of observation, they joined in the bullying that someone else started (they could have assisted the bully by catching or holding the victim whilst he/she is harassed). A focal child was highlighted as a potential defender if, during the minute of observation, they tried to stop the bully or the others from bullying the victim. A defender may try to arbitrate the differences by talking and may involve others or an adult in order to stop the bullying episode. They may encourage the victim to seek help from an adult and they will comfort the Victim after an episode of bullying and they may even take revenge on the bully themselves. Finally, a focal child was highlighted as a potential outsider if, during the minute of observation, they did not get involved in the bullying episode. These children may pretend not to notice what was happening or they may just not take sides with anyone, but ultimately they do not do anything about it either. The parents were asked about bullying behaviour during the final telephone interview and the teachers' measure of bullying was an established questionnaire. These measures were administered at the end of the second set of observations and they identified whether the focal child had been picked or had picked on other children. The results of the observations and the parent and teacher questionnaires were collated in such a way that those children identified with a participant role were highlighted and the number of times they were identified in a particular role was recorded. Using a case study approach, this information was compared to the information gained in the baseline assessment and with the updated information gained from the telephone interviews to investigate potential risk factors and antecedents of the bullying behaviours.

Chapter 5

METHOD

METHOD

This extended Method chapter describes the techniques and measures used in the investigation and it provides the rationale behind them. Furthermore, it follows the chronological order of the study to provide an insight into how the research developed and evolved. Ultimately, the research included three phases: Phase One was primarily concerned with obtaining a Preschool Assessment of the children and their families; Phase Two concentrated on how the children had adjusted to starting school; and Phase Three focused on identifying bullying behaviours using observations on the playground, parental reports and teacher reports. These phases are discussed in detail below and are summarised at the end of the chapter.

5.1   Design of the Research

5.1.1   Initial Ideas

As the objectives of the research were being laid down, it became apparent that if inferences of causality were to be drawn from the findings, then the possible influences and antecedents of bullying behaviours had to be assessed before the bullying behaviour began. Additionally, with her emphasis on the power of peers, Harris (1998) provided an impetus for the study to include a Preschool Assessment that occurred before the children had even met. This was done to ensure that the influence of child's new classmates could not affect the data and that the findings were evidence of personal characteristics and family factors.

Furthermore, research had found that the transition from preschool to Kindergarten/Reception class was a more positive experience for those children who moved into a class with a larger proportion of familiar peers, especially if they already had existing friendships with these children in their new class (Ladd and Price, 1987; Ladd, 1990). Therefore, as there was a possibility that the data collected at school could be affected by relationships previously formed at preschool/nursery, this transition was examined more closely at the local schools. It was found that some of the schools had definite pre-school and/or nursery facilities attached, some had strong links a local pre-school and some did not have any links with pre-schools at all. Furthermore, children did not necessarily move from their pre-school to the attached or the linked school. Parents would choose which school they would prefer to send their child (regardless of the pre-school the child had attended) and they would apply. It was acknowledged that some families had even moved house to get their child into the school of their choice. Subsequently, it was found that Reception classes tended to have a large proportion of children who had attended pre-school and/or nursery together and a smaller proportion of the children who either knew one or two children or knew none of the children who would be in their new class.

The present investigation attempted to control this variable and explored a number of options. The first considered studying children at a pre-school, assessing all of these children there, following them to their new schools and then continuing the research on the bullying behaviours adopted by those children during their reception year. However, time constraints and problems relating to the fact that children could move to any school

78

in or out of the area of the pre-school marred this route for the research. The second option considered identifying the children who would start at a particular school in September 2001 and beginning the research at each of their pre-schools. However, following the initial Head teacher interview (discussed in more detail later), it became obvious that this would be an impossible task, as the local education authority advised its schools in of the September intake in the May before. Therefore, this option revealed problems with time limits and problems regarding the identification the children's pre-schools due to the Data Protection Act.

Consequently, it was decided that the research would identify all of the children who were to start their schooling at a chosen school in September 2001. This school would not have a pre-school or a nursery attached, to make sure that some children did not start school with more friends and acquaintances than others. The research involving these children would begin during the summer of 2001, before the children started school and before they had the chance to start any new relationships with their classmates. It would initially involve a Preschool Assessment of all possible influences and antecedents of bullying behaviours (e.g. children's personal characteristics and their family backgrounds, their parents' personal characteristics and their parenting styles).

It was also at this point in the design of the study that a longitudinal design was considered most favourable and it was decided that the bullying behaviours of children would be measured during their time in the Reception class of infant school. It was believed that this would not only allow a Preschool Assessment to be arranged before the

children had met each other, but it would also (following the findings of previous research, e.g. Whitney and Smith, 1993; Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a) ensure that bullying behaviours would be prolific. Furthermore, if Perry, Perry and Boldizar's (1990) arguments were correct, this early stage of group formation would elicit aggressive behaviours from aggressive children toward a variety of other children and once these aggressive children learned to recognize victims' reactions, they would focus their attacks on increasingly narrow range of peers (i.e. those children who reinforce aggressive behaviours).

Initially, an informal interview was conducted with a Head teacher from a primary school that would not be able to take part in the investigation. It involved a discussion of the ideas surrounding the research and contained questions regarding the recruitment and induction of reception class children. The interview provided very useful information that subsequently shaped the recruitment process of the research. For example, it was acknowledged that bullying is a sensitive topic for many schools and they often believe that bullying behaviour does not occur at their school or that it occurs infrequently and they have dealt with the incidences. Therefore, the word 'bullying' was avoided in all interviews and conversations with school personnel and parents. Instead, the term 'negative interaction' was used. Additionally, the Head teacher explained that primary schools are informed of their September intake by the local Education Authority and that popular schools may not actually receive this information until the final term of the school year. Consequently, the primary schools that were involved in the research were contacted during the half term before the summer holiday of 2001. Finally, the Head

teacher explained that due to the Data Protection Act, it would not be possible to contact the parents of new starters directly and that introductory correspondence about the research would have to be issued through the school. The Head teacher also warned that in her experience the response rate from these parents was usually very poor. This interview had a significant impact upon the recruitment process of the research. It not only affected the format of the Head teacher interviews and the correspondence to the parents, but it also led to a re-think regarding the participants.

The original plan to involve just one school in the investigation (and to analyse all peer interactions within its Reception class) had to be changed. It was decided that more schools needed to be invited to take part in the research just in case the response from parents was poor. Furthermore, (as previously discussed) as the research only wanted to include children who had not started to form relationships with each other, only schools that did not have a nursery or pre-school facilities attached were considered. Consequently, three schools in the South Ribble area of Preston were contacted and interviews with the Head teachers were arranged. The possibility of including schools from other areas of Lancashire was considered, however, it was becoming increasingly apparent that the time and distance between the schools could be a very important issue if observations of the children were to occur and so including schools from further afield was avoided. (The observations are discussed further later).

5.1.2 Head Teacher Interviews

Interviews with three Head teachers took place, each following the same structured

format. The interviews opened with a brief description of the investigation and Head teachers were shown a letter from the University's Ethics Committee granting approval for the research. The proposed Preschool Assessment and the two subsequent assessments were described briefly to the Head teachers and was clarified that the first re-assessment would involve observations of the children as they were left for the first time by their caregiver(s) on their very first day at school. Additionally, the head teachers were told that parents and teachers would be asked about how the children had adjusted to starting school and that the second re-assessment would take place after the Christmas holidays. Furthermore, it was explained that it would be necessary to observe the children during free-play in the classroom and on the playground.

The proposed dates for the completion of each of the assessments were provided to illustrate the time scale of the research and the Programme of Research was given to the Head teachers at the end of the interview for future reference. Questions regarding the research were answered and permission to conduct the research at the school was obtained. All three of the Head teachers interviewed were keen to be involved in the study and agreed to issue letters to the parents of the children who were due to start school in September. They provided their signatures as proof of their consent and additional details were then ascertained (e.g., the names of the Reception class teachers, the number of children expected in the September intake and details regarding induction days and official visits for the new children). All of this information was recorded on the Head Teacher Interview Guide (refer to Appendix 1 for a complete guide to the interview and Appendix 2 shows the Program of Research that was referred to in the interview and given to the Head teacher for future reference at the end. Please note that the actual

programme of research was modified from the one outlined to the Head teachers at this time).

5.1.3 Recruitment

The original intention was for the Preschool Assessments to commence in May 2001. However, the local County Council did not make the information about September intakes available until late in May. Nevertheless, as soon as the September intakes were known at the target schools the preparation for the Preschool Assessment began. This took place in June 2001 and involved the issue of a batch letters and pre-paid envelopes to the parents of the September intake. A covering letter thanked the Head teacher for agreeing to take part in the research and contained contact telephone numbers and proof of the University's involvement in the research (refer to Appendix 3 for this covering letter addressed to the Head teachers).

The letters addressed to the parents of the children of the September intake gave a very brief description of the study and highlighted the Head teacher's consent to be involved in the research. The need for parental involvement was stressed and parents were asked to complete and detach the bottom section of the letter and return it to school in the envelope provided before the last day of the summer term (refer to Appendix 4 for an example of the Parents' Introductory Letter). It was understood that this method would present a self-selecting sample, but with the time constraints and the controls presented by the Data Protection Act, there did not seem to be any other option at this time.

5.1.4 Response

Of the 109 parents' letters that were given to the three schools, only 29 'cut off slips' from the bottom of the letters were returned to the schools. However, all of the slips received indicated that the parents would like to take part in the research.

5.1.5 Telephone Briefing

Parents were contacted by telephone immediately and the telephone conversations followed a structured format. It was explained that the research was concerned with family interactions and the social adjustment of children in Reception class. Parents were advised that if they were to volunteer to take part in the research they would need to answer questions about themselves, their family and in particular their child who was about to start school. It was further explained that it would be necessary to observe their child at school during the reception year. Assurance was given that the observations would not disrupt the child's learning and confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed.

Parents were then asked if they would like to be involved in the research. All parents agreed to take part and individual interviews were arranged to take place in the home environment during the last two weeks of August 2001. Parents were advised that they could withdraw from the research at any time and they were thanked for their time and for agreeing to take part in the research. (Appendix 5 provides a complete guide to this Telephone Briefing. Appendix 6 shows the checklist used throughout the research which was specifically designed to hold the personal details taken from this telephone conversation, e.g., the child's name, address, and the time and date of the interview).

From the parents' reactions to their involvement in the research, it was obvious that they were happy to be involved in a Preschool Assessment, but as long as it did not take up too much of their time. Therefore, small changes were made, for example, a few items from the Caregiver Questionnaire were removed to make its completion quicker. This questionnaire had been designed specifically for the research and is discussed in more detail later. Additionally, the simplest Adult Attachment Measure was chosen for the study. This was an established questionnaire and is discussed in more detail later. Furthermore, the original intention had been for the researcher to complete the exercises with the primary caregiver. However, additional paperwork and guidance notes were created to allow the primary caregivers to complete the exercises without the presence of the researcher. It was believed that not only would this shorten the Preschool Assessment interview, but it would ensure that the completion of the measures would not be rushed, thus avoiding mistakes and fatigue effects.

5.2   Phase One - Preschool Assessment

5.2.1   Participants

The main participants of the first phase of the study were 28 children who were about to enter their first year of formal schooling. Their ages ranged between 3 years 11 months and 4 years 11 months. The caregivers of these children also participated and their ages ranged between 26 and 53 years. Of the 28 primary caregivers, 27 were the children's birth mothers and there was one paternal grandmother.

5.2.2 Parents' Interviews

All of the home interviews were conducted during the last two weeks of August 2001 and were completed before the children attended school for the first time. It was considered important that all of the Preschool Assessment s occurred at, relatively, the same time, so that possible seasonal, environmental and media influences would be similar for all participants. Furthermore, any possible interference to the data due to the parents discussing the interviews amongst themselves was avoided and although this possibility was already slight, as there was no reason other than proximity that these parents would already know each other, every effort was made to avoid such influences on the data.

Briefing Exercise

The interviews followed a structured format and began with a briefing that thanked caregivers for allowing the meeting to take place in their home. The research was discussed in a little more detail and the nature and extent of the parents' involvement was explained. The Programme of Research was again used as a guide by the interviewer, however parents were not given a copy to keep (refer to Appendix 2 for a copy of the Programme of Research. Please note that the actual programme of research was modified from the one outlined to the parents at this time). Confidentiality and anonymity were guaranteed and it was further stressed that the research conducted in school would not disrupt the children's learning or socialisation. (Refer to Appendix 7 for further details regarding the Briefing Exercise. Please note that the last three points of Appendix 7 were discussed towards the end of the Interview and will be referred to later in the section entitled 'The End of the Briefing Exercise').

Contract Letter

The Caregivers were then asked if they would like to participate in the research and only one parent decided not to participate in the study for personal reasons. All volunteers were given the Contract Letter to sign and this letter was then cut in half. The top half of the letter was for the parents to keep as it provided them with a signed contract from the researcher. It also provided them with contact telephone numbers and it re-emphasised commitment to confidentiality and anonymity. The bottom half of the letter, containing the parents' signatures and was kept by the interviewer. (Refer to Appendix 8 for a copy of the Contract Letter).

5.2.3   Caregiver's Questionnaire

Each child's primary caregiver was then interviewed using the Caregiver's Questionnaire, which was specifically designed for the study. The aim of the questionnaire was to keep all of the interviews similar and to obtain details regarding the child's family background (refer to Appendix 9). Overall, it contained thirty questions that were considered vital to the research and they were organised in such a way that the information could be ascertained in a conversation and they were specifically phrased to avoid ambiguity. Once the child's name was known, it was always used in the questions to ensure a personal approach was maintained and most questions had fixed choice answers (e.g. *How would you describe the birth of [this child]? – Easy, Normal* or *Difficult*) or Likert-type scales were provided (e.g. *How often is [the child] naughty when in your care? – Always, Most of the Time, Half of the Time, Sometimes or Never*). The only open-ended questions in the questionnaire were those which required personal

responses from the caregiver and no 'leading' from the researcher (e.g. *How do you deal with [this child's] good behaviour?* and *Please give details of this major life event experienced by [your child]*).

More specifically, the caregiver's questionnaire identified the primary caregiver of the child (in most cases the primary caregiver was the child's biological mother) and it asked for the dates of birth of the primary caregiver and of the children in the family. This information would be used later to determine any birth order effects. It asked about the child's experience of major life events (e.g. divorce or death of a family member) and where applicable it asked for further details regarding the child's reaction to this major life event. This information was considered necessary as experiences such as a divorce, the birth of a younger sibling or the death of a close family member could affect the child's adjustment to starting school and their behaviour with new friends.

The questionnaire also asked about the child's daycare arrangements, the child's experience with the new school and the child's attitude towards starting school in September. Furthermore, the primary caregiver was asked about the nature of the relationship between the child and his/her biological mother. (In most cases, the primary caregiver was actually the child's biological mother). This was ascertained using a few simple questions and a three-point scale (i.e. Easy, Normal, and Difficult). The first question asked for a description of the birth of the child, the second question asked for a description of the first 6 months of the child's life and the third question asked for a description of the primary caregivers' current relationship with the child. An additional question asked if the biological mother had suffered from post-natal depression following the birth of the child. The primary caregiver's reward systems and methods of discipline

were also examined by the questionnaire. Caregivers were asked to provide examples of what they considered 'good behaviour' and then were asked to rate how often the child displayed good behaviour whilst in their care, using a five-point scale (i.e. Always, Most of the time, Half of the time, Sometimes and Never). The questionnaire went on to ask caregivers to provide examples of what they considered 'bad behaviour' and asked them to rate how often the child displayed bad behaviour whilst in their care, using the same five-point scale. This information was considered to be a measure of discipline and gave an insight into the parenting styles adopted by the caregivers, in particular the primary caregiver. Finally, the questionnaire focused on the children who were no longer living with one or both biological parents. The age of the child at the time of the separation was documented and the custody arrangements and visitation rights of non-custodial parents were discussed (refer to Appendix 9 for further details on the Caregiver Questionnaire).

Exercises for the Caregivers

It was then explained to the parents that there would be four exercises for them to complete which could take about half an hour. They were asked if they would prefer to complete the exercises immediately with the interviewer present. All parents wanted to complete the exercises in their own time and promised to contact the interviewer if they needed assistance.

General guidelines regarding the exercises were provided (refer to Appendix 10 for a copy of the Information for Caregivers regarding the Exercises). This information was explained verbally and then presented in a written format for reference later. The guidelines explained that the exercises would look at their behaviour and the behaviour of

their child and stressed the necessity of making judgements that were based on their most recent and current behaviour (over the last 4 to 6 weeks). They were also asked to judge each statement independently without trying to present a consistent picture of themselves or of their child. Furthermore, it was emphasised that there were no right or wrong answers and that they should try to make their judgements quite quickly. Caregivers were asked to use extreme ratings on questionnaires where appropriate and avoid rating near the middle of the scale. They were advised to skip any statements that they had difficulties with and go back to them at the end of the exercise. They were also asked to make sure that they had rated every statement. If they found themselves unable to judge a statement (because of a lack of information or because it did not seem to apply) they were asked to circle the number of the statement to show that they had not missed it in error and to make a comment explaining the problem. The primary caregivers were asked to complete the exercises at different times and not straight after each other (to avoid effects of fatigue and boredom).

Copies of the other measurements were then given to the caregiver. These had been designed by other authors and included an Attachment Measure for Adults (Hazan and Shaver, 1987); The Interpersonal Adjective Scale That Includes the Big Five Dimensions of Personality (Trapnell and Wiggins, 1990); The Measurement of Temperament in 3 to 7 year old Children (McDevitt and Carey, 1975) and the Attachment Behaviour Q-Sort Exercise (Waters, 1989). In most instances, only one caregiver was present at the interview (usually the primary caregiver), but adult attachment and adult personality measures were left for completion by all of the child's significant caregivers. As

intergenerational continuity of attachment was to be examined in the analysis, it was considered important that all attachment relationships with the child were identified (Schaffer and Emerson, 1964).

Each questionnaire was explained to the caregivers until the researcher believed they totally understood what was required of them and it was stressed that it was very important that only the primary caregiver was to complete the child's temperament questionnaire and the attachment Q-sort exercise. Furthermore, to avoid boredom and fatigue effects, it was suggested to the primary caregivers that they completed the measures at different times, especially the child's temperament questionnaire and the attachment Q-sort exercise. This was also suggested to deter the primary caregiver from deliberately trying to provide the same answers in both measures, as some of the items were similar.

5.2.4 Adult Attachment Measure

In order to assess the intergenerational transmission of attachment security between the caregivers and the child an adult attachment measure was included in the Preschool Assessment. Originally, the investigation had planned to include the Adult Attachment Interview (George, Kaplan and Main, 1985; 1987; 1996), however, after careful appraisal this method was considered too costly and too time consuming in researcher training and administration. Furthermore, this very clinical interview would provide excessive amounts of information, superfluous to such a minor part of the present study. The dimensional measures of adult attachment available were also considered, however, some

had received criticism regarding their internal reliability (e.g. The Attachment Style Measure by Simpson, 1990 and The Measure of Attachment Qualities by Carver, 1997). Others had been criticized for being based on conventional (rather than empirical) factors (e.g. The Relationship Scales Questionnaire by Griffin and Bartholomew, 1994 and The Attachment Style Prototypes by Levy and Davis, 1988) or for having a relatively large number of individual items (e.g. The 10 Item Attachment Scales by Brennan, Shaver and Hazan, 1989).

It was decided that a simple categorical measure would be more appropriate for the present study. Bartholomew and Horowitz's (1991) Relationship Questionnaire was evaluated and it was found that it had an advantage in that it measured the two theoretical dimensions of avoidance and anxiety. However, it had proven a less popular measure in the literature and Garbarino (1998) noted that low reliabilities had been reported for this measure. Therefore, it was finally decided that the three category measure - The Adult Attachment Questionnaire by Hazan and Shaver (1987) would be used for ease and speed during the Preschool Assessment. Even though the authors had not provided reliability co-efficients, they had performed a test re-test experiment involving younger and older participants and as the measure is well established and widely used it was considered reliable for the purposes of the present investigation.

Copies of this measure (refer to Appendix 11) were left for all of the child's significant caregivers to complete. This usually included just the child's Father, but in a few cases, extra copies were left for completion by the child's Mother, Grandmother or Nanny. This

exercise provided three statements and caregivers were asked to indicate which statement best described their feelings. The three statements were as follows:

(1) *I find it relatively easy to get close to others and am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't often worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to me.*

(2) *I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others; I find it difficult to trust them completely, difficult to allow myself to depend on them. I am nervous when anyone gets too close, and often, love partners want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.*

(3) *I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me or won't want to stay with me. I want to get very close to my partner and this desire sometimes scares people away.*

Defining the Categories

The three categories of the Adult Attachment Questionnaire were very easy to define: if a respondent had indicated that the first statement best described their feelings they were coded as SECURE; if a respondent had indicated that the second statement best described their feelings they were coded as AVOIDANT; and if they had indicated that the third statement best described their feelings they were coded as ANXIOUS/AMBIVALENT.

5.2.5   Adult Personality Measure

The present investigation required a measure that focused upon the five main areas of personality: **Neuroticism** that included anxiety, hostility, depression, self-consciousness, impulsiveness and vulnerability; **Extraversion** that included warmth, gregariousness, assertiveness, activity, excitement-seeking and positive emotions; **Openness to Experience** that included fantasy, aesthetics, feelings, actions, ideas and values; **Agreeableness** that included trust, modesty, compliance, altruism, straightforwardness and tender-mindedness; and **Conscientiousness** that included competence, self-discipline, achievement-striving, dutifulness, order and deliberation. Although it was found that many different measures were available that included the 'Big-5' it soon became apparent that most of the questionnaire type measures were too costly and would be far too time consuming in the Preschool Assessment   (e.g. The NEO Five-Factor Inventory by Costa and McCrae, 1992 and The Personality Research Form by Jackson, 1997). Therefore, the present investigation decided to avoid large personality questionnaires as they would generate excessive amounts of unnecessary information and could possibly lead the caregivers to believe that they (rather than their children) were the focus of the present investigation. Instead, Trapnell & Wiggins (1990) Interpersonal Adjective Scale was adopted (refer to Appendix 12). This questionnaire was not only cheap to administer, it was fun, relatively short and easy to complete. The authors had not provided reliability co- efficients for the measure, but it had shown reliability and success in other studies (e.g. Day, 1998; Dyce, 1998) and was considered useful for the present investigation.

Similarly to the Adult Attachment Measure, Copies of this measure were also left for all

of the child's significant caregivers to complete and they were asked to indicate how

accurately they felt the 92 adjectives described themselves using the scale that ranged

from 1 (extremely inaccurate) - 8 (extremely accurate). The adjectives were positive and

negative characteristics based upon the Big Five dimensions of Personality. For example,

the adjectives 'sympathetic' and 'unsympathetic' were two of the sixteen adjectives used

to measure 'Agreeableness' and 'tense' and 'relaxed' were two of the twenty adjectives

used to measure 'Neuroticism'.

5.2.6   Child Temperament Measure

As the main aim of the investigation was to examine the relationship between children's

attachment and their subsequent roles in bullying situations at school, it was considered

important that the children's temperament was examined at the same time. It was also

believed that the measure of child temperament had to be similar in size and content to

the attachment measure for assessment in the analysis and so that primary caregivers

would believe the two exercises were simply measurements of their child's behaviour

(rather than of different constructs).

The Child Temperament Measure used was an adaptation of that devised by McDevitt

and Carey (1975). The authors did not provide reliability co-efficients and so reliability

checks were made for the present investigation (refer to Chapter 6). The adaptations were

purely grammatical in that the original questionnaire was designed for completion by an

independent observer, whereas the current research required the child's primary caregiver to rate the items of the measure. For example, the item that originally read '*The child* is moody for more than a few minutes when corrected or disciplined.' was adapted to read '*Your child* is moody for more than a few minutes when corrected or disciplined.' In addition, the item that originally read '*The child* protests when *denied a request by the parent*.' was adapted to read '*Your child* protests when *you deny a request*.' Overall, the measure contained items very similar to those in the Attachment measure, however, it was in a questionnaire format and contained 100 items and a scale that ranged from 1 (almost never) – 6 (almost always). Caregivers were asked to circle the number that best described how often their child's recent and current behaviour had been like the behaviour in each statement (refer to Appendix 13).

It was understood that asking the primary caregiver to provide this information about their child invited criticism, as it relied on truthfulness, memories and the perceptions of the primary caregivers, which could present a confounding affect on the results. However, all of the children had all finished attending their pre-schools at this time which meant previous day-carers could not be contacted and interviewed about the and so the primary caregiver was considered the most reliable person to ask to complete this exercise at this time. However, this measure had been used with success in other studies (e.g. Gibbs, Reeves and Cunningham, 1987 and Larmour, 1995) and its content and size were considered that appropriate to the research that it was decided that this measure would be used alongside the Attachment Q-Sort Exercise (discussed in more detail below). Consequently, the importance of completing this exercise personally was stressed to the primary caregivers and they were asked to complete all of the questionnaires and

exercises at separate times to avoid fatigue, boredom and repetition effects.

Defining the Sub-Scales

McDevitt and Carey (1975) presented nine sub-scales of this Behavioural Style Questionnaire. These sub-scales are described below with examples of the items:

ACTIVITY

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child was generally active and fidgety and lower scores indicated that the child was able to sit quietly when playing or listening and they may have even performed tasks slowly. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child sits calmly while watching TV or listening to music*

* *Your child leaves or wants to leave the table during meals*

* *Your child moves about actively when he/she explores new places*

* *Your child fidgets when he/she has to stay still*

RHYTHMICITY

Most of the items in this sub-scale were reverse scored and therefore, lower scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child preferred regularity and routine. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child has bowel movements at about the same time each day*

* *Your child eats about the same amount at supper from day to day*

* *Your child is sleepy at his/her bed-time*

* *Your child becomes upset if he/she misses a regular TV programme*

APPROACH

Lower scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child was outgoing and liked to try new things, whereas higher scores indicated that the child would hold back from new activities, situations and people. Items from this sub-scale included:

*	*Your child approaches children his/her age that he/she doesn't know*

*	*Your child holds back until sure of himself/herself*

*	*Your child needs encouragement before he/she will try new things*

*	*Your child avoids new guests or visitors*

ADAPTABILITY

Lower scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child would adjust to change well and would adapt quickly to new situations. Items from this sub-scale included:

*	*Your child can be coaxed out of a forbidden activity*

*	*Your child needs a period of adjustment to get used to changes at school or at home*

*	*Your child settles arguments with playmates within a few minutes*

*	*Your child seems to take setbacks in his/her stride*

INTENSITY

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child would express strong positive and negative emotion. Items from this sub-scale included:

*	*Your child cries intensely when hurt*

*	*Your child is enthusiastic when he/she masters an activity & wants to show everyone*

98

*   *Your child reacts strongly (cries or complains) to a disappointment or failure*

*   *Your child laughs hard while watching TV cartoons or comedy*

MOOD

Lower scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child would display positive and happy

moods most of the time. Items from this sub-scale included:

*   *Your child laughs or smiles while playing*

*   *Your child smiles or laughs when he/she meets new visitors at home*

*   *Your child is annoyed at interrupting play to comply with a parental request*

*   *Your child protests when you deny a request*

PERSISTENCE

Most of the items in this sub-scale were reverse scored and therefore, Lower scores in

this sub-scale indicated that the child liked to finish an activity or would try to see a task

through to completion.

Items from this sub-scale included:

*   *Your child spends over an hour reading a book or looking at the pictures*

*   *Your child says that he/she id 'bored' with his/her toys and games*

*   *Your child is reluctant to give up when trying to do a difficult task*

*   *Your child is unwilling to leave a play activity that he/she has not completed*

DISTRACTIBILITY

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child could be easily distracted.

Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child seems not to hear when involved in a favourite activity*

* *Your child stops an activity because something else catches his/her attention*

* *Your child responds to sounds or noises unrelated to his/her activity*

* *Your child wants to leave the table during meals to answer the door or telephone*

THRESHOLD

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child was sensitive to differences or change. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child notices minor changes in your dress or appearance (clothing, hairstyle, etc.)*

* *Your child responds to mild disapproval from you (a frown or shake of the head)*

* *Your child is sensitive to noises (telephone, doorbell) and looks up right away*

* *Your child notices differences or changes in the consistency of food*

5.2.7   Child Attachment Measure

It became apparent that there were very few measures of attachment for children aged 4-5 years of age. There were quite a few measurements of attachment history for much older children and adults, however, they tended to involve self-report questionnaires that either assessed current attachment relationships or were retrospective and referred to the respondent's attachment relationship with their primary caregiver in infancy. Furthermore, the findings from both types of questionnaire have received heavy criticism, for example, the stability and continuity of attachment style has not been shown, due to

the lack of longitudinal studies that follow individuals throughout the lifespan. Additionally, such retrospective measures rely on memory recall and as the initial attachment relationship is formed in the first few years of life, it is questionable whether accurate recall is possible.

The Strange Situation, self-report measures and autobiographical accounts were found to be inappropriate for children of this age and the Separation Anxiety Test (Klagsbrun and Bowlby, 1976) was avoided due to the age of the children and the findings of previous research (e.g. Myron-Wilson and Smith; Bowers, Smith and Binney, 1994). This Separation Anxiety Test (SAT) consisted of 6 or 9 photographs which depicted various levels of separation. The child is shown each picture and is then asked to describe how they think the child in the picture feels, why he/she feels that way and what they think the child will do. Responses are taped, transcribed verbatim and then coded using a specific coding system to reveal their security of attachment category (e.g. *Dismissive, Enmeshed* or *Secure*). The findings of studies that have used this method are not consistent and therefore its reliability is questionable. For example, Main, Kaplan and Cassidy (1985) used the SAT with 6-year-old children and found insecure children gave the most 'frightened' responses and the secure children provided the most constructive responses, but they believed that the separated child could experience more than one emotion depending on the situation. Additionally, Myron-Wilson and Smith (2001) used the SAT to investigate the relationship between attachment style and the roles the children adopted in bullying situations (similar to the present investigation) and found that insecurely attached children were more likely to be nominated as involved in bullying. Bullies were more likely to be found in the angry insecure category and children who fell into the

passive insecure and the dismissive insecure categories were more likely to experience victimisation. However, Shouldice and Stevenson-Hinde (1992) found problems with the SAT as a measure with 4 year olds and strongly felt that this should not be used alone as a measure of attachment and Bowers Smith and Binney (1994) believed that the reason why they had not found a relationship between attachment security and bully and victim status in their study was not because there was no relationship, but because the SAT was an imperfect measure of attachment security.

'Story Completions' were also considered as a possible method to access the internal working models of the children in the study. This method is similar to the SAT but the separation scenarios would be enacted with dolls as models instead of the photographs. This method had been used by Main and his colleagues with children aged 3-4 years. However, this method was avoided due to the problems already discussed regarding the very similar SAT and also because of the criticisms regarding possible limitations in meta-cognition of young children (Flavell, Flavell and Green, 1987).

Instead, the Attachment Behaviour Q-Sort Exercise (Waters, 1989) was used to measure the children's attachment styles. The authors did not provide reliability co-efficients and so reliability checks were made for the present investigation (refer to Chapter 6). Furthermore, even though this measure had not been used in research relating to bullying, it had been used with some success in previous studies. For example, Laganiere, Tessier and Nadeau (2003) studied mother-infant attachment of premature babies and had found maternal perceptions of the infant were associated to attachment security (e.g. mothers who perceived their infant as having difficulties dealing with changes, as being more distractible, more demanding, developed a more insecure attachment relationship with

102

their premature infant). Additionally, Schulz (1998) studied the concomitants of success

in a perinatal substance abuse treatment program and found that more positive and/or

realistic perceptions of their mothers predicted lower use of mood-altering substances,

more adaptive child-rearing beliefs, and a greater security of their children's attachment.

Furthermore, the consistency of the mothers' use of treatment was associated with greater

idealization of the mothers' maternal attachment figures, more adaptive child-rearing

beliefs, and reduced symptoms of depression, which in turn appeared to influence

reduction in mothers' use of mood-altering substances and greater security of their

children's attachment.

This Q-Sort Exercise had been originally designed for use during observation exercises

performed by a researcher on younger children. However, following the head teacher

interviews and the initial telephone conversations with the primary caregivers, it became

increasingly obvious that the participants would not be willing to devote enough time to

allow the researcher to observe the children in their home environment. Therefore, the

items of this measurement were adapted slightly so that primary caregivers could use it

with ease to rate their pre-school children. The adaptations were purely grammatical in

that the original Q-Sort had also been designed so that an independent observer could sort

the items. Additionally, the sole use of the masculine pronouns was replaced with

'he/she' and 'his/her'. For example, the statement that originally read '*When the child*

cries he cries hard.' was adapted to read '*When your child cries he/she cries hard.*' And

the item that originally read '*When the child gets upset by mother's leaving, he continues*

to cry or even gets angry after she is gone.' was adapted to read '*When your child gets*

upset because you are leaving, he/she continues to cry or even gets angry after you have

gone.' Even though it was appreciated that the attachment behaviours reflected in these items related to younger children and that the present sample would probably elicit slightly different and less pronounced attachment behaviours, the items were not changed in any other way.

At the time of the Preschool Assessment, primary caregivers were given written instructions of how to sort the items of this Q-Sort (refer to Appendix 14 for a copy of the instructions). The 90 items of this Q-sort were presented in numerical order on separate strips of A6 sized paper (refer to Appendix 15 for further details of the items of the Q-Sort). The score sheet was also given to the primary caregivers at this stage (refer to Appendix 16 for a copy of the score sheet). The interviewer read the instructions with the caregiver and encouraged the caregiver to place the first few statements into the nine piles. (i.e. where statements considered to be 'most like the child' were placed in pile 9, statements that were 'most unlike the child' were placed in pile 1 and piles 4 - 6 were for statements that were 'neither like nor unlike the child').

As with the Child Temperament Measure (discussed in detail above), it was understood that by asking the primary caregiver to provide this information about their child the research would be open to criticism, as it would be relying on the truthfulness, the memories and the perceptions of the primary caregivers. Additionally, the process of sorting the statements in the Q-sort was a laborious and time-consuming task for even the keenest of parents and boredom and fatigue affects could prevail. However, as previously explained, all of the children had all finished attending their pre-schools at this time

which meant previous day-carers could not be contacted and interviewed about the and so

the primary caregiver was considered the most reliable person to ask to complete this

exercise at this time. Consequently, it was explained to the primary caregivers that it was

very important that they completed this exercise personally and it the importance of

completing this and the other questionnaires at separate times was stated (to avoid

fatigue, boredom and repetition effects).

5.2.8   End of the Briefing Exercise

It was explained to the primary caregivers that it was very important that they completed

the Child's Temperament Questionnaire and the Child's Attachment Measure personally

and the importance of completing the questionnaire and the exercise at separate times

was re-stated.

The interviewer then referred to the last few points of the Briefing Exercise (refer to

Appendix 7 for further details regarding the Briefing Exercise). It was explained to the

parents that they could withdraw from the research at any time and they were asked for

their permission to take a photograph of their child for identification purposes at school

and in the absence of the child, a photograph was borrowed. The parents were advised

that all photographs would be sent to them at the end of the observations at school.

The caregivers were reminded about the letter containing the contact telephone numbers,

were told not to hesitate to call if a problem arose and/or help with the exercises was

needed and they were given stamped addressed envelopes to return the exercises as soon

as possible.

Finally, the parents were advised that the interview and the exercises could raise personal

issues that they might like to speak to someone about and they were given a list of telephone numbers of 'help-lines' that they could use if necessary (refer to Appendix 17 for the list of help-line numbers the parents were given). All caregivers were thanked for their time and involvement in the research and were given a sugar-free lollipop for each of their children.

5.2.9   Analysis of the Preschool Assessment

It was decided, even before the researcher had met the participants, that the analysis of the Preschool Assessment data would not take place until the end of the research. This was so that the researcher could maintain an objective position throughout the research and it would help to avoid researcher bias during the observations etc. Therefore, the data analysis did not start until the autumn of 2002.

5.3   Phase Two

The children's adjustment to starting school was checked using parental reports and the children were observed in their classrooms during periods of free play.

5.3.1   Participants

The main participants of the second phase of the study were the same 28 children who took part in Phase 1. These children were about to enter their first year of formal schooling and their ages now ranged between 4 and 5 years. The caregivers of these children also participated and their ages ranged between 26 and 53 years. Of the 28 primary caregivers, 27 were the children's birth mothers and there was one paternal

grandmother.

5.3.4 Classroom Observations

These observations took place when the children had attended school full-time for at least two full weeks. The children were given this time to settle into a daily routine and to feel more at ease in their surroundings and with their peers. The observations occurred in the children's classrooms during periods of free play and they took place on two separate occasions over a three-week period. All of the children were observed on a Monday or a Tuesday when it was expected that they would be refreshed after the weekend and they were all observed again on a Friday. It was expected that by the end of the week the children would be tired and perhaps more likely to elicit aggressive behaviour towards their classmates.

A number of observational methods were practiced at the most obliging school. It was eventually decided that, in order to gain information regarding the childrens' situational and contextual information, as well as their participant roles during incidences of bullying, the optimum method for collecting the data from the observations would be to employ an experienced researcher who could take purely factual and descriptive handwritten notes (in shorthand) about the childrens verbal and non-verbal communications, their actions and their playthings. This type of observation technique, although unusual, had been used in similar circumstances by Ainsworth (1969). She had orally recorded the infants' behaviour and transcribed the factual descriptions later. However, the use of video and audio equipment had been dismissed as an option to record the separation behaviours, as they were too intrusive, disruptive and potentially

damaging to the results.

It was further decided that each observation should last for one minute per child (using a stopwatch). The collection of situational and contextual information as well as the bullying data was considered important as the study wanted to be able to differentiate between behaviour that could be misconstrued as bullying behaviours (e.g. aggression, rough and tumble play). Additionally, these narrative descriptions of each child's minute of activity would also identify interactions between the child and other children of the study. It was understood before the observations took place that most of the data provided by this method would be useful for future research, however, it would also provide a deeper understanding of the contexts and situations where bullying behaviours occur.

The observations took place during periods of free play in the classroom so that comparisons could be drawn with the bullying behaviours observed in the playground later in Phase 3. This decision followed the findings from previous research that had shown direct bullying to be more prevalent in the playground (e.g. Craig, Pepler and Atlas, 2000) and indirect bullying to be more prevalent in the classroom (e.g. Craig, Pepler and Atlas, 2000; Rivers and Smith, 1994). This was considered interesting and worthy of further study as other research (e.g. Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993) had shown girls tended to get involved in indirect bullying more than boys and boys tended to get involved in direct forms of bullying more than girls. Therefore, the present investigation attempted to find out if most of the bullying behaviour involving girls took place in the classroom and if most of the bullying behaviour involving boys took place on the playground.

5.3.2 First Adjustment Questionnaire

Primary Caregivers were contacted during the same period that the children were observed during free-play in the classroom and a structured interview took place over the telephone using the Adjustment Questionnaire as a guide (refer to Appendix 18). Starting school was considered as a major life event for the children. Previous research had found childrens' adjustment to starting school could affect their attitudes about school and whether they socialised well with their classmates (e.g. Boulton and Underwood, 1992; Hoover, Oliver and Hazler, 1992; Olweus, 1993; Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a and 1996b; Bernstein and Watson, 1997; and Rigby, 1997).

The telephone questionnaire contained a mixture of fixed choice and open-ended questions. It ascertained how the children felt before they went to school on their first day (e.g. excited, reluctant etc.), who took them to school that day (primary caregiver, primary and secondary caregiver etc.) and how the child reacted to the separation (e.g. happy to go, upset and didn't want to go etc.). The primary caregivers were also asked about their feelings when they left their child on their first day (e.g. happy to let them go, didn't want to let them go etc.) and how they currently felt about their child attending school (happy, apprehensive etc.). There were also items that considered the child's current attitude to attending school (e.g. doesn't want to go at all, looks forward to going etc.), what they did at lunchtime (e.g. packed lunch, school lunch etc) and how the child felt about their teacher (e.g. doesn't like her. Really likes her etc.). Furthermore, the primary caregivers were asked about the child's friendships at school and were asked to describe their relationship with their child since the start of school along with providing details about any changes that they had witnessed in their child's behaviour since they

had started school. Finally, the primary caregivers were asked to provide information

regarding any major life events that their child had experienced since the Preschool

Assessment. This data was added to the findings of the Preschool Assessment data and

was not analysed until the end of the data collection period.

5.4   Phase Three

5.4.1   The End of the Child's First School Year

This phase of the research was primarily concerned with obtaining data regarding the

children's involvement in bullying. Self-report methods were considered inappropriate

methods of assessing bullying behaviours with this age group of children, as the

investigation intended to observe the children in their classrooms two weeks after they

had been attending school full-time. Sociometry and peer nomination exercises would not

have been plausible as the children would not have known each other well enough to

know each other by name. Furthermore, the study did not want to interview the children

about bullying at this early stage of their adjustment to starting school, as they may not

know about bullying and it may cause them to worry unnecessarily. Furthermore, Smith,

(1991) explained that interviews were not the best way to assess bully and victim

problems. Additionally, the present investigation wanted to examine the participant roles

identified by Salmivalli et al. and wanted to ensure all roles were identified. As evidence

suggested that victims were more likely to tell someone at home rather than a teacher

(Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Eslea and Smith, 1998; Smith and Shu, 2000)

and both bullies' and victims' parents were relatively unaware of their bully/victim

problems at school (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Smith and Shu, 2000), the

investigation opted for a triangulation approach to identifying bullying. The childrens'

parents and teachers would be asked about their histories of bullying and victimisation

and observations of the children would be taken during the lunchtime playtime on the

playground. These three measures used are discussed in detail below.

5.4.2   Participants

One of the children who had taken part in Phase 1 of the study moved out of the area of

study during the first term. Therefore, only 27 of the children from the Phase 1

participated in the third phase. Their ages ranged between 4 years and 9 months and 5

years and 9 months. The children's caregivers continued to be secondary participants and

their ages ranged between 27 and 56 years.

5.4.3   Observations on the Playground at Lunchtime

It was decided that the children would be observed towards the end of the first year to

avoid the early stages of group formation, where aggressive behaviours would be more

prolific. Instead, the observations would be more likely to recognize the aggressive

children who had learned to recognize and focus their attacks on the victims (Perry, Perry

and Boldizar, 1990). Furthermore, as some of the children did not have periods of free

play timetabled (as discussed previously) all observations took place on the playground.

The lunch playtime was considered the optimum time to observe the children, as more

observations could be taken ensuring all children could be observed at least once.

The observations took place during the last half term of the children's reception year and they were arranged in such a way that all of the children were observed on a Monday, a Tuesday, a Wednesday, a Thursday and a Friday to balance out fatigue, situational and seasonal affects.

Following the success of the first set of observations (in the classroom) it was decided that the same methods would be used on the playground and once again each observation occurred for one minute per child (using a stopwatch). Even though the weather, illness and holidays stopped the occurrence of some of the childrens' observations, every child was observed at least 15 times and many children were observed for longer. Examples narrative transcripts of the observations can be seen in Appendix 19.

5.4.5 Second Adjustment Questionnaire

Following this last set of observations, caregivers were contacted again by telephone. The telephone conversations adopted a similar interview format using second the adjustment questionnaire as a guide (refer to Appendix 20 for the full telephone questionnaire). Most of the questions were repeated from the first telephone questionnaire, for example, questions that related to the primary caregiver's relationship with the child and the child's experience of major life events. However, these questions were now referring to the time since the child had returned to school after the Christmas holidays.

Caregivers were also asked about their child's current attitudes towards school and towards their teachers. They were asked about the child's friendships and about their lunchtime arrangements. Additionally, the interview contained a couple of questions that related specifically to bullying. Caregivers were asked to answer 'Yes' or 'No' to the

following question:

Has your child been involved in any of the following behaviour at school?

...been accused of picking on another child/children

...been picked on by another child/children

If a primary caregiver answered yes to either question, they were asked to provide further details. These answers and comments would be compared with the other measures of bullying at the end of the data collection period.

5.4.6   Teacher's Questionnaire

Concurrently, teachers were asked to complete Goodman's (1999) Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire for each child in their class who was involved in the study. The questionnaire included 25 behavioural statements and the Teachers were asked to rate each child individually using the scale: 'Not True'; 'Somewhat True'; or 'Certainly True' (refer to Appendix 21 for the full questionnaire).

This measure was chosen as pervious research had shown this questionnaire to be useful (Mathai, Anderson and Bourne, 2003) and to correlate well with similar questionnaires (Goodman, 1997; Klasen, Woerner, Wolke, Meyer, Overmeyer, Kaschnitz, Rothenberger and Goodman R, 2000). Furthermore, it was shorter; it focused on strengths as well as difficulties and provided better coverage of inattention, peer relationships and prosocial behaviour. The teachers were purposefully given a general questionnaire about the

childrens' behaviour to 'hide' the questions relating to bullying behaviours and continue

the façade. Most of the information provided by the teachers in this questionnaire was to

be used in future studies, however there were two items relating to bullying and

victimisation. The teachers were asked indicate whether the statements were '*Not True*',

Somewhat True' or '*Certainly True*'. These items are shown below:

Often fights with other children or bullies them

Picked on or bullied by other children

The three measures of bullying were adopted to provide a form of reliability and to

provide a more complete representation of the bullying behaviours of reception class

children. In line with previous findings, it was expected that parents would provide the

most useful data and that the teachers' reports would provide confirmation of these

results. Furthermore, the intention of the observational data was to corroborate the

findings from the other two measures and to pick up bullying behaviours that hadn't been

reported to an adult, especially the participant roles of Outsider, Assistant, Reinforcer and

Defender. The results of the observations and the parent and teacher questionnaires were

collated in such a way that those children identified with a participant role were

highlighted and the number of times they were identified in a particular role was

recorded. Using a case study approach, this information was compared to the information

gained in the baseline assessment and with the updated information gained from the

telephone interviews to investigate potential risk factors and antecedents of the bullying

behaviours.

5.4.7   Case Studies

As previous research into bullying had concentrated on using quantitative analysis to reveal the nature and extent of bullying, the characteristics of the individuals involved and its antecedents and effects, it was considered important that the present investigation would adopt qualitative methods of analysis. Therefore, following the reduction of the data from each of the questionnaires and interviews described above, the findings were collated using a case study approach. The aim of this was to provide a nucleus of potential antecedents and data that may influence the child's behaviour directly (e.g. their attachment style) or indirectly (e.g. their mother's history of depression, in particular postpartum depression that may affect the mother-child attachment relationship, which in turn would affect the child's behaviour). These variables would then be analysed qualitatively with the bullying data obtained from the parents, the teachers and the observations. The intention behind this procedure was to provide very informative and unusually detailed information about those involved in bullying behaviours (refer to Appendix 22 for the individual case studies).

5.5   Summary

The final format of the method of the investigation involved three phases and these are displayed in Table 5.1 below. The first phase concentrated on recruiting participants and collecting data at the Preschool Assessment, where primary caregivers provided details

about their child's attachment, temperament, family history and family background. Additionally, all primary, and the majority of secondary, caregivers completed personality and attachment measures and provided details about their parenting styles and their relationships with their child.

Following classroom observations, the primary caregivers were contacted by telephone during phase two of the research and were asked to provide details about their child's adjustment to starting school and to provide an update on their child's behaviour and their relationship with the child.

During Phase three, data regarding bullying behaviours among the children were collected. It used three measures and included reports from primary caregivers, teachers and observations taken on the playground at lunchtime, a year after the Preschool Assessment had taken place. Finally, to reduce the possibility of researcher bias, the analysis of data began at the very end of the data collection period and no analysis was carried out before.

Table 5.1: Summary of the Methods used in each of the Phases of the Investigation

PHASE ONE	**Recruitment** (June - July 2001)	Head Teacher Interviews Parents' Introductory Letter Telephone Briefing
	Preschool Assessment (end August 2001)	Caregiver's Questionnaire Child Attachment Measure Child Temperament Measure Adult Attachment Measure Adult Personality Measure
PHASE TWO	**Second Assessment** (mid September 2001)	Classroom Observations 1st Adjustment Questionnaire
PHASE THREE	**Third Assessment** (June - July 2002)	Lunchtime Playground Observations 2nd Adjustment Questionnaire Teachers' Questionnaire

.

Chapter 6

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS

This chapter describes the preliminary analyses and the reliability checks that were required for the childrens' Attachment measure, the childrens' Temperament measure and the Adults' Personality measure from the Preschool Assessment. Additionally, it describes the analysis of the observational data from the childrens' first day at school that was to be used to devise an attachment measure that could be used in future research with children of this age group and it considers the codings of the observations that took place in the classrooms. Finally, it describes the coding of the observations taken of the children playing at lunchtime.

6.1 The Childrens' Attachment Measure

6.1.1 Scoring of Q-Sort Data

The codings provided by the primary caregivers were checked for errors on receipt and were then placed in a secure place until the end of the data collection. The analysis of the data from the Preschool Assessment was performed once all of the data was in to avoid researcher bias during the observations.

6.1.2 Identifying the Attachment Types of the Children

The orders of the items of the Q-sort, provided by each child's primary caregiver, was correlated with a criterion sort that had been provided by the authors. This criterion sort was derived from the average scores of hypothetical Q-sorts performed by a number of

attachment experts who had sorted the 90 items into the order they believed would

identify a securely attached child. The results of this correlation provided each child with

an attachment type of securely attached, insecurely attached or unclassified. Those with

correlation coefficients above 0.3 were classified as having a Secure Attachment style;

those with correlation coefficients above -0.3 were classified having an Insecure

Attachment style; and those with correlation coefficients were between -0.3 and 0.3 were

named Unclassified. The children's individual attachment category scores are shown in

Appendix 23.

6.1.3   Defining the Sub-Scales of the Measure

To provide an extra dimension to the analysis and to provide more details about the

childrens' attachment styles, the results of Waters' 90-item Q-Sort were also arranged

into ten sub-scales outlined by Mangelsdorf, Berlin, Dedrick and Sussell (1990). These

sub-scales are described below.

SOCIABILITY – RESPONSIVENESS TO STRANGERS

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child was sociable and responsive with

adults and strangers who visited their home. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child laughs and smiles easily with a lot of different people;*

* *Your child largely ignores adults who visit the home and finds his/her own*

    activities more interesting.

FRUSTRATION TOLERANCE

Most of the items in this sub-scale were reverse scored and therefore, higher scores indicated that the child was tolerant and patient. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child easily becomes angry with toys;*

* *Your child is demanding and impatient with you. He/she fusses and persists unless you do what he/she wants right away.*

POSITIVE AFFECT

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child was generally happy and playful. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child is light-hearted and playful most of the time;*

* *Your child is often serious and businesslike when playing away from you or alone with toys.*

RESISTANCE

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child tended to be fussy and hard to please. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *When your child returns to you after playing, he/she is sometimes fussy for no clear reason;*

* *Your child sometimes signals or gives you the impression that he/she wants to be put down and then fusses or wants to be picked up again.*

CONTACT SEEKING AND MAINTAINING

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child wants to be held and cuddled by

their primary caregiver often. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child asks for and enjoys having you hold, hug and cuddle him/her;*

* *Your child puts his/her arms around you or puts his/her hand on your shoulder when you pick him/her up.*

SECURE BASE BEHAVIOUR

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child used the primary caregiver as a secure base around the home most of the time. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child stays closer to you or returns to you more often than the simple task of keeping track of you requires;*

* *If you move away from your child, he/she will follow to be near you (not having to be called or carried and doesn't stop playing or get upset).*

DEMANDS MOTHER'S ATTENTION

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child tried to be the centre of the primary caregiver's attention most of the time. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *When you sit with other family members, or when you are affectionate with them, your child tries to get your affection for himself/herself;*

* *Your child wants to be the centre of your attention and if you are busy or talking to someone, he/she will interrupt.*

INDEPENDENCE

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child was independent. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child rarely asks you for help;*

* *When your child is near you and sees something he/she wants to play with, he/she fusses or tries to drag you over to it*

NEGATIVE REACTION TO NOVELTY

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child didn't get used to new or frightening things easily. Items from this sub-scale included:

* *Your child quickly gets used to people or things that initially made him/her shy or frightened;*

* *Your child is fearless.*

ACTIVITY

Higher scores in this sub-scale indicated that the child was active. Items from this sub-scale included:

Your child is very active. He/she is always moving around and prefers active games to quiet ones;

* *On average, your child is more active than you are.*

6.1.4 Attachment Q-Sort Reliability Measure

A reliability check was performed on the Attachment Q-Sort Sub-scales and items were

deleted until an Alpha score >.680 was obtained. Three sub-scales with low reliabilities

were not used in analyses and these were Positive Affect, Independence & Negative

Reaction to Novelty. The results of the reliability check are shown below.

FINAL SOCIABILITY/RESPONSIVENESS TO STRANGERS SUBSCALE
7 ITEMS: 5 7 12 48 50 58 66 72 78
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .702
No items deleted
FRUSTRATION TOLERANCE
6 ITEMS: 17, 20, 30, 38, 56, 74
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .471
With item 20 deleted = .599; when item 56 deleted = .680

FINAL FRUSTRATION TOLERANCE SUBSCALE
4 ITEMS: 17 30 38 74
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha: .680

POSITIVE AFFECT
3 ITEMS: 9 39 62
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .348
No substantial improvement with items deleted, therefore subscale unreliable - not used

FINAL RESISTANCE SUBSCALE
3 ITEMS: 2 33 71
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .863
No items deleted

FINAL CONTACT SEEKING & MAINTAINING SUBSCALE
4 ITEMS: 11 28 44 3
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .906
No items deleted

FINAL SECURE BASE BEHAVIOUR SUBSCALE
5 ITEMS: 21 36 43 59 90
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .802
No items deleted

FINAL DEMANDS MOTHER'S ATTENTION SUBSCALE
2 ITEMS: 23 31
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .696
No items deleted

INDEPENDENCE
4 ITEMS: 6 35 69 83
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .218
No substantial improvement with items deleted, therefore subscale unreliable - not used

NEGATIVE REACTION TO NOVELTY
2 ITEMS: 12 57
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = -.166, subscale unreliable - not used

FINAL ACTIVITY SUBSCALE
2 ITEMS: 37 68
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .680
No items deleted

6.1.5   Comparison of Attachment Types on Attachment Q-Sort Sub-scales

Children assigned to Secure, Insecure and Unclassified attachment categories were compared on the Attachment Q-Sort sub-scales to determine how the three categories could be distinguished from each other in regard to attachment related behaviours. The results of this analysis would also be useful for providing broader definitions of the three attachment types and for determining the extent to which the secure and insecure

125

attachment types identified here corresponded with established definitions of secure/insecure attachments of younger children (Ainsworth et al, 1978).

The comparison of the three attachment categories was made by means of one-way MANOVA, with the 7 attachment sub-scales included as dependent variables in the analysis. The overall main effect of attachment category was found to be significant (Pillais .990, F[7,19] = 276.192, p <.001;partial Eta2 .729), providing evidence of substantial differences between the three categories. Further exploration of differences between the three attachment types on the individual Attachment Q-Sort subscales revealed that the three groups varied on 5 out of the 7 dimensions entered in the analysis. These group differences were analysed further by means of appropriate post-hoc tests depending on whether or not the homogeneity of variance assumption was met (Tukey LSD or Games-Howell respectively).

Significant effects of attachment type were found for the Attachment Q-Sort subscale, Sociability & Responsiveness to Strangers (F[2,25] = 12.554, p <.001; Partial Eta^2 .501), Frustration Tolerance (F[2,25] = 29.697, p <.001; Partial Eta^2 .704), Resistance (F[2,25] = 68.814, p , .001; Partial Eta^2 .846), Contact Seeking and Maintaining (F[2,25] = 71.133, = p <.001; Partial Eta^2 .851) and Secure Base Behaviour (F[2,25] = 7.108, p .004; Partial Eta^2 .363).

Post-hoc comparisons of the mean scores of the three attachment types on the above 5 Attachment Q-Sort subscales were performed to examine the between group differences

more closely. These analyses revealed Securely Attached children to have significantly higher mean scores than both the Insecure children for Frustration Tolerance (Games-Howell 3.222, p .001;) and higher scores than both Insecure and Unclassified children for Contact Seeking & Maintaining (Tukey LSD 6.000, p <.001; Tukey LSD 2.215, p .001, respectively). Insecurely Attached children had significantly higher mean scores than both the Securely Attached and the Unclassified children for Resistance (Tukey LSD 5.630, p <.001 and Tukey LSD 4.140, p <.001 respectively) and (surprisingly) higher scores than the Secure children for Secure Base Behaviour (Games-Howell 2.50, p.033). The Unclassified children had a higher mean score than Insecure children for Sociability/Responsiveness to Strangers (Games-Howell 2.315, p .036) and Contact Seeking (Tukey LSD 3.771, p <.001). They also had higher scores than Secure children for Resistance (Tukey LSD 1.407, p .014).

Summary

Secure:	*Higher* than Insecure on:	Frustration Tolerance
		Contact Seeking
	Higher than Unclassified on:	Contact Seeking
Insecure:	*Higher* than Secure on:	Resistance
		Secure Base Behaviour
	Higher than Unclassified on:	Resistance
Unclassified:	*Higher* than Secure on:	Resistance
	Higher than Insecure on:	Sociability/Responsiveness to Strangers
		Contact Seeking

6.2   Childrens' Temperament Measure

6.2.1   Defining the Temperament Clusters

McDevitt and Carey (1975) provided detailed instructions regarding the method behind individually scoring each child. This process required the completion of a Profile using the guidelines set out in the Diagnostic Clusters and the Definition of Diagnostic Clusters. All of this information is set out in Appendix 24 and the children's individual temperament category scores are shown in Appendix 25.

Compared to the mean scores shown in red in Appendix 24, the children who were diagnosed as **EASY** revealed a low activity scores. This indicated they were not overly active and were able to sit quietly. They scored low on the rhythmicity sub-scale indicating they preferred regularity and routine. They also revealed low scores for approach which indicated they were outgoing, liked to try new things. These children revealed lower scores for adaptability which indicating that they adjusted to change well and adapted quickly to new situations. They scored lower on the intensity sub-scale which indicated that they would generally express mild emotion and they revealed lower scores for the mood sub-scale which indicated that they would display more positive and happy moods.

Compared to the same mean scores shown in red in Appendix 24, the children diagnosed as **DIFFICULT** revealed lower scores for the rhythmicity sub-scale. This indicated that they did not prefer regularity and routine. They scored higher for the approach sub-scale

indicating that they would hold back from new activities, situations and people and they revealed higher scores for adaptability. This indicated they were slow to adjust to change and would not adapt to new situations well. These children revealed higher scores for the intensity sub-scale, which indicated that they expressed strong positive and negative emotion and they scored higher in the mood subscale. This indicated that they displayed negative moods most of the time.

Compared to the mean scores shown in red in Appendix 24, the children diagnosed as **SLOW TO WARM UP** had to reveal scores that were no greater than the mean for activity and intensity. This indicated they were not overly active and were able to sit quietly. They had to score 2 or 3 standard deviations above the mean on two out of the following three clusters: approach; intensity and mood. Furthermore, approach or adaptability had to be more than one standard deviation above the mean. This indicated that these children would display more negative moods, they would be more likely to display withdrawal behaviours and they may even express strong positive and negative emotion.

The children who were diagnosed as **INTERMEDIATE HIGH** had to either reveal scores than were higher than the mean scores (shown in red in Appendix 24) in four or five of the following subscales rhythmicity, approach, adaptability, intensity and mood with one of the scores from the subscale being one standard deviation higher than the mean score OR they had to reveal higher scores than the mean in two or three of the subscales with tow or three of those scores being higher than the mean by at least one

standard deviation. Such scores would indicate that the child showed behaviours similar to that of the **Difficult** cluster of children and were included with this category.

The children who were diagnosed as **INTERMEDIATE LOW** were those children whose scores, when compared to the mean scores (shown in red in Appendix 24) did not fit into any above clusters (including **Slow to Warm Up**). This indicated that these children tended to display behaviours that were similar to those of **Easy** cluster of children and were included with this category.

6.2.2 Temperament Measure Reliability Check

A reliability check was performed on the Temperament measure sub-scales and items were deleted until an Alpha of >.7 was obtained for all of the final subscales except Mood (.651) and Threshold (.625). The results of the reliability check are shown below.

<u>ACTIVITY</u>
13 ITEMS: 4 6 9 13 14 24 26 32 44 58 70 87 94
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .623
When item 6 deleted = .685; when item 24 deleted = .694; when item 14 deleted = .696; when item 4 deleted = .722

<u>FINAL ACTIVITY SUBSCALE</u>
9 ITEMS: 9 13 26 32 44 58 70 87 94
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .722
RHYTHMICITY
9 ITEMS: 11 23 36 47 49 52 62 75 84
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .135
When item 75 deleted = .360; when item 11 deleted = .527; when item 52 deleted = .635; when item 23 deleted = .709

FINAL RHYTHMICITY SUBSCALE
5 ITEMS: 36 47 49 62 84
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .709

FINAL APPROACH SUBSCALE
11 ITEMS: 12 21 25 31 43 50 54 67 68 86 98
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .773
No items deleted

ADAPTABILITY
12 ITEMS: 3 8 10 15 19 28 55 56 61 63 65 80
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .551
When item 80 deleted = .592; when item 56 deleted = .625; when item 3 deleted = .678; when item 19 deleted = .698; when item 65 deleted = .728

FINAL ADAPTABILITY SUBSCALE
7 ITEMS: 8 10 15 28 55 61 63
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .728

FINAL INTENSITY SUBSCALE
12 ITEMS: 7 20 30 41 42 45 46 53 76 82 92 99
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .734
No items deleted

MOOD
12 ITEMS: 1 5 29 34 38 64 69 72 78 96 97 100
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .602
When item 29 deleted = .609; when item 69 deleted = .618; when item 38 deleted = .645; when item 97 deleted = .651

FINAL MOOD SUBSCALE
8 ITEMS: . 1 5 34 64 72 78 96 100
RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .651

PERSISTENCE

10 ITEMS: 27 33 35 39 40 71 73 83 90 93

RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .522

When item 83 deleted = .692; when item 73 deleted = .725

FINAL PERSISTENCE SUBSCALE

8 ITEMS: 27 33 35 39 40 71 90 93

RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .725

FINAL DISTRACTIBILITY SUBSCALE

10 ITEMS: 2 17 48 51 66 77 81 85 89 95

RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .710

No items deleted

THRESHOLD

11 ITEMS: 16 18 22 37 57 59 60 74 79 88 91

RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .324   When item 88 deleted = .384;

when item 91 deleted = .430; when item 16deleted = .446; when item 74 deleted = .469;

when item 60 deleted = .487; when item 22 deleted = .537; when item 59 deleted = .625

FINAL THRESHOLD SUBSCALE

4 ITEMS: 18 37 57 79

RELIABILITY: Cronbach's Alpha = .625

6.3   The Adults' Personality Measure

6.3.1   Reduction of Data into the Five Dimensions

The individual adjective scores for each caregiver were sorted into the five personality dimensions using Trapnell and Wiggins (1990) methods. The dimensions are briefly

described below, with examples of the adjectives. The primary and secondary caregivers'

dimension scores are shown in Appendix 26.

SURGENCY / EXTRAVERSION

Higher scores in this dimension indicated that the caregiver was bold, assertive and

persistent. Other adjectives from this dimension included:

*   *Dominant*

*   *Self-confident*

*   *Shy*

*   *Unauthoratative*

AGREEABLENESS

Higher scores in this dimension indicated that the caregiver was kind, tender and

charitable. Other adjectives from this dimension included:

*   *Sympathetic*

*   *Accommodating*

*   *Cruel*

*   *Iron hearted*

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS

Higher scores in this dimension indicated that the caregiver was organised, efficient and

neat. Other adjectives from this dimension included:

*   *Thorough*

*   *Self-disciplined*

*   *Forgetful*

*   *Unreliable*

NEUROTICISM

Higher scores in this dimension indicated that the caregiver was tense, hypersensitive and highly-strung. Other adjectives from this dimension included:

*   *Worrying*

*   *Over-excitable*

*   *Stable*

*   *Calm*

OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE

Higher scores in this dimension indicated that the caregiver was reflective, inquisitive and broadminded. Other adjectives from this dimension included:

*   *Philosophical*

*   *Individualistic*

*   *Unimaginative*

*   *Conventional*

6.3.2   Adult Personality Measure Reliability Check

The personality dimensions of Trapnell & Wiggins (1990) Interpersonal Adjective Scale Questionnaires were checked for reliability and Table 6.1 shows the reliability

coefficients for the primary and secondary caregivers where an Alpha of >.7 was obtained for all of the subscales.

Table 6.1: The Results of the Reliability Check on the

Five Personality Dimensions

DIMENSION	ALPHA SCORE Primary Caregivers	ALPHA SCORE Secondary Caregivers
SURGENCY/ EXTRAVERSION	.8677	.7927
AGREEABLENESS	.6884	.8551
CONSCIENTIOUSNESS	.8573	.8143
NEUROTICISM	.9045	.9174
OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE	.7357	.7525

6.4   Observations

The collection of situational and contextual information gained from the observations provided details regarding the quality of the interactions that occurred between the focal children of the study and between the focal children and other children (those not in the study). It further provided a deeper understanding of bullying behaviours as they occurred and allowed comparisons to be drawn between the classroom data of Phase 2 and the playground data of Phase 3. The analysis of the data gained from the observations began immediately after the final observation of Phase 3 had taken place.

The first set of observations took place during periods of free play in the classroom.

Unfortunately, one of the classes in one of the schools in the study did not have free play

periods timetabled. This class mainly consisted of Year 1 children and five of the older

new starters. Solely for the purposes of the study, the teacher arranged for the reception-

aged children from this 'older' class to take part in the free play periods enjoyed by the

other 'younger' reception class of children. However, after two sessions of observations,

she stopped periods of free play for these children. As a result, the classroom

observations had to be cut short and each child was only observed for approximately 10

minutes.

The playground observations took place during the last few weeks of the childrens'

Reception year and each child was observed for approximately 20 minutes directly and

for approximately 10 minutes indirectly (i.e. during another focal child's minute of

observation).

6.4.1   Coding the Observation Narratives

The handwritten purely factual and descriptive notes from the observations were typed

verbatim to produce narrative transcripts of each of the minutes each child was observed

(Refer to Appendix 19 for Examples of these narratives). The narratives were then coded

by four independent raters using the set definitions and operational variables (refer to

Appendix 27 for the Coding Sheet, Definitions and Operational Variables for Coding the

Observations) and these are described in below:

<u>Participant Roles Scale</u>

The scale was based upon the work of Salmivalli et al. (1996) and focused upon bullying

behaviours. To promote consistency among the raters, Salmivalli's definition of bullying

136

was provided. It states that:

'It is bullying when one child is repeatedly exposed to harassment and attacks from one or several other children; harassment and attacks may be, for example, shoving or hitting the other one, calling him/her names or making jokes about him/her, leaving him/her outside the group, taking his/her things, or any other behaviour meant to hurt the other one.'

Additionally the six roles of the Participant Roles Scale were described for the raters. The behaviour of a BULLY was described:

'Starts bullying; makes the others join in the bullying; always finds new ways of harassing the victim.'

The behaviour of an ASSISTANT was described:

'Joins in the bullying, when someone has started it; assists the bully; helps the bully, maybe by catching the victim.'

The behaviour of a REINFORCER was described:

'Comes around to see the situation; laughs; incites the bully by shouting or saying, "Show him/her!"'

The behaviour of a DEFENDER was described:

'Comforts the victim or encourages him/her to tell the teacher about the bullying; tells the others to stop bullying; tries to make the others stop bullying.'

137

The behaviour of an OUTSIDER was described:

'Is not usually present in bullying situations; stays outside the situation; doesn't take

sides with anyone.'

The behaviour of a VICTIM was described:

'Is (repeatedly) harassed and attacked by one or several other children.'

Focusing on one child at a time, raters were asked read each minute of the observation

narrative and record '1' to denote the presence of one of the participant roles or '0' to

denote the absence of one of the participant roles.

6.4.2   Inter-Rater Reliability

Two independent raters coded ten of the twenty-seven handwritten accounts of the

classroom observations. 100% agreement was achieved for six of the cases and the other

four cases achieved between 97.5% and 98.8% agreement. Four independent raters were

responsible for coding the narrative descriptions of the playground observations and

twenty of the twenty-seven narratives were re-coded (i.e. five sets of observational

narratives per rater) to check for inter-rater reliability. Between 96.1% and 100%

agreement was achieved.

6.5   Case Studies

The findings from the Preschool Assessment, the telephone interviews and the bullying measures were collated in such a way that would allow easy inspection and comparisons between participants. Each case study displayed the participant's Attachment and Temperament types. It confirmed who the primary and secondary caregivers were and displayed their Attachment styles and their Personality dimension details in brief.

The primary caregivers' occupation and the number of hours worked in a week were also noted along with details regarding depression and the birth order of the child. Additionally, the methods of discipline adopted by the caregivers and examples of the children's good and naughty behaviour were recorded.

The answers to the repeated measures (provided at the three interviews) were noted and these included, information regarding the primary caregiver-child relationship, the child's experience of major life events (with brief details), the child's attitude towards school and the amount of naughty and good behaviour displayed by the child. Furthermore, the repeated measures that were just taken at the telephone interviews were also recorded and these included the children's attitudes towards their teacher and their friends, and changes in their behaviour.

Finally, the data from the three measures of bullying were added to the case studies. This included information regarding the person who had reported the bully and the victim information (i.e. parent or teacher) and the participant roles data obtained from the observations on the playground were added.

139

For comparison purposes the case studies (shown in Appendix 22) were divided into groups relating to the participant roles identified. These groups were: Bully; Victim; Bully Only; Victim Only; Bully & Victim; Bully & Defender; Victim & Outsider; Defender; and No Role (i.e. children who had not been identified as having a participant role). The analysis of this data is described in Chapter 8.

Chapter 7

RESULTS

RESULTS

This chapter begins with an overview of the analysis and outlines the findings from the

three phases of the research with consideration to the hypotheses stated in Chapter 3.

Using a case study approach, the information from the Preschool Assessment, the

telephone interviews and the bullying data obtained from the parents, teachers and the

observations is collated for each child and compared to the findings from previous

research outlined in Chapter 2.

7.1 Overview of the Analysis

The completed questionnaires, telephone interviews and codings from the Attachment

Behaviour Q-Sort Exercise, provided by the primary caregivers, were checked for

omissions on receipt and then, to avoid researcher bias, they were then placed in a secure

place until the end of the data collection. The analysis of the data was performed

immediately after the final observations had taken place.

7.1.1 Antecedents of Bullying

The primary focus of the investigation was to identify antecedents of bullying in young

schoolchildren. Included in the analysis were data on the personal characteristics of the

children, their caregivers and their family background. More specifically, the antecedents

of bullying of interest to the study included: the child's attachment to their primary

caregiver, child temperament, the current nature of the relationship between parent and

child, parenting style, the child's birth order, the number of major life events experienced by the child and measure of the parents' personality. These variables are reviewed below:

The child's attachment to their primary caregiver was measured using the Attachment Q-Sort (Waters 1987), which was completed by the primary caregivers. The children were categorized as secure, insecure or unclassified) based on the size and direction of the correlation between primary caregivers' sorts and the criterion sort provided by the Q-sort author (>.3 = secure, >-.3 = insecure, between +/- .3 = unclassified).

Child temperament was measured using the Child Temperament Questionnaire (McDevitt & Carey, 1975) and this was completed by the primary caregivers. On the basis of their scores on each of the 9 temperament sub-scales, the children were assigned to 5 temperament clusters devised by the questionnaire authors. These 5 clusters (Easy, Difficult, Slow to Warm Up, Intermediate High and Intermediate Low) were condensed to three by reassigning the children in Intermediate High & Low categories into the nearest most appropriate category based on their questionnaire sub-scale scores.

The primary caregiver-child relationship was measured by interview at the Preschool Assessment and again during the telephone interviews. The primary caregiver was asked how they would describe the relationship (either 'easy', 'normal' or 'difficult') at each of the three phases of data collection. Parental style was measured by interview at the Preschool Assessment and focused specifically on how parents rewarded good behaviour (rewards & treats/praise/rewards & treats & praise) and how they disciplined bad behaviour (distracts/penalty/verbal punishment [shouts]/physical punishment).

The child's birth order was also noted at the Preschool Assessment and the children were categorized based on whether they were an only child, the eldest, the youngest or a middle child.

The number of major life events experienced by the child was measured by interview at the Preschool Assessment and during the telephone interviews.

The adults' personality was measured using the personality dimensions extracted from the Interpersonal Adjective Scale (Trapnell & Wiggins, 1990). These measures were completed by both the primary & secondary caregivers. Of the 5 dimensions extracted, only two were used in the analysis: Agreeableness - which included adjectives such as 'kind', 'tender', 'charitable' and Neuroticism - which included adjectives such as tense, 'hypersensitive', 'highly-strung'.

The children's involvement in bullying was measured in three ways. (a) During the final telephone interview with the primary caregiver, two questions ascertained whether the child had bullied another child and whether the child had been picked on or bullied by another child. (b) Two items from the 'Strengths & Difficulties Questionnaire (Goodman, 1999) completed by teachers were extracted to ascertain whether the child fought with or bullied other children, and whether the child had been picked on. (3) During the playground observations conducted by the researcher, children's participant roles in bullying situations were coded. On the basis of these various sources of evidence, the children's participation in bullying was collated in such a way that those children identified with a participant role were highlighted and the number of times they were identified in a particular role was recorded.

7.1.2   Factors Associated with Attachment

Another focus of the investigation, addressed by the analysis, was to examine factors associated with attachment. It was suggested that attachment might serve as a mediator of the factors potentially involved with bullying roles in young schoolchildren. Additionally, this analysis would enable a further hypothesis concerning the association between parent and child attachments to be explored and thereby provide evidence for the possibility of inter-generational transmission of attachment. The factors examined included: Child Temperament (as outlined above); Parental attachment measured using a measure (Shaver & Hazan, 1987) by which the primary and secondary caregivers were categorized as either: Secure, Avoidant, or Anxious-Ambivalent; Major life events (as outlined above); and Maternal postpartum depression taken from information obtained at the Preschool Assessment interview.

7.2   The Nature and Extent of Bullying in School

7.2.1   Prevalence of Bullying

The extent of bullying revealed was comparable with previous findings (e.g. Olweus, 1989 and 1993a; Stevenson and Smith 1989; Boulton and Underwood, 1992; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Boulton and Smith, 1994; Byrne, 1994; Smith and Levan, 1995; Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a; 1996b; Borg, 1999). 55% of the children in the study had been implicated in bullying and Table 7.1 shows eight children were identified as a bully, twelve children were identified as a victim and six of these children were identified as

145

both a bully and a victim. For example, Participant 14 was identified as a bully by his teacher who reported that he often fought or bullied one child in particular. The primary caregiver of Participant 25 explained that her son had been picked on by one boy. She explained

> "*I saw him nipping him and hitting him on the head at the summer fair. I told the teacher and everything is ok now. They made friends at the Summer Play-Scheme*"

Participant 11 was identified as a bully and a victim. When asked if her child had been accused of picking on another child or children, her primary caregiver of explained,:

> "*The Teacher had a word with her because the finger was pointed at her a couple of times*"

When she was asked if her child had been picked on by another child or children, she stated:

> "*She's come home every now and then and said someone's been horrible to her.*"

Table 7.1: The Number of Children Identified in Each Participant Role

Participant Role	Number of Children Identified
Bully	8
Victim	12
Bully & Victim	6
Bully Only	1
Victim Only	4
Bully & Defender	1
Victim & Outsider	2
Defender	1
Children with No Role	12

There was one child who was identified as a bully only, four children who were identified as a victim only and twelve children who were not assigned to any of the participant roles.

Table 7.2 provides further details regarding each of the participants' involvement in bullying at school (the participant numbers are colour coded to denote gender, i.e. blue for males and pink for females). Each child's participant role is clearly shown and it can be seen that some children were identified as participating in more than one role (e.g. bully and victim or victim and outsider). However, no-one child was identified as participating in more than two roles. This provides support for studies and theories regarding bully/victims (e.g. Olweus, 1978; 1993; Perry, Perry and Kennedy, 1992; Mynard and Joseph, 1997; Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit and Bates, 1997; Schwartz, Proctor and Chien, 2001). It also provides a further insight into the participant roles, in that Salmivalli et al. found highly significant gender differences in the distribution of the participant roles, whereby there were far more defenders and outsiders among the girls, but the present findings did not support this nor the finding that most of Salmivalli's bullies were boys. However, like Salmivalli's findings, the number of victims in this study were about the same for boys and girls. Furthermore, there was no support for Salmivalli et al's theory that the participant roles are mutually exclusive or that victims were significantly more likely to be defenders too. Table 7.2 also reveals the number of times each child was identified with a particular role. For example, Participant 8 was identified as a victim once and as an outsider once, Participant 16 was identified as a victim twice and as a bully once and Participant 26 was identified as a victim twice and as a bully seven times.

Table 7.2: The Number of Children Identified in Each Participant Role

Participant No.	Participant Roles (No. times recorded)
1	No Role
2	No Role
3	No Role
4	Bully (1)
5	Victim (1)
6	Victim (1)
7	No Role
8	Victim (1) + Outsider (1)
9	No Role
10	No Role
11	Bully (1) + Victim (1)
12	No Role
13	No Role
14	Bully (1) + Victim (2)
15	No Role
16	Bully (1) + Victim (2)
17	Victim (1)
18	Defender (2)
19	No Role
20	Victim (2) + Outsider (1)
21	No Role
22	Bully (2) + Defender (1)
23	Bully (1) + Victim (2)
24	Bully (2) + Victim (1)
25	Victim (1)
26	Bully (7) + Victim (1)
27	No Role

7.2.2 Comparison of the Bullying Measures

By design, the teacher and parent reports could only identify the children as bullies and victims and so evidence for the other roles was provided by the observations. It was predicted that the teacher and parent reports would be very similar and that the results of the observations would corroborate this evidence as far as bullies and victims were concerned and would add detail regarding the other participants' roles. However, it is evident from Table 7.3 that very little agreement between the three measures was achieved (except the 100% agreement regarding those 12 children identified as not

having a participant role). Despite this, table 7.3 provides further information regarding

incidences where a child has been reported in a particular role more than once.

Table 7.3 Childrens' Involvement in Bullying Behaviours as Identified by Primary Caregivers, Teachers & during the Observations

Participant No.	Participant Roles	Primary Caregiver	Teacher	Observation
4	Bully		✓	
5	Victim	✓		
6	Victim	✓		
8	Victim			✓
	Outsider			✓
11	Bully	✓		✓
	Victim	✓		
14	Bully		✓	
	Victim	✓	✓	
16	Bully		✓	
	Victim	✓	✓	
17	Victim	✓		
18	Defender			✓(x2)
20	Victim	✓ (x2)		
	Outsider			✓
22	Bully		✓	✓
	Defender			✓
23	Bully		✓	
	Victim	✓ (x2)		
24	Bully	✓		✓
	Victim			✓
25	Victim	✓		
26	Bully		✓	✓ (x7)
	Victim	✓		

Using the some of the example participants mentioned above, it can be seen that

Participant 11 was identified as a victim and a bully by her primary caregiver only. She

was only observed once as a bully, but her teacher did not report her as a bully, despite

the evidence provided by the caregiver regarding the teacher having had a word with the

child about bullying. It was a similar case for Participant 25, as his primary caregiver explained she had told the teacher about his victimisation, yet the teacher did not report it. Additionally, it can be seen that Participant 8 was identified as a victim once and as an outsider once during the observations and Participant 16 was identified as a victim by his primary caregiver and his teacher and as a bully once by his teacher, but he was not observed in either of these roles. Furthermore, Participant 26 was identified as a victim only by his primary caregiver, but was identified by his teacher as a bully and was observed bullying children on seven separate occasions. However, this child's primary caregiver explained that she had not been to see the teacher about the victimisation as it stopped after a few weeks and the teacher did not tell the parent about the bullying as she had the situation under control. Similarly, whereas Participant 4 had been identified by the teacher as a bully, she had not been observed as a bully directly, but had been seen to be aggressive towards others. The following two examples taken from the observations of this child in the classroom illustrate this point:

> P4 is still using the computer and P23 is sitting next to her again. This time P23 wants to use the computer and is determined. P4 (without moving or looking at P23) says 'I don't like you!' She then looks around the room and doesn't play with the computer or even let P23 play with it. It then becomes apparent that there is a problem with the computer, as the teacher appears and sorts it out. P4 continues to play on the computer and P23 doesn't move or say a word.

150

P4 is still on the floor playing with the village alone. A boy comes over with

a finger puppet and obviously wants to catch P4's attention, but he,

accidentally, knocks a few pieces off the wall. P4 says in a loud voice 'Don't,

don't!' and then pulls a sulky face as the boy moves away. She rebuilds the

wall and stares angrily at the boy. She continues to watch the boy as he

moves around the classroom. She then picks up a different piece, but stops to

listen to the teacher.

Therefore, discrepancies between the findings provided by the different measures were

not considered as omissions or problems. Instead the findings from the reports and

observations were collated and considered as providing a thorough and comprehensive

picture of bullying behaviours adopted by the children in the study. Furthermore, these

findings provide support for research that has found victims were more likely to tell

someone at home rather than a teacher (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Eslea

and Smith, 1998; Smith and Shu, 2000). However, the findings did not provide support

for the studies that found teachers did relatively little to put a stop to bullying when they

were made aware of it (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993), as all parents had

seen positive results when the teacher was made aware of the situation.

7.2.3   Bullying Behaviours

Evidence to support previous research was found regarding the nature of bullying in the

classroom compared to the playground. It was found that more indirect forms of bullying

occurred in the classroom compared to the more direct forms found on the playground.

For example, during the set of observations in the classroom, Participant 24 was seen to be excluded by Participant 11:

P11 is still at the Lego blocks activity, playing with a boy as P24 comes to join in. P11 says to P24 'No, It's my game!" and starts to roughly take P24's bricks back off the board. She then says, as she stands in between P24 and the Lego 'No, you're doing it different colours.' P24 tries to continue to put the blocks onto the Lego wall-board even though it is obvious that P11 doesn't want her to. P11 continues to put the bricks onto the board, but is doing it much slower than she was doing before and calls out colours as she does to the boy as they both block P24 from getting to the Lego wall-board.

Furthermore, during the set of observations on the playground, Participant 26 was observed a number of times during incidences of direct bullying. Two of which are described below:

P26 has his hands around a much smaller boy's throat squeezing hard. He then punches the boy in the stomach. The boy fights back the tears but is clearly upset and grabs and pinches the skin on P26's cheeks with both of his hands as he tries to defend himself. P26 does the same back to the boy and they move and tussle around the playground pinching each other's cheeks very hard for quite a few seconds. One boy goes off to tell the Welfare

152

Assistant that the smaller boy has been hurt by P26 and is crying, but the
Welfare Assistant doesn't hear him as she is pre-occupied with another child.

P26 is standing in the middle of the playground playing with 8 boys.
Although he barely attempts to get to the ball he is clearly with these boys to
play football, as he watches it as it gets kicked all over the playground. P26
turns and thumps a boy in the arm and then immediately turns back to watch
the ball (the boy does not respond, other than to rub his arm). The group of
boys chase around after the ball, but P26 doesn't really move off the spot, he
just keeps turning as he watches the ball (as if he is waiting until it comes to
him).

Table 7.4 Types of Bullying Behaviour

Participant No.	Bully or Victim Role	Type of Bullying
4	Bully	Indirect - Verbal
5	Victim	Indirect - Exclusion
6	Victim	Direct - Physical
8	Victim	Direct - Physical
11	Bully Victim	Indirect - Verbal Indirect - Verbal
14	Bully Victim	Direct - Verbal/Physical Direct - Verbal/Physical
16	Bully Victim	Direct - Verbal/Physical Direct - Verbal/Physical
17	Victim	Direct - Physical
18	Defender	Direct - Verbal/Physical
20	Victim Outsider	Direct - Verbal/Physical Direct - Verbal/Physical
22	Bully Defender	Indirect - Verbal Direct - Verbal/Physical
23	Bully Victim	Indirect - Verbal Direct - Verbal/Physical
24	Bully Victim	Direct - Verbal/Physical Indirect - Exclusion
25	Victim	Direct - Physical
26	Bully Victim	Direct – Verbal/Physical Direct – Verbal/Physical

The types of bullying behaviours displayed by the bullies and experienced by the victims were noted. The findings, shown in table 7.4, provided support for previous research in that most of the bulling took the form of general name-calling and the next most frequent forms of bullying were being physically hit (Whitney and Smith, 1993). Furthermore, the gender differences revealed in previous survey studies (e.g. Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Smith and Shu, 2000) were also evident, i.e. girls tended to be more exposed to indirect and more subtle forms of bullying (e.g. rumour mongering, manipulation of friendship relationships and exclusion) and boys tended to suffer more direct and physical forms of bullying (e.g. pushing, kicking and taking away personal belongings).

7.3   Antecedents of Bullying

Previous research has suggested that the personal characteristics of the children involved in bullying situations, their family characteristics, attachment relationships and the parenting styles which they experience should all be considered as possible antecedents of bullying (e.g. Smith and Myron-Wilson, 1998). Therefore, this section examines the following potential risk and protective factors: attachment, temperament, friendships, attitude towards attending school, parenting style and the experience of major life events. Although all of the factors discussed below consider the participant roles identified by Salmivalli et al., the focus in some cases is primarily on the bully, victim and bully/victim roles to allow comparisons with existing findings.

7.3.1   Intergenerational Continuity of Attachment Type

In light of previous research (e.g. Van IJzendoorn, Duffer and Duyvesteyn, 1995), it was

expected that there would be evidence of intergenerational transmission of attachment

type and the childrens' attachment categories and the attachment types of their Primary &

Secondary Caregivers can be seen in Table 7.5. However, a significant relationship

between the childrens' attachment types and that of their primary and/or secondary

Caregivers was not found and so the prediction was not met.

Table 7.5 Attachment Categories of the Participants and their Primary & Secondary Caregivers

Participant No.	Childrens' Attachment Categories	Primary Caregiver's Attachment Types	Secondary Caregiver's Attachment Types
1	Secure	Secure	Secure
2	Secure	Secure	Avoidant
3	Secure	Avoidant	Secure
4	Secure	Secure	Secure
5	Secure	Secure	Secure
6	Unclassified	Secure	Anxious-Ambivalent
7	Insecure	Secure	Secure
8	Insecure	Secure	-
9	Secure	Secure	Avoidant
10	Unclassified	Secure	Secure
11	Secure	Secure	-
12	Secure	Secure	-
13	Insecure	Secure	Secure
14	Secure	Secure	Secure
15	Secure	Secure	-
16	Insecure	Secure	Secure
17	Secure	Secure	Secure
18	Secure	Secure	Secure
19	Secure	Secure	Secure
20	Secure	Secure	Secure
21	Secure	Secure	-
22	Unclassified	Avoidant	Secure
23	Secure	Secure	Secure
24	Secure	Secure	Secure
25	Insecure	Secure	Secure
26	Unclassified	Secure	-
27	Insecure	Secure	Secure
28	Secure	Secure	Secure

7.3.2 Childrens' Temperament and Attachment Types

Despite the controversy surrounding links between attachment and temperament (e.g. Sroufe, 1985; Calkins and Fox, 1992; Vaughn, et al., 1992; Bremner, 1994; Shaffer, 1996), associations between the two constructs were predicted. It was expected that insecurely attached children would have difficult temperaments and securely attached children would have easy temperaments. However, a significant relationship was not found and the prediction was not met. Table 7.6 displays the childrens' attachment and temperament categories.

Table 7.6 Childrens' Attachment Categories, Temperament Clusters and their Participant Roles in Bullying Situations

Participant No.	Childrens' Attachment Categories	Childrens' Temperament Categories	Participant Roles (No. times recorded)
1	Secure	Easy	No Role
2	Secure	Easy	No Role
3	Secure	Easy	No Role
4	Secure	Easy	Bully (1)
5	Secure	Difficult	Victim (1)
6	Unclassified	Difficult	Victim (1)
7	Insecure	Easy	No Role
8	Insecure	Easy	Victim (1) + Outsider (1)
9	Secure	Slow to Warm Up	No Role
10	Unclassified	Easy	No Role
11	Secure	Easy	Bully (1) + Victim (1)
12	Secure	Slow to Warm Up	No Role
13	Insecure	Easy	No Role
14	Secure	Difficult	Bully (1) + Victim (1)
15	Secure	Easy	No Role
16	Insecure	Easy	Bully (1) + Victim (2)
17	Secure	Easy	Victim (1)
18	Secure	Easy	Defender (2)
19	Secure	Easy	No Role
20	Secure	Difficult	Victim (1) + Outsider (1)
21	Secure	Easy	No Role
22	Unclassified	Easy	Bully (2) + Defender (1)
23	Secure	Easy	Bully (1) + Victim (1)
24	Secure	Easy	Bully (2) + Victim (1)
25	Insecure	Easy	Victim (1)
26	Unclassified	Easy	Bully (7) + Victim (1)
27	Insecure	Easy	No Role
28	Secure	Difficult	-

7.3.3 Childrens' Attachment Types and their Participant Roles

In light of previous research (e.g. Troy and Sroufe 1987), the prediction that the children's participant roles, when compared to their attachment styles, would reveal bullies and victims as being more likely to have insecure attachments than the other children was not met either. Refer to the childrens' attachment categories and their involvement in bullying behaviours at school in Table 7.6.

Table 7.7 Frequencies and Percentages of
Insecure and Secure Children in Bullying Roles

| Bullying Roles | Attachment Type | |
	Insecure	Secure
None n % within attachment type	3 50.00	9 52.94
Bully only n % within attachment type	0 0.00	1 5.88
Victim only n % within attachment type	2 33.33	3 17.65
Bully + Victim n % within attachment type	1 16.67	4 23.53
Bully n % within attachment type	1 16.67	5 29.41
Not Bully n % within attachment type	5 83.33	12 70.59
Victim n % within attachment type	3 50.00	7 41.18
Not Victim n % within attachment type	3 50.00	10 58.82

Although these analyses revealed no significant associations between participant roles and attachment type, it is of interest to note that only 16% of insecure children were reported as being a bully, compared to 29.4% of securely attached children. Refer to table 7.7 for these unexpected results. Furthermore, when attachment type was considered in

relation to victim status, 50% of insecurely attached children were reported as a victim of bullying compared to 41.2% of those children who were securely attached. For those children reported as having been both bullies and victims, securely attached children were again more highly represented than insecure children, with 23.5% of 'bully & victim' children being securely attached compared to 16.7% of insecurely attached children. Finally, as can be seen in table 7.6 (page 156), one of the defenders had a secure attachment and the other was unclassified, whereas a secure attachment type was revealed for one of the outsiders and an insecure attachment type was revealed for the other.

7.3.4   Childrens' Temperament Categories and their Participant Roles

With reference to table 7.6 (page 156), of the two children observed as outsiders, one had a difficult temperament and one had an easy temperament, whereas, the two defenders had easy temperaments. In line with previous research, more analysis was conducted on the children identified as bullies, victims and those children who had not been identified as having a participant role. With reference to table 7.8, of the children in the three temperament clusters (easy, difficult and slow-to-warm-up), those children in the difficult cluster were most likely to be reported as bullies and as victims. 40% of difficult children compared to 30% of easy children were reported to have bullied and 80% of difficult children compared to 40% of easy children were reported to have been victims. There was also a difference in the proportion of easy and difficult children reported as bullies & victims with more of the easy children (25%) than the difficult children (20%) assigned. Furthermore, none of the slow-to-warm-up children were implicated in bullying. Despite

the observed differences between easy and difficult children, none of the

temperament/bullying role associations were found to be significant. Additionally,

victims scored higher than children who had not been found as a bully or a victim on the

temperament sub-scale Activity and children identified as both a bully and a victim

scored higher on temperament sub-scale Approach than the victims and the children who

had not been found as a bully or a victim.

Table 7.8 Frequencies and Percentages of
Children in Different Temperament Clusters in Bullying Roles

Bullying Roles	Temperament Clusters		
	Easy	Difficult	Slow to Warm Up
None n % within temperament clusters	11 55.00	0 0.00	2 100.00
Bully only n % within temperament clusters	1 5.00	1 20.00	0 0.00
Victim only n % within temperament clusters	3 15.00	3 60.00	0 0.00
Bully + Victim n % within temperament clusters	5 25.00	1 20.00	0 0.00
Bully n % within temperament clusters	6 30.00	2 40.00	0 0.00
Not Bully n % within temperament clusters	14 70.00	3 60.00	2 100.00
Victim n % within temperament clusters	8 40.00	4 80.00	0 0.00
Not Victim n % within temperament clusters	12 60.00	1 20.00	2 100.00

Furthermore, lower Threshold scores were revealed for the children identified as both a

bully and a victim compared to the children who had not been found as a bully or a

victim (refer to Appendix 25 for the childrens' scores on the sub-scales on the

159

Temperament measure). This indicated that victims were generally more active and fidgety than bullies, non-bullies and non-victims and bully/victims were more likely to hold back from new activities, situations and people; however they were not sensitive to differences or change.

7.3.5   Childrens' Friendships and their Participant Roles

It was further expected that bullies would be more likely to have less friends than the non-victims and that they would be likely to have more friends than the victims, however this prediction was not met. Primary caregivers were asked throughout the research about their child's friendships and for the purpose of the analysis only the information given during the final telephone interview was used. The analysis was concerned with whether the child spoke about a friend at home and how they felt about their friends in general. Table 7.9 reveals the childrens' involvement with friends and their attitudes towards them along with their participant roles.

7.3.6   Childrens' Attitude towards Attending School and their Participant Roles

Furthermore, it was expected that bullies would have a more negative attitude about going to school than non-victims, but that they would have a more positive attitude about attending school than the victims, however, this prediction was not met. Primary caregivers were asked throughout the research about their child's attitude towards attending school, but for the purpose of the analysis only the information given during the final telephone interview was used. Table 7.9 shows the childrens' attitudes towards attending school and the participant roles they adopted in bullying situations.

160

Table 7.9 Childrens' Participant Roles,

Friendships and their Attitudes towards School

Participant No.	Participant Roles (No. times recorded)	Friendships	Attitude Towards School
1	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
2	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Isn't bothered either way
3	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
4	Bully (1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
5	Victim (1)	Doesn't talk about friends from school	Looks forward to going
6	Victim (1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
7	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
8	Victim(1)+Outsider(1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
9	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Isn't bothered either way
10	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Is excited about going
11	Bully (1) + Victim (1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
12	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Has mixed feelings
13	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
14	Bully (1) + Victim (1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Has mixed feelings
15	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Has mixed feelings
16	Bully (1) + Victim (2)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
17	Victim (1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Has mixed feelings
18	Defender (2)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Has mixed feelings
19	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
20	Victim(1) + Outsider(1)	Talks about at least one friend, but not sure if he likes them or not	Looks forward to going
21	No Role	Talks about at least one friend and likes them	Looks forward to going
22	Bully (2) + Defender (1)	Talks about at least one friend, but he doesn't like them	Has mixed feelings
23	Bully (1) + Victim (1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Is excited about going
24	Bully (2) + Victim (1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Looks forward to going
25	Victim (1)	Talks about at least one friend, but has mixed feelings about them	Looks forward to going
26	Bully (7) + Victim (1)	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Isn't bothered either way
27	No Role	Talks about at least one friend & likes them	Is excited about going

7.3.7   Family Background

Primary Caregiver–Child Relationship and the Childrens' Bullying Roles

The largest proportion of children whose caregiver reported an easy or easy-normal

relationship were found not to have participated in bullying (50% and 61.5% respectively

– refer to table 7.10). For those children who had 'normal' relationships with their

caregivers, 33.3% were assigned to the non-participant, bully only and the bully/victim

161

categories respectively. Children who had normal-difficult relationships with their caregivers were distributed evenly across the 4 bullying categories (non-participant, bully only, victim only, bully/victim). Parents who reported their relationship with their children as being normal-difficult had the largest proportion of their children identified as bullies (50%). One-third of the children who had normal relationships with their caregivers had bullied, with parents reporting easy and easy-normal relationships with their children having similar proportions of children implicated as bullies (25% and 23.1% respectively – refer to Table 7.10).

Table 7.10 Frequencies and Percentages of the
Primary Caregiver-Child Relationship and the Childrens' Bullying Roles

Bullying Roles	Primary Caregiver-Child Relationship			
	Easy	Easy/Normal	Normal	Normal/Difficult
None n % within temperament clusters	2 50.00	8 61.54	2 33.33	1 25.00
Bully only n % within temperament clusters	0 0.00	1 7.69	0 0.00	1 25.00
Victim only n % within temperament clusters	1 25.00	2 15.38	2 33.33	1 25.00
Bully + Victim n % within temperament clusters	1 25.00	2 15.38	2 33.33	1 25.00
Bully n % within temperament clusters	1 25.00	3 23.10	2 33.33	2 25.00
Not Bully n % within temperament clusters	3 75.00	10 76.90	4 66.67	2 50.00
Victim n % within temperament clusters	2 50.00	4 30.80	4 66.67	2 50.00
Not Victim n % within temperament clusters	2 50.00	9 69.20	2 33.33	2 50.00

Interestingly, the proportions of children found to have been victims of bullying was quite high across all four of the parent-child relationship categories. Those children who

had normal relationships with caregivers were more likely to be identified as victims

(66.7%). Half of all the children who had easy relationships and half of those who had

normal-difficult relationships with their parents were reported to have been victims,

whilst 30.8% of the children enjoying easy-normal relationships with caregivers were

also found to have been victims of bullying. Finally, all of the defenders and outsiders

were reported to have easy relationships with their primary caregivers, except Participant

8, who was reported as having a normal relationship.

Parenting and Bullying Roles

Parents' responses to their childrens' good and bad behaviour were explored in regard to

their association with their children's involvement as a bully or a victim. As can be seen

in table 7.11, of the children whose parents used distraction as a means of disciplining

bad behaviour, 57.1% did not participate in bullying in any role, 14.3% had participated

only as bullies and 28.6% had participated as both bullies and victims An even greater

proportion of children of parents who used penalties in disciplining bad behaviour had

children who were not involved in bullying (66%) with the remaining 33% of children

participating as both bullies and victims.

Interestingly, all of the children whose only role in bullying was that of the victim were

from families where the primary caregiver used either verbal or physical punishment as a

method of dealing with bad behaviour. Of the parents who used verbal punishment,

14.3% had were reported as being victims only, 26.6% were bullies/victims, whilst the

largest proportion, 57.1% had not participated in bullying in any role. Compared to

parents who used distraction, penalties or verbal punishment in order to deal with their

163

children's bad behaviour, those parents who used physical punishment had a larger number of children in the bullying categories. 50% of the children of parents who used physical punishment were reported to be victims only, with 10% of their children in each of the bully only and bully/victim categories. Only 30% of the children of these parents were not reported to have been involved in bullying at all.

Table 7.11 Frequencies and Percentages of Disciplining Methods of Bad Behaviour and the Childrens' Bullying Roles

| Bullying Roles | Parental Disciplining of Bad Behaviour | | | |
	Distracts	Penalty	Verbal Punishment	Physical Punishment
None n % within temperament clusters	4 57.14	2 66.67	4 57.14	3 30.00
Bully only n % within temperament clusters	1 14.29	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 10.00
Victim only n % within temperament clusters	0 0.00	0 0.00	1 14.29	5 50.00
Bully + Victim n % within temperament clusters	2 28.57	1 33.33	2 28.57	1 10.00
Bully n % within temperament clusters	3 42.90	1 33.33	2 28.60	2 20.00
Not Bully n % within temperament clusters	4 57.10	2 66.67	5 71.40	8 80.00
Victim n % within temperament clusters	2 28.60	1 33.33	3 42.90	6 60.00
Not Victim n % within temperament clusters	5 71.40	2 66.67	4 57.10	4 26.70

With reference to table 7.12, when parents' responses to good behaviour were compared, it was found that for children whose parents used rewards and treats, 55.6% were not reported to have been involved in bullying, 22.2% had been both bullies and victims,

with 11% of the children having been a either a victim only or a bully only. This distribution of children across the various bullying role categories was similar to that of parents who used rewards, treats & praise (50%, 30%, 10% & 10%). Those parents who only used praise in response to good behaviour had far fewer children with no participant role (37.5%), whilst 50% of their children had been victims only and 12.5% bully/victims.

Table 7.12 Frequencies and Percentages of Parents' Methods of Rewarding Good Behaviour and the Childrens' Bullying Roles

| Bullying Roles | Parental Rewarding of Good Behaviour | | |
	Rewards & Treats	Praise	Rewards, Treats & Praise
None n % within temperament clusters	5 55.60	3 37.50	5 50.00
Bully only n % within temperament clusters	1 11.10	0 0.00	1 10.00
Victim only n % within temperament clusters	1 11.10	4 50.00	1 10.00
Bully + Victim n % within temperament clusters	2 22.20	1 12.50	3 30.00
Bully n % within temperament clusters	3 33.33	1 12.50	4 40.00
Not Bully n % within temperament clusters	6 66.67	7 87.50	6 60.00
Victim n % within temperament clusters	3 33.33	5 62.50	4 40.00
Not Victim n % within temperament clusters	6 66.67	3 37.50	6 60.00

Bullying appeared to be associated more with the use of rewards, treats and praise in response to good behaviour, with 40% of the children who experienced these methods reported as bullies. Compared to 33.3% of children whose parents used rewards and

treats had also bullied and to 12.5% of children of parents who used only praise. More children whose parents used praise, however, were identified as victims of bullying (62.5%) compared to parents who responded to good behaviour by other means. Those parents using rewards & treats had the lowest proportion of children reported as victims, whilst 40% of the children, whose parents used rewards treats and praise had been victims. Few children of parents using any of these reward methods were found to have been both bullies and victims. Interestingly, both of the children who were identified during the observations as outsiders experienced physical punishments for bad behaviour and praise only for good behaviour, whereas one of the defenders experienced penalties and treats and the other defender experienced physical punishments and rewards.

Birth Order and Bullying Roles

In light of previous research (e.g. Miller and Maruyama, 1976), links between the child's birth order and bullying status showed the largest proportion of children not involved in bullying was the eldest children, whereas the largest proportion of children reported to have only bullied or to have only been bullied were those who were an only-child and the largest proportion of children reported as bully/victims were youngest children. Finally, one of the children identified as an outsider was an only child, the other was the youngest child and of the defenders, one was an only child and the other was first born.

Table 7.13 Frequencies & Percentages of Childrens' Birth Orders & Bullying Roles

Bullying Roles	Birth Order			
	Only Child	Eldest	Middle	Youngest
None n	1	6	3	3
% within temperament clusters	16.67	85.71	75.00	30.00
Bully only n	2	0	0	0
% within temperament clusters	33.33	0.00	0.00	0.00
Victim only n	2	0	1	3
% within temperament clusters	33.33	0.00	25.00	30.00
Bully + Victim n	1	1	0	4
% within temperament clusters	16.67	14.29	0.00	40.00
Bully n	3	1	0	4
% within temperament clusters	50.00	14.30	0.00	40.00
Not Bully n	3	6	4	6
% within temperament clusters	50.00	85.70	100.00	60.00
Victim n	3	1	1	7
% within temperament clusters	50.00	14.30	25.00	70.00
Not Victim n	3	6	3	3
% within temperament clusters	50.00	85.70	75.00	30.00

7.4 Characteristics of the Children Identified with Participant Roles

The similarities between the children, their caregivers and their family backgrounds within each of their participant role groups were identified using Thematic Analysis.

7.4.1 Children Identified as Bullies Only

Only Participant 4 was identified as a being a bully only. She was identified as a bully by her teacher, who indicated that it was 'certainly true' that she often fought with other children or bullied them and she added:

"She can be very nasty, but will stop when asked to."

However, this child had not been observed as a bully directly, but had been seen to be aggressive towards others (as explained previously on page 150). This child had a secure attachment type and an easy temperament and both of her caregivers had revealed secure

attachment styles too. Her primary caregiver had not experienced any form depression and they enjoyed an easy relationship at the time of the preschool assessment. This relationship changed to 'normal' after just a few weeks at school and had become a difficult relationship by the end of the child's first year at school (refer to Appendix 22 for more details). Additionally, this child had experienced two major life events before she started school (deaths in the family) and although she had not experienced any major life events in the first term at school, her primary caregiver explained that she had experienced problems with the school dinners:

> *"She wasn't used to having a tray and actually having to chose what she*
>
> *wanted to eat. She had a nightmare that night after her first day and it was*
>
> *about the dinner ladies and school dinners."*

However, she always looked forward to going to school throughout her first year, she liked her teacher and talked about (at least) one friend at home in a positive way. Participant 4 was used to methods of distraction when she displayed naughty behaviour and praise and treats when she was good. She was an only child at the time of the Preschool Assessment, but her primary caregiver was expecting a baby, which was born during her second term in reception class. At about the same time she started to wear spectacles and, at parents evening, her teacher told her parents that she could be bossy and would fall out with friends.

It was evident at both sets of observations that this child enjoyed attention from adults more than she wanted to play. For example, during an observation in the classroom,

> P4 plays quietly and busily with Knex, getting the necessary pieces and
>
> fitting them together. She is distracted by a girl who is talking to the helper.

(The helper is also sitting at the table). She continues to look up towards the helper, but tries to fit the Knex together without looking. She then gets up and goes around to the helper to show her the construction.

And during an observation on the playground,

P4 is standing by the Welfare Assistant with a skipping rope in her hand. She looks around the activities in the playground and after quite a while she moves over to a skipping rope that is lying on the ground. She swaps it for the one she has in her hand and then goes back to the Welfare Assistant and tells her a story.

7.4.2   Children Identified as Bullies in General

The eight children identified as bullies included four girls and four boys. Two children were reported by their primary caregivers, six were reported by their teacher and one of these boys was also observed as a bully in seven separate minutes. Five of the children had Secure Attachment styles and seven of the children had Easy Temperament types. Furthermore, the four girls had Secure Attachment styles and Easy Temperament types. All of the bully's caregivers revealed Secure Attachment types, except for one primary caregiver with an Avoidant Attachment type and two secondary caregivers who had not completed the attachment and personality measures. Additionally, three primary caregivers and three secondary caregivers revealed average scores across the dimensions. Only two of the children (i.e. both boys) were used to being smacked for their naughty behaviour, most of the other children were more used to distraction and time out techniques, with only two children who could be shouted at as well.

169

There was only one child who had not experienced a major life event before starting school, there were three children who had experienced one or two events and the rest of these children had experienced many major life events during their first school year.

Most of the primary caregivers-child relationships had fluctuated between easy and normal throughout the study and most of the children only displayed naughty behaviour sometimes at home and displayed good behaviour most of the time.

Most of these children had positive attitudes about school and only three boys hadn't said whether they liked their teacher or not after the first few weeks at school, all of the other children really liked their teacher and all of the children really liked their teacher by the end of the school year. Three children hadn't said whether they liked their friends or not after the first few weeks at school and one child said he didn't like his friends after the first few weeks at school; however all, but one of these children liked their friends by the end of the school year.

In summary, most of these children had Easy Temperament types and the four girls had Secure Attachment styles and Easy Temperament types. Most of their caregivers revealed Secure Attachment types and three primary caregivers and three secondary caregivers revealed average scores across the personality dimensions.

Most of the children were used to distraction and 'time out' techniques when they were naughty and most of them had experienced a major life event before starting school and more than half had experienced many major life events during their first school year. Most of the primary caregivers-child relationships had fluctuated between easy and normal throughout the study and most of the children only displayed naughty behaviour sometimes and displayed good behaviour most of the time. Most of the children had

positive attitudes about school and all of the children liked their teacher and their friends by the end of the school year.

More specifically, Participant 4 is included in this category (see above for details) as are Participants 11, 14, 16, 22, 23, 24 and 26. Participants 11, 14, 16, 23, 24 and 26 were also identified as Victims, and Participant 20 was also identified as a defender. Therefore, these children will be discussed in more detail below (in 7.4.5 Children Identified as a Bully and a Victim and in 7.4.7 Children Identified as Defenders)

7.4.3 Children Identified as Victims Only

Two boys and two girls were identified as being victims only and they had all been identified as victims by their primary caregivers. Although there were no real similarities between the childrens' attachment styles or their Temperament types, all of their primary and secondary caregivers had secure attachment styles except the secondary caregiver of Participant 6, this father had revealed an Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment type. None of the primary caregivers had suffered from depression (including postpartum depression) and three of them were at home all day, either because they worked from home or because they did not work.

Three of the primary caregivers were apprehensive about sending their children to school after they had been attending for a couple of weeks full-time, and although there were no real similarities across the four children as far as the primary caregiver and child's relationships and the childrens' displays of naughty and good behaviour were concerned, three of them had shown negative changes in their behaviour by the end of their first year at school. Furthermore, three of them were used to being smacked when they were

naughty and three of them had experienced at least one major life event before starting

school. Only one of these children was positive about their teacher and friends at school,

the other three were either negative or non-committal about their teacher and/or friends.

In summary, all of these children had been identified as victims by their primary

caregivers. Most of their primary and secondary caregivers had Secure Attachment

Styles. None of the primary caregivers had suffered from depression at all, most of them

stayed at home all day and most of them were apprehensive about sending their children

to school after they had been attending for a couple of weeks.

Most of the children had shown negative changes in their behaviour by the end of their

first school year, most of them were used to being smacked when they were naughty,

most of them had experienced at least one major life event before starting school and

most of them were either negative or non-committal about their teacher and/or friends.

More specifically, these children included Participants 5, 6, 17 and 25. Participant 5 was

a girl who had been the youngest child of five up until approximately one year before the

Preschool Assessment. The child had been identified as securely attached with a difficult

temperament, her mother described their relationship as difficult and she explained:

> *"She is always naughty now. Up until a month ago she was never naughty*
>
> *and now all of a sudden she's never good!"*

Furthermore, after looking forward to starting school, after just a few weeks she had

mixed feelings about going and her primary caregiver felt reluctant to send her and was

apprehensive about her daughter going to school. She explained that their relationship

had improved, but the child would get really upset at home-time and would sometimes be

hysterical. She described the root of the problem:

"She's ok going into school in the morning, now, but after about a month, she would try

to avoid going in a morning. You see, she has traumas about lunchtime. She can't eat her

lunch in the time allowed and never finishes it. During the first week she choked on an

orange segment and she got very upset and needed a dinner lady."

Just before the start of the observations on the playground, this child's teacher explained:

"There had been a spell of problems at the beginning of the [school] year

about lunchtime. Then it all settled down until a couple of weeks ago when

P5 started to fuss again about lunchtime. It didn't last long because I had had

a word with her and told her in a nice way that if the problems started again I

wouldn't be happy. P5 is now more confident all round. She is very

independent, but can get frustrated at times."

During the observations this child didn't play with anyone in particular and would spend

most of her time on the playground in a world of her own or looking through the railings

in to the older childrens' playground waiting for her sister. For example:

P5 is standing next to the railings that separate the reception playground from

the infant's playground. She is talking through the railings to her sister (who

is in the infant's playground). They walk up and down the railings as they

chat and seem oblivious to anyone who comes near to them.

P5 stands alone in the middle of the playground. She has a rope, but she is not

skipping, she just looks around. She continues to watch what is going on the

playground and appears to be in a world of her own. She starts singing to

173

herself and is completely unaware that P1 is watching her. There is no

interaction between the two girls. P5 starts to wander as she sings.

The child's primary caregiver reported her victimisation. She explained:

> *"She has been picked on by another child. It wasn't drastic, but this child*
>
> *didn't want to play with her. It upset her and has been on and off all year."*

This caregiver had not mentioned it to the teacher and by the end of this child's first year

at school she seemed settled and a lot happier, she even started a friendship with

Participant 12.

Participant 6 was a boy who had been identified as having a difficult temperament and

whose attachment classification was unclassified. He was an only child, who had a

normal relationship with his primary caregiver and he was very positive about school, his

friends and his teacher. However, on his first day at school his teacher explained:

> *"Although he seemed very settled and happy at first, after about half an hour*
>
> *later he caused a scene. He would not share the train engines with anyone*
>
> *else and didn't respond positively to my suggestions of another activity. He*
>
> *eventually had a tantrum and threw himself onto the floor, crouching and*
>
> *face down. He shouted at me 'You are giving me a headache.' He was very*
>
> *difficult to handle and the whole episode disrupted the class, making the*
>
> *other children feel quite unsettled."*

During the observations in the classroom, this child was not at all considerate during

play and did not like to share. His behaviour could be quite loud, rude and disruptive. For

example:

P6 is wheeling the pram around and says out loud "I've got a little baby." He continues to push the pram around as if to show everyone. He pushes the pram right across the car mat and disrupts the game going on there. He doesn't move off the mat even when a boy asks him to.

P6 is playing on the carpet with 2 other boys. They are playing with trains and tracks. P6 is keeping tightly hold of the engines he has chosen. He gets up and walks over to the end of the track as if he just wants to play on his own. He makes appropriate noises e.g. "Choo, choo". He crawls across the tracks despite the 2 other boys and now one girl who he disrupts as he does so. P6 begins to move the buildings around without regard to the children playing with and around them.

However, on the playground he would play chasing games with boys and girls, but boys mainly and these games tended to involve play fighting, for example:

P6 runs out with one boy and then he runs back in again. He runs into the middle of the playground and looks around smiling. He talks to 2 girls and then makes a gun out of his fingers. He makes a "Pow!" sound and shoots at a boy as they run towards each other. The boys reach each other and tussle. He stops and sees a girl watching him, they smile at each other and then he runs around with 2 boys who are chasing after a girl.

175

Participant 17 is a girl who was identified as securely attached with an Easy temperament. She was the youngest child of older parents and her siblings were in their teens. She spent a lot of time with her 'Aunty' who was a year older than her. She had experienced two major life events before starting school. The first involved her father's illness and his regular hospital trips that sometimes started in an ambulance as an emergency from the house. The second event occurred a week before the Preschool Assessment when a man attempted to abduct her whilst she was playing outside her house. Fortunately, the child ran for her 'Aunty' and they both ran inside and told an adult. After the first couple of weeks at school the primary caregiver was apprehensive about her attending school because the child had mixed feelings about school and didn't want to go most of the time. Although she liked her teacher, she didn't talk about any friends from school. However, by the end of her first year, even though she still had mixed feelings about going to school, her primary caregiver felt that she had settled and explained how she talked positively about her teacher and her friends at school.

The experiences involving her fathers trips to hospital continued throughout the year and her primary caregiver explained:

> *"Her Dad's been in and out of hospital with unstable angina once every couple of months. Recently he had an attack and went in an ambulance. It really upset her and she wakes up crying every night he's away."*

She was identified as a victim by her primary caregiver who explained:

> *"A boy would pull her hair and trip her up, but it stopped after Christmas. I didn't go in"*

176

Participant 25 had an Easy temperament and an insecure attachment type. His primary

caregiver appeared to be very protective towards him and was reluctant and apprehensive

about him starting school and even after the first few weeks, despite the fact that he

looked forward to going to school. At the end of this child's first year the primary

caregiver felt that their relationship had changed from a normal one to a difficult one and

when she was asked if she felt he had settled at school, she explained:

"Oh yes he has settled, but not as well as I'd hoped though. He's not invited

to many parties, but he got a couple of friends last term."

It was the child's primary caregiver who identified him as a victim (refer to page 146 for

the exact details). There was no evidence of this from the observations. In fact, this boy

could sometimes be disruptive and boisterous. However, at other times he was patient

with other children and polite. For example:

P25 is shouting, smiling and running around on the big blocks with 2 other

boys. He pushes P18 who immediately pushes him back. He then pulls P18

off the construction, playfully and is smiling. He then tussles with P18 on the

mat and then with more force, pushes P18 in his stomach.

P25 and P15 are with a Welfare Assistant. The Welfare Assistant turns one

end of the skipping rope and the boys take it in turns to turn the other end,

whilst the other one jumps. P25 runs to jump in on his turn and skips well.

Smiling, he swaps with P15 and is very patient with P15, who isn't as good at

skipping as he is.

7.4.4. Children Identified as Victims in General

The twelve children identified as victims included five girls and seven boys. Eight of the children were identified by their primary caregivers, two more were identified by their primary caregivers and their teachers and two children were observed as they were victimised. Seven of the children had secure attachment styles (including all five of the girls), eight had easy temperament types and four had difficult temperament types. All of the caregivers had secure attachment types, except one secondary caregiver with an anxious-ambivalent type and three secondary caregivers who did not complete the attachment and personality measures.

Half of these children were used to receiving a smack if they were naughty and only three primary caregivers reported using methods of discipline that did not include smacking or shouting (e.g. distraction and time out).

Only two of the children had not experienced a major life event before starting school and all but one of the children's displays of naughty and good behaviour stayed the same throughout their first year or there was a decrease in naughty behaviour and/or an increase in good behaviour. Most of the children had positive attitudes about school and, although four children had not made any positive comments about their teacher at the start of the year all of the children liked their teachers by the end of the school year. Furthermore, five of the children had not said that they liked their new friends at the start of the school year and four children were still not talking positively about friends at school by the end of the year

In summary, seven of the children had secure attachment styles (including all five of the girls) and eight had easy temperament types. Most of the caregivers had secure

178

attachment types.

Half of the children were used to receiving a smack if they were naughty and most of the children's displays of naughty and good behaviour stayed the same throughout their first year (or there was a decrease in naughty behaviour and/or an increase in good behaviour). Only two of the children had not experienced a major life event before starting school, most of the children had positive attitudes about school and all of the children liked their teachers by the end of the school year. However, four children were still not talking positively about friends at the end of the year.

7.4.5   Children Identified as Bully & Victim

Six children were identified as a bully and as a victim. Participant 11 was a girl who had been identified as a bully and a victim by her primary caregiver. Participants 14 and 16 were boys who had been identified as a victim by their primary caregivers and identified as a bully and a victim by their teachers. Participant 23 was a girl who had been identified as a victim by her primary caregiver and as a bully by her teacher and Participant 24 was a girl who had been identified as a bully by her primary caregiver and as a victim during the observations. Participant 26 was a boy who had been identified as a victim by his primary caregiver, but had been identified as a bully by his teacher and as a bully in seven separate minutes in the observations in the playground. Furthermore, his name had cropped up during telephone interviews with other participants' primary caregivers.

All three of the girls and one boy had revealed secure attachment styles and five of the children had easy temperament types, with the other child having a difficult temperament type. Furthermore all three of the girls had secure attachment types and easy temperament

179

types. All of the caregivers were shown to have secure attachment types (however, two of their secondary caregivers did not complete the attachment and personality questionnaires). Four of the primary caregivers worked for more than 2½ days a week and three of the primary caregivers had suffered from postpartum depression and two were still suffering from depression at the time of the Preschool Assessment. All of the children were used to receiving praise and/or treats when they displayed good behaviour and only one child would be punished with a smack. Four of the children were used to being shouted at or had time out on the stairs or in their bedrooms and one child's parents would discourage his naughty behaviour by distracting him.

All but one of the children had experienced one major life event before starting school. Two children had experienced the arrival of a new baby arrive into their family (including their primary caregivers' stay in hospital etc.) and the other three children had experienced many life events through out their lives. Although there were fluctuations, all of the primary caregivers and child's relationships were normal/easy throughout the study (except when the children started school, the primary caregiver and child's relationship became difficult for participant 26, but it had returned to normal by the following assessment). Most of the children were very positive about starting school and this enthusiasm was still evident after the first couple of weeks. However, by the end of their first year only four of the children felt the same way. Although some of these children had not liked their teacher and friends earlier in the year, by the time they had settled all of them were very positive about their teacher and their friends. Nevertheless, only two of the children had shown positive changes in their behaviour at the times of the telephone

interviews. The other children had all shown no changes or negative changes, except participant 23 had shown both positive and negative changes.

In summary, most of these children had secure attachment styles and most of them had easy temperament types, with all three of the girls having secure attachment and easy temperament types. All of the caregivers who had completed the measure had revealed a secure attachment type, most of the primary caregivers worked for more than 2½ days a week and half of the primary caregivers had suffered from postpartum depression.

Most of the children were used to being shouted at or having 'time out' when they were naughty and most of the children had experienced one major life event before starting school. Most of the primary caregiver and child's relationships were normal/easy throughout the study and most of the children were initially very positive about starting school. However, only four felt the same way at the end of their first school year. Finally, most of the children had all shown no changes or negative changes through this year. For a deeper understanding of their lives, their experiences are described below.

Participant 11 who was categorised as securely attached with an easy temperament, had experienced numerous major life events at the time of the Preschool Assessment and was living with her paternal grandmother. Her grandmother explained:

> *"Yes, I am her primary caregiver. She's been coming to me every weekend*
>
> *since the day she was born and twice in the week. Her Mum has never been*
>
> *able to cope with her."*

Her parents had separated when she was six months old and then continued to fight over her father's access to the child. She lived with her mum until she was approximately 3 years old when her mother felt she couldn't cope with raising her anymore and the child's

181

father gained full custody of her. At this time her father was living with his cousin and her two daughters and so Participant 11 moved into a family unit and was made to feel very welcome. Visiting her mother dwindled to once a year and her grandmother explained:

> *"she would always get very upset after seeing her mum and she misses her*
>
> *terribly."*

At the age of four years 5 months, the child had to move in with her Grandmother role as her father started a prison term and her cousin did not have the legal rights to keep her when the child's biological mother objected to her living there (the mother did not approve of the father's relationship with his cousin). Participant 11 also experienced two deaths in the family before she started school. Although, this child was an only child, she still spent a lot of her time with her cousins and in effect was treated like the youngest child of three girls. She seemed to settle at school quite quickly and was always positive about school, her teacher and her friends. However, her behaviour deteriorated at home following a violent and frightening experience involving her Grandmothers new partner at her Grandmother's house. This occurred during the child's first term at school and her Grandmother explained:

> *"She was very frightened and was screaming especially at the sight of blood.*
>
> *The police had to come, because he got very violent and started smashing*
>
> *things up. Her Aunty came and took her away and she's started wetting the*
>
> *bed again."*

At the time of the final telephone interview, the child's father had been released from prison and the child had moved back in with her father and his family. However, her

Grandmother explained:

> "She's been really naughty all of the time. She's been scribbling on the walls
>
> upstairs, she's put nail varnish on the bed covers and her cousin's legs and the
>
> last time she was here, she wet my bathroom through. There's no malice with
>
> her though, she's just playing. "

Her Grandmother also explained:

> "Her school work has deteriorated as well and she's started to be disruptive in
>
> class, disrupting the whole class. So I go in to help. She sees me there a few
>
> days a week and she's not as bad."

During the observations, this child was seen to exclude Participant 24 during free play in

the classroom (as previously described on page 152) and she wasn't always willing to

share with others. During the observations on the playground, this child was seen

smacking girls in a playful way on a couple of occasions and then she got into trouble

with the Welfare Assistant. However, it was obvious that she did not mean to hurt the

girls and that the girls just wanted to cause trouble for, but she did not explain herself to

the adult, she just accepted the telling off. For example:

> P11 is playing with 3 girls. She gets up and moves away from 2 of the girls
>
> and goes to the 3rd girl. She smacks her on the head gently. The girl screams
>
> (inappropriately) and jumps up and goes to the Welfare Assistant who has
>
> been standing quite close to the group. The Welfare Assistant turns to P11
>
> and says "How many times do you need telling?" P11 walks backwards
>
> slowly away from the girls and the Welfare Assistant. She talks to a different

183

girl and then returns to the group of girls she had been playing with before

being told off.

Participant 14 had been shown to be securely attached with a difficult temperament.

However, his mother described as a: *"Loving, little angel."*

He was the youngest child at the time of the Preschool Assessment and his brother was

going to start secondary school at the same time as he would start at infant school. His

mother was expecting a baby at this time and the baby was born prematurely during the

child's first term at school. At the time of the telephone interviews the child's mother

explained:

"He's never naughty these days, he's always good."

At the same time he only spoke positively about school, his teacher and his friends.

However, his mum explained that some older children had been picking on him because

they found out he does ballet, but it all stopped after she went and spoke to the teacher.

The teacher identified him as a bully and a victim with one child in particular (P16) and

she said the same on P16's measure too about P14. She did also point out that this

participant was also friends with all of the children. Although, there was no evidence of

him bullying others or being picked on in the observations, he was seen teasing children.

For example:

P14 is running all over the playground, with a few girls chasing him. He has a

girl's head band in one hand, which he throws after a while and P3 manages

to get it before any of the girls do. P14 then goes over to the group of girls

(including P10) who have now stopped running around. He just stands on the

184

outskirts of the group watching. He then moves over to another girl, he talks to her and then wanders away, but turns quickly and starts to chase her around the tree. They both smile all of the time.

P14 is watching a game of football. He then moves towards the footballers and chases after the ball. He tries to pick the ball up, but is unsuccessful. One of the footballers is clearly unhappy with P14's interference as he scowls at him and hits his arm. P14 spins around to face the boy and hits the boy back on the arm. He then skips backwards and moves around in front of the boy with his palms facing upwards, smirking. P14 is obviously goading the boy. The boy tries to hit P14 again, but P14 jumps back smiling, still with his palms in the air. The boy tries to attack P14 again, but P14 is quicker and hits him on the arm, immediately jumps out of the way of the boys slap and dodges backwards around the tree. The boy is clearly getting angrier and angrier as P14 continues to goad him, smirking, with his palms up, but the boy cannot get at P14 and so turns and goes to tell the Welfare Assistant.

Participant 16 was identified as having and insecure attachment type and an easy temperament. He was the youngest child and had suffered a great loss when his best friend moved to Australia. He took this major life event badly and still referred to his friend often. Furthermore, his mum had a baby during his first term at school. He always looked forward to going to school throughout his first year, always liked his teacher and was talking about (at least) one friend at home in a positive way by the end of his first

185

year. His primary caregiver identified him as a victim:

"Yes he has been picked on by a boy in the other [reception] class. He scratched his face and bashed his nose. So I stepped in and stopped it. It's not happened since."

As previously explained, the teacher identified him as a bully and a victim with one child in particular (P14) and she said the same on P14's measure too about P16. She also pointed out that this participant was also friends with all of the children. Although, there was no evidence of him bullying others or being picked on in the observations, he was very noisy and inconsiderate during the observations in the classroom. For example:

P16 is alone, but very busy in the kitchen area of the classroom. He is jumping about and banging plates together by the oven, which is disrupting girl's the quiet play at the sink. He ignores the girls' reactions and complaints, but quietens down when the teacher comes over and speaks to him.

P16 is defending his actions as the teacher tells him off. The teacher eventually 'wins' and P16 goes back towards the kitchen area, then behind the teacher's back (in an act of rebellion) he flips the egg up in the pan. Seconds later he flips some more food up in the pan and the teacher tells him off again and makes P16 sit on the floor by her feet as she is busy talking to another group of children. P16 sits well.

Additionally, during the observations on the playground P16, appeared less disruptive,

186

but would still behave strangely, for example:

> P16 is wearing a woollen hat and scarf (inappropriate for the weather conditions!) and is standing at the edge of one of the flower beds. He flaps his arms about as he looks around the playground. He spots his friend standing by a tree and moves towards him. P16 shakes the tree until the Welfare Assistant comes over and says "Off the tree, please Darling". P16 moves towards the flower beds and pulls at a rose bush and then plays in the soil.

Participant 23 had been revealed a secure attachment type and an easy temperament type. She was the eldest child of two girls and she was excited about going to school throughout her first year. She had experienced a number of major life events before starting school; she had had three nannies in $2\frac{1}{2}$ she'd experienced the arrival of her baby sister, her mum's return to work and a brief visit to hospital when she had an accident and fell off a wall. Furthermore, her secondary caregiver explained:

> "She hasn't any major life events since she started school, but she gets stressed about lunchtimes, the trays are too heavy and she's scared about dropping hers. She worries about having to choose her meal and about having to eat it all."

Her caregivers reported her experiences of bullying. They explained:

> "During the first week it was obvious that something was bothering her and eventually we found out that she'd been whacked on the head."

> "She was roughed up by boys in the first term, but it stopped before we got to

the bottom of it."

"More recently, she believes that older girls are laughing at her in the dinner

queue."

Although her teacher identified her as a bully, there was some evidence of a negative

interaction with Participant 4 during observation 2, as previously described on page 150.

Participant 24 was a securely attached girl with an easy temperament type. She had one

older brother and had broken her arm when she was younger which resulted in an

overnight stay as it needed to be reset. Her primary caregiver had suffered from

postpartum depression, but had not suffered since. She experienced and easy and a

normal relationship with her primary caregiver throughout her first year at school and

always had positive things to say about school, her teacher and her friends. She did not

experience any more major life events during her first year and by the end of the year she

never displayed naughty behaviour with her primary caregiver. This child was observed

as a victim of exclusion (refer to page 152) and as a bully during the playground

observations:

P24 is playing with 3 girls (in 2 pairs). They have their arms folded across

their chests and the pairs constantly bang into each other with their folded

arms. One girl starts to cry and P24 deliberately bangs into her again and

turns to one of the other girls laughing. The girl cries harder and P24 runs

away. She returns with another girl and watches as this girl asks the girl who

is crying "Are you ok?" P24 links arms with 2 girls and they skip happily

across the playground. (The Welfare Assistant comes over and speaks to the

girl who is crying and then she rubs her arm. The girl is ok and plays with the

girl who came over to see if she was ok).

P24 is playing with 4 girls and they are walking across the playground

holding hands, smiling and chatting. P24 tries a few times to drop the girl's

hand next to her (this is the girl who was crying before). The chain of girls

move across the playground and P24 is clearly not that happy. She joins in

with the girls as they chat and walk around, but keeps snapping at the girl

who was crying before. She continues to try and let go of the girl's hand, but

the girl must have a P24 in a vice like grip!

Furthermore, her primary caregiver explained:

"An older girl got her and a lot of others involved to pick on another little

girl, It only happened once, but we took her to the little girl and her mum to

apologise. It was really out of character for her. "

Participant 26 was a boy who had been identified with an easy temperament and an

unclassified attachment type. He was an only child who had experienced an number of

major life events before starting school. His mother and father had separated two years

before and were now separated; he lived with his mother and had moved house twice in

those two years. Both of his parents had new partners and he had only started to see his

Dad on a regular basis 6 months before the Preschool Assessment. This boy had looked

forward to going to school during his first term, but by the end of his first year he wasn't

bothered a bout going to school, although he still liked his teacher and his friends. During

his first year he experienced a couple of major life events. His mum had to spend some

time in hospital during his second term and close the end of his first year, he was the page

boy at his Dad's wedding.

His primary caregiver reported his experience as a victim of bullying. She explained

during the first telephone interview:

"He has trouble off some juniors, they say he's fat."

She also explained at the second telephone interview:

"He's told me that the juniors hit him, but he's not bothered, he just

mentioned it."

However, his teacher identified him as a bully and he was seen during seven separate

minutes of observations as a bully. For example, during the classroom observations:

He is still engaged in the same activity at the sandpit with the same 2 boys.

Another boy tries to join in and P26 behaves in a very hostile manner towards

him and says "You're not allowed to play" and "Get out!" The boy stays and

P26 gets angry. He tries to strangle the boy. I stepped in and he continued to

play nicely and was smiling (I think that the smiling was for my benefit, it

was as if he wanted to show me that he was a nice boy really).

And during the observations on the playground this boy was seen to behave aggressively,

even when he wasn't bullying someone. For example, refer to page 152 and:

P26 is with 3 other boys and is still being very aggressive towards the boy

from before. P18 has taken the role of 'defender' in this scenario and the boy

190

standing closest to P26 appears to be the onlooker. The onlooker then shouts

at P26 about the way he is treating the 'victim' and P26 changes his tone and

speaks in a gentler and more cajoling way to the onlooker, trying to bring him

round to his point of view. The onlooker then appears to become a

'reinforcer' as he sticks up for P26 and shouts at P18. Following P18's direct

response to him, he appears to become an onlooker again as he looks more

sheepish and steps back a little and doesn't respond. Instead he looks sad and

concerned again for the victim.

P26 goes over to P25 who has a ball. P25 manages to keep the ball despite

P26's aggressive attempts to take it from him. P26 moves away and goes to

sit on the floor next to a boy and shouts "Yeah!" at him, watching him

carefully all of the time. P26 stands up and goes over to 4 boys and then

throws a stone at the boy who had been his 'victim' previously. The 'victim'

goes to the Welfare Assistant and tells her what P26 has just done. P26

watches this happen.

7.4.6   Children Identified as Victims & Outsiders

Two boys were identified as victims and outsiders. Participant 8 had been observed as a

victim and an outsider in two separate observations and participant 20 had been observed

as an outsider and had been identified as a victim by his primary caregiver. Their

Attachment styles and Temperament types were not similar, but their caregivers revealed

secure attachment types. Both children received praise for displays of good behaviour

191

and both children experienced some kind of physical response when they had a tantrum. For example, participant 8 would get a smack on the bottom and participant 20 would be pinned down until he 'broke the tantrum' and burst into tears and apologised.

They had both experienced a major life event before they started school and did not experience another during their first year at school. The primary caregiver and child's relationships were easy/normal and remained quite constant throughout the study and although they both showed changes in their behaviour during the study one showed positive changes and one showed negative changes. They both looked forward to going to school throughout their first year and were quite positive about their teachers and their friends.

In summary, both of these boy's caregivers revealed secure attachment types (where the measure had been completed) and both children experienced some a physical punishment when they had a tantrum. They had both experienced a major life event before they started school and did not experience another during their first year at school. The primary caregiver and child's relationships were easy/normal and remained quite constant throughout the study. They both looked forward to going to school throughout their first year and were quite positive about their teachers and their friends.

More specifically, Participant 8 was the younger of two boys and was always positive about attending school, his teacher and his friends. The potential roles of outsider and victim were observed during the second set:

> As P8 runs onto the playground a boy runs into him deliberately. P8 shouts
> "Arrh!" as the boy laughs and keeps on running. The boy stops and looks
> back at P8 and P8 slowly wanders over to him, looking around the

playground all of the time. He then stops and watches a group of boys move

across the playground.

P8 is with a large group of boys who are all standing. P8 stands on the

outskirts of the group and stays there listening as the 2 boys who were getting

too rough before start to fight. He then wanders behind the group, but doesn't

take his eyes off the fight for a second. He clearly wants to detach himself

from the group as he moves away. He eventually stops watching the fight as

he starts to look around the field. He then wanders across the grass.

Participant 20 was an only child and was positive about attending school, his teacher and

his friends. His primary caregiver mentioned a couple of times that he was being picked

on by P26. On the second occasion, she explained:

"P26 goes around bullying most kids. He was picking on my son and he

didn't want to go to school because of it. He blurted it out over tea one

evening that P26 had pushed him against the wall and he showed us the

bumps and bruises. I went in and spoke to the teachers and they already knew

about it. They said they would talk to P26. He doesn't say P26 bothers him

anymore."

The potential role of outsider was seen during the observations on the playground:

P20 stands and watches as one of the boys in the group (the one with the ball)

is aggressive towards another of the boys. The 'victim' of the aggression the

goes to tell a Welfare Assistant and P20 watches this too. Although P20 keeps out of the trouble, he then approaches the aggressive boy and they sort out the rules of the game.

7.4.7   Children Identified as Defenders

Two boys were identified during the observations as defenders and participant 18 had been observed as a defender in two separate minutes. No similarities between their attachment styles were found, but they had both been identified as having easy temperament types. All of the caregivers had revealed secure attachment types, except participant 22's primary caregiver who had an avoidant attachment style (this child had revealed an unclassified attachment style).

Both of the primary caregiver and child's relationships were easy/normal throughout the year and were easy at the end of the year. They both showed positive changes in behaviour after starting school and then no changes after that and they both displayed good behaviour most of the time throughout the study. They were only naughty sometimes and by the end of the year participant 18 was never naughty.

Both children had experienced at least one major life event before starting school and were positive about starting school. However, their enthusiasm decreased throughout the year and they had mixed feelings about going by the end of their first year.

In summary, the two boys had revealed easy temperament types and most of the caregivers had revealed secure attachment types. Both of the primary caregiver and child's relationships were easy/normal throughout the year and were easy at the end of the year. They both showed positive changes in behaviour after starting school and then

no changes after that and they both displayed good behaviour most of the time throughout

the study. Both children had experienced at least one major life event before starting

school and were positive about starting school, but had mixed feelings about going by the

end of the year.

More specifically, Participant 18 was identified as securely attached and as having an

easy temperament. He was the older sibling and had experienced a dog bite to his face

when younger. Although he was always positive about attending school, his primary

caregiver was reluctant to let him go to school as she explained that she missed him. He

was observed in the role of defender on two occasions during the observations on the

playground:

> P18 is with 3 other boys who have all adopted roles in a bullying situation.
> P18 is defending the victim, who P26 is being very aggressive to. There is
> also an onlooker on the other side of P26. The victim is clearly getting upset
> and P18 moves closer to him and then takes the victim's face in his hands (in
> a caring manner) and asks him something. P26 continues to have a go at the
> boy and P18 steps in between the bully and the victim and speaks in a very
> brave and confident manner to P26 who then turns to the onlooker. P26
> speaks to the onlooker and he appears to say something to back up his
> actions. P26 then grabs P18's arm, but P18 ignores P26 and hugs the victim.
> (Refer to page 191 for further information about this scenario).

> Still in the bullying situation, P18 keeps eye contact with P26 and moves his
> body slightly to the victim's side ('defender'). There are no words and then

P26, the onlooker and P18 move away from the victim (by about 4-5 feet),

leaving him by the wall looking very upset (close to tears). P26 comes back at

the boy and nods in the victim's face. P18 and the onlooker return

immediately and all 4 boys run off into the playground.

Despite his positive behaviour as a defender this child had been seen as aggressive and

bossy in other minutes and he clearly did not like sharing with others. For example;

P18 is throwing sand onto the floor (not allowed to do this!) and then scoops

it up and puts most of it back in to the sand pit/box. He aggressively walks

outside to 3 boys playing with large pieces of ego on a mat. He strides over

them and their activities. He tries to break up a construction by hitting it and

the boy shouts at him.

P18 is standing by a wall, talking across a distance (the area between the two

buildings) to another boy with a racquet. P18 then kicks a piece of litter

towards the boy for him to bat back. He is still standing by the wall as he

watches a group of 4 boys. He ignores the whistle and continues to argue with

a boy about the bat and then moves to line up on the second whistle.

Participant 22 was identified as having an unclassified attachment type and an easy

temperament type. He was an only child who looked forward to starting school, but had

mixed feelings about going for the rest of the year. He was identified by his teacher as a

bully - who often argued with others. She further explained before the start of the set of playground observations:

"P22 is lovely" and then she continued laughing, "For me to say that he must be being good today!" She went onto explain that he severely lacked motivation and tended to want to play all of the time. She said that when the work was of a practical nature and P22 felt like it was play, then he would do the work with no problem, but if the work involved writing then there was "no chance." She also explained that earlier on in the year he was very sulky, he would scowl and throw temper tantrums. "However," she said "you can jolly him along now and the temper tantrums and sulks only happen occasionally." She explained that he and his friend (M – not involved in the research) had a love/hate relationship. They were both very egocentric, but were like magnets to each other. They both had strong personalities and liked to have their own way. They were usually worse when they are tired (e.g. towards the end of the half term) and they're not so bad after the holidays/break.

He was also seen to be aggressive towarsds others during the playground observations, for example:

P22 hits M on his head, the boy screams and then P22 screams and they both go over to the Welfare Assistant. The Welfare Assistant puts her arm around M and tells P22 off. P22 walks back to the bench quietly and looks very embarrassed. He then rubs at his ears with his hands and M leaves the

197

Welfare Assistant and walks off in the other direction. P22 has already been

told off a couple of times by the Welfare Assistant today; once for not

'playing nice' and another time for biting another child.

He was also observed as a defender during the playground observations in the following

minute:

P22 stops a boy from hurting another boy. He pushes the aggressor away and

then sorts the problem out. He turns to M immediately and said "Sorry, what

were we doing?" They then walk away, talking to each other and playing with

their hoods, smiling. P22then pulls up M's hood.

7.4.8   Children Identified as Children with No Role

Twelve children had not been identified as being involved in bullying behaviour at

school, seven of which were girls and five were boys. Eight children had secure

attachment styles, three had insecure attachment styles and one was unclassified. Ten of

the children had easy temperament types and two were slow to warm up (the only two in

this category in the study). Eleven primary caregivers and five secondary caregivers

revealed secure attachment types. One primary caregiver and two of the secondary

caregivers revealed avoidant attachment types and the three other secondary caregivers

had not completed the attachment measure. Furthermore, nine primary caregivers had not

suffered from depression.

All of the children were used to receiving praise and/or rewards for good behaviour and

the majority of them would be punished verbally or given time out on the stairs or in their

bedrooms when they were naughty. Seven of the children had not experienced a major

life event before starting school and apart from participant 3 the rest of the children

experienced very few major life events, with six children experiencing no major life

events at all between the two telephone interviews.

Except for participant 15 (whose relationship had become difficult by the end of the

study), the primary caregiver and child's relationships had fluctuated between 'easy' and

'normal' throughout the study. The amount of naughty behaviour that the children

displayed remained quite constant throughout the study, with improvements in some

cases and most children either did not show any changes in their behaviour or they

became cheekier by the end of the year

Seven of the children had positive attitudes about attending school and although three of

the children had not said whether they liked their teachers and six had not said whether

they liked their friends (after the first few weeks of school) every child liked their friends

and their teacher by the end of their first year at school.

In summary, eight children had secure attachment styles and most of the children had

easy temperament types. Most of their caregivers revealed secure attachment types and

nine primary caregivers had not suffered from depression at all.

The majority of these children would be punished verbally or given 'time out when they

were naughty and most of the children experienced very few or no major life events

throughout their first year at school. Most of the primary caregiver-child relationships

had fluctuated between 'easy' and 'normal' throughout the year and the amount of

naughty behaviour that the children displayed remained quite constant, with

improvements in some cases. Most children did not show any changes in their behaviour

and every child liked their friends and their teacher by the end of their first year at school.

Additionally, most of these children (Participants 1, 2, 3, 7, 10, 13, 15, 19, 21, 27)

enjoyed many friends and were thoughtful and polite with each other. They all would

play well together and would share readily. Two of the children (Participants 9 and 12)

seemed to be quieter and in a world of their own most of the time, but even these children

had a continuous friendship with one other child. Examples of their observations are

shown below to allow the contrast to be seen between their play and the play of the other

child identified with a participant role.

> **Participant 1** is playing in a group of girls (P1 + 3 others). They are standing
>
> in a line or queue up the grassy bank and they take it in turns (when they
>
> reach the front of the queue) to slowly run to the edge of the grass and
>
> playground to stop and say "I'm a Princess!" On P1's second turn (there are
>
> now + 4 girls) she adds more to the statement and makes everyone laugh.
>
> Kerry skips to the back of the queue again, smiling all the time. They are all
>
> smiling and each girl adds more to the statement on their go. The game stops
>
> as all the girls watch 2 girls who are playing close by with a skipping rope.

> **Participant 2** is standing next to P16 and is playing with a girl's hair. She
>
> pauses to listen to P13's instructions and then moves away from this group of
>
> girls who are dressing each other's hair with clips and combs. She watches
>
> the girls and then moves over to the railings with P16. They chat to each other
>
> about the leaves that are protruding through the railings. P16 gives P2 the leaf

he has plucked from the bush and then goes to the pile of leaves he has been making on the bench. P2 pulls a leaf off the bush and then takes it over to P16's pile and adds her leaves to it.

Participant 3 is running with a football. Someone shouts his name and he gets the ball again, kicks it and then stands still. A boy goes over to P3, talks to him and then 2 boys lead P3 over to another boy. The boy asks P3 something and they chat for a while. It becomes clear that have been deciding which players they will be in the game of football. There is a bit of a disagreement about who will play David Beckham and P3 makes a suggestion.

Participant 7 is with P3 and they are running around the playground. P3 leaves P7 at the tree and runs over to 3 girls who are sitting on a bench (one of the girls is P1). P7 comes over to the bench. P3 sits down and talks to P1. P7 crouches and talks to 2 other girls.

Participant 9 is standing at the top of the hill and is looking at a girl (his best friend) who is also standing at the top but some distance away from P9. They both set off running towards each other smiling. They continue to run passed each other and stop and turn to face each other when they have swapped positions. They do this again, but this time P9 stops as he passes the girl and

bends down to tie his shoe lace. He then runs back to the girl. They swap ends

and then P9 runs down the hill. The girl runs after him.

Participant 10 is playing with 6 girls, P7 and P3. They all laugh as P3 puts

P13's headband on P7. P10 watches as P13 takes the head band off P7 and

puts it on her own head, but around her forehead. P10 laughs along with

everyone else at P3 who takes P10's pink head band off her head and puts on

his own head. P10 then takes the head band back off P3 and put it across her

own eyes and then jumps and moves away from the group and over to the

grass where she falls. The other girls all run over to P10 and flop on top of

her.

Participant 12 is standing by the railings watching a girl who is reaching

through the railings to get leaves. They then stand and step away from the

railings, but remain very close to each other. P12 looks behind her and around

the playground (as if to see if any one has seen what they're up to) and then

she puts her head in close again as she and the girl look at their leaf. The girl

then moves to the edge of the grass/playground and bends down. P12 watches

her every move and then joins her. They both plant the leaf together.

Participant 13 is talking with 2 girls (one of whom is P10) and they are all

looking at P10's toy. P1 and another girl come over and the girls listen to P1.

P13 looks at P10's comb and then follows P10 over to a bench. P13 and P10 skip off linking arms and the other 3 girls follow.

Participant 15 walks up the hill with a boy. They wander into the meadow and talk to each other constantly. The boy then links his arm through P15's and they turn to face each other as the boy says "Pow pow!" They make fists and hit each other's fists. Another boy joins them and P15 punches his fists into the air. The boys wander back towards the playground together, but stop under the tree and look up into it.

Participant 19 is standing by the door with 2 girls. She is holding her nose and listening to the girl with the skipping rope. She then moves around to the railings, she swings on them then claps her hands. She looks over to the playground and then wanders into the playground alone.

Participant 21 is standing by the wall (in the goals). Then a boy comes and stands next to him and P21 says "Arrh, but I was here first!" and the 2 boys continue to discuss who is to be the goalie. Robert then gives the boy one of his goalie gloves and they both stand waiting for the ball in the goals. P21 punches the ball away as it comes near and then he wanders away. He returns to his spot on the wall and plays with his glove. P21 ignores the ball as it comes over and the other boy tries to save it, but misses it and it is a goal. P21

then wanders over to the other footballers and waits for the goalie to throw

the ball out with the other boys.

Participant 27 has hold of the end of a rope and is holding hands in a chain

with 4 other girls. She is in the middle of the chain, but seems to be leading as

she is ahead of the others and she appears to be dragging the girl on her right

(the others are keeping up with P27). P27 is very vocal and appears to be very

happy. She remains in the chain, never letting go of either of the girl's hands

and continues to tug and pull the chain all over the playground.

These children displayed more prosocial behaviour towards each other than those

children identified with a participant role. For example;

P1 is sitting listening to P13 reading. She gets her own book and tells P13

that she has this book at home. She then asks "Do you want me to read it to

you?" and with consent P1 pretends to read the book and they both look at the

pictures.

P7 is at the table that has felt geometrical shapes on it and he is sitting with

P3. P3 head butts the palms of his own hands and P7 smiles at this and then

helps P3 to make the shape he is trying to make. P7 & P3 smile all the time

and P7 listens to P3 as he talks all of the time. He giggles too and reaches for

a specific piece of felt that is in the box.

P15 is watching P18, who is using the computer. He coaches P18, is smiling and makes complimentary comments. Still making suggestions, he stands and begins to sway. He then tries to take the mouse from P18, but is not persistent. He makes another suggestion and points to the screen.

In summary, the children with no-roles appeared to play in a different ways to the other children who were identified with participant roles. They appeared to be milder, calmer, and generally more peaceful than the other children were. They engaged in more co-operative play and they appeared thoughtful towards others around them.

Chapter 8

DISCUSSION

DISCUSSION

This Chapter discusses the results in relation to the hypotheses and the expected findings from the existing literature. In order to highlight antecedents of bullying behaviours, these discussions primarily focus upon the children's attachment type and their subsequent participant roles in bulling situations at school. However, potential influences on each of these factors (e.g. postpartum depression on the mother-child attachment relationship, parental discipline styles on bullying behaviours) are also considered. Additionally, this Chapter highlights the limitations and difficulties encountered during the investigation and ends with suggestions for future research.

8.1   Hypotheses and the Expected Findings

The analyses conducted to test the hypotheses are discussed below and consider the effects of the following factors on the participant roles of bullying: attachment types; temperament types; primary caregiver–child relationship; parenting; birth order; and major life events.

8.1.1   Attachment Types and Bullying Roles

Following the findings of previous research (e.g. Troy & Sroufe, 1987; Turner, 1991), it was expected that this study would find bullies and victims to be more likely to have insecure attachments than the other children, but the results did not support this hypothesis. However, it was revealed that children in the victim only category were slightly more likely to have insecure attachment types than secure attachment types and those children who had not been identified as being involved in any bullying role were more likely to have secure attachment types than insecure attachment types.

8.1.2 Temperament Types and Bullying Roles

Significant differences between group means scores were revealed on the sub-scales. These findings suggest that victims tended to be generally more active and fidgety than those children who had not been identified with a participant role and they tended to be more easily distracted and less likely to see a task through to its end, compared to those children who had never been victimised. Bullies were found to be more active (from the attachment measure) and were more able to sit quietly when playing or listening compared to those identified as not been bullied at school and those children who had been identified as both a bully and a victim were more likely to hold back from new activities, situations and people than victims. Furthermore, they were not as sensitive to differences and changes as those children who had not been identified with a participant role. Therefore, these findings provided support for previous research (e.g. Olweus, 1993a; Smith, 1991) that has suggested links between childrens' temperament types and bullying.

8.1.3 Primary Caregiver–Child Relationship and Bullying Roles

Although there was no significant association found between the primary-caregiver-child relationship and the various bullying participation roles, parents who reported their relationship with their children as being normal-difficult had the largest proportion of their children identified as bullies and those children who had normal relationships with caregivers were more likely to be identified as victims. These results indicate that even when children are bullies and victims at school their relationship with their parents may not reveal the problems. Similarly, the case studies showed that most children's

relationship fluctuated across their first year at school and the children who were reported

to be experiencing a difficult relationship with their primary caregiver had also

experienced a major life event. Therefore, even a negative change in this relationship

could be attributed to another reason and would not be useful in identifying bullying

behaviours.

8.1.4   Parenting and Bullying Roles

Although there were no significant associations found for parental disciplining of bad

behaviour and for responses to good behaviour with the various bullying participation

roles, there were some interesting findings. Most of the children whose parents used

distraction or penalties in disciplining bad behaviour had children who were not involved

in bullying, whereas, victims tended to be from families where the primary caregiver

used either verbal or physical punishment, with half of the *only* victims used to just

physical punishment. Additionally, those parents who used just physical punishment had

a larger number of children in the bullying categories. These results provide support for

previous studies like that of Loeber & Dishion (1984) who parents who used aversive

discipline techniques with physical punishment were more likely to have a child who was

more aggressive to others and Olweus (1993a) who believed that parents' use of 'power-

assertive' child-rearing methods such as physical punishment are more likely to have

children who becomes both a bully and a victim. Further interesting findings relating to

discipline techniques involved parents who used distraction techniques tended to have the

largest proportion of their children reported as bullies as did those parents who used

rewards, treats and praise in response to good behaviour and praise only was more

associated to victim status.

.

8.1.5 Birth Order and Bullying Roles

Interesting findings between the childrens' birth order and their participation in bullying

was revealed, where the eldest children were the largest proportion of children not

involved in bullying, the 'only-child' group were the largest proportion of children

reported to have *only* bullied or to have *only* been bullied and the youngest children were

the largest proportion of children reported to have been both bullies and victims. These

results were not supportive of previous findings which suggested that later-born children

were more popular (Miller and Maruyama, 1976) or the findings that suggested older

siblings replicate dominant behaviour with siblings at school (Berndt and Bulleit, 1985;

Smith and Myron-Wilson, 1998).

8.1.6 Major Life Events and Bullying Roles

The case studies showed some interesting findings relating to major life events. Most of

the children who had been identified as victims only had experienced at least one major

life event before starting school. Of the children who had been identified as a bully and as

a victim, half of their primary caregivers had suffered from postpartum depression, all but

one of them had experienced one major life event before starting school and two of the

children had experienced the arrival of a new baby with the other three children

experiencing many life events through out their lives. Of the bullies in general, there was

only one child who had not experienced a major life event before starting school and

most of the children had experienced many major life events during this time. When compared to those children who had not been identified in any of the participant roles: seven had not experienced a major life event before starting school and most of the other children experienced very few major life events, with six children experiencing no major life events at all between the two telephone interviews. These results suggest that a child's experience of major life events may have an effect on their behaviour at school and therefore, should therefore considered an important factor for future research and for teachers and schools.

8.2   Factors Associated with Attachment

The analyses that were conducted to investigate whether the type of attachment experienced between a child and its caregiver (whether secure or insecure) could act as a mediator between antecedent variables and bullying participation are now discussed.

8.2.1   Child Temperament and Attachment Security

The results showed that two-thirds of the children with easy temperaments were classed as having a secure attachment, whereas, contrary to expectations, *all* of the difficult and slow to warm up children were categorised as secure. However, the disproportionate number of children in this study falling into the easy and secure categories, combined with the small sample, no doubt had a major influence on this finding.

8.2.2   Maternal Post-Natal Depression and Children's Attachment Types

Interestingly, the results revealed that two-thirds of those mothers who had not

experienced depression of any kind and half of the mothers who had suffered from

depression but not post-natal depression had securely attached children However, again,

unexpectedly, *all* of the mothers who had experienced post-natal depression had children

who were securely attached.

8.2.3   Associations between Parent and Child Attachment Types

There was no evidence to support the hypothesis based on the intergenerational

transmission of attachment style between the primary or the secondary caregiver and their

child. However, the usefulness of the adult attachment measure is drawn to question and

is discussed in more detail later.

8.3   Additional Factors

Following the findings from previous research, extra factors were considered in the study.

These included the childrens' towards attending school, their teacher and their friends;

the similarities between teacher and parent reports of bullying and the prevalence of

bulling in Reception Class. Theses factors as discussed in more detail below.

8.3.1   Positivity towards School, Teacher and Friends

The case studies highlighted the subtle differences between the participant roles and the

childrens' attitudes towards attending school, their attitudes towards their teachers and

their attitudes towards their friends. Most of the children identified as victims only were

either negative or non-committal about their teacher and/or friends, but the victims in

general had positive attitudes about school and all, but four, of the children liked their

teachers by the end of the school year. Most of the children identified as bullies had

positive attitudes about school and all of the children liked their teacher and their friends

by the end of the school year and most of the children identified as a bully and as a victim

were initially very positive about starting school, but only four felt the same way at the

end of their first school year. Those children identified as victims and outsiders looked

forward to going to school throughout their first year and were quite positive about their

teachers and their friends, whereas, the defenders were positive about starting school, but

had mixed feelings about going by the end of the year. These findings provide some

support for previous studies (e.g. Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a) which found that

victimisation led to negative attitudes about school and that victims receive very little and

inadequate social support from peers and that this may actually lead to poor mental health

(e.g. Cox, 1995).

8.3.2   The Bullying Measures

The present investigation adopted the use of three measures of bullying to ensure as many

participant roles were identified as possible and to also compare the effectiveness of the

measures. It was predicted that comparisons between the teacher and parent reports of

bullying would be very similar, however this was not supported. In fact, all three of the

measures showed very few similarities. However, the discrepancies between the findings

of the measure were not considered as omissions or problems. Instead they were seen to

provide a thorough and comprehensive picture of bullying behaviours adopted by the

children in reception class. Furthermore, these findings provided support for previous

findings relating to victims being more likely to tell someone at home rather than a

teacher (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Eslea and Smith, 1998; Smith and Shu, 2000). However, the findings did not provide support for the studies that found teachers did relatively little to put a stop to bullying when they were made aware of it (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993), as all parents had seen positive results when the teacher was made aware of the situation.

8.3.3 Prevalence of bullying

42.9% of the children in the present study were identified as victims at some time during their first year at school and 28.57% children were identified as bullies. Compared with the findings from previous prevalence studies (e.g. Whitney and Smith, 1993; Kochenderfer and Ladd, 1996a and 1996b) the findings from this study are not only similar but provide support that the percentage of pupils who are bullied steadily decreases with age (Olweus, 1993a; Whitney and Smith, 1993; Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius and Piha, 2000).

8.4   Limitations of the Research and Suggestions for Future Research

Despite the non-significant findings relating to attachment style and bullying behaviours, it is suggested that future research is still required to examine the associations further. Therefore this section considers the limitations of the present investigation to highlight difficulties and problem areas as an insight for researchers in the future.

8.4.1 Self-selecting Sample

A couple of limitations of the study were based on the sample. These included the unavoidable problem that the sample was self-selecting due to the Data Protection Act. To avoid a self-selecting sample, it is suggested that future research of this nature would approach potential participants directly, perhaps through a presentation at each school during the summer term when the parents bring their children to induction days. This would ensure *all* parents are contacted and are aware of the study. It would also avoid repetition and would save time at the Preschool Assessments. Furthermore, as the parents time was limited during the Preschool Assessment, only the Caregiver's Questionnaire was completed by the interviewer. All other measures were left with the primary caregivers (with full instructions). However, this is not necessary that best method to complete these measures, especially the Child's Attachment Q-Sort and the lengthy Behavioural Style Questionnaire. Therefore, it is suggested that future research asks participants to complete the Adult Attachment and Personality measures after the presentation. They would the be asked to complete the Child's Attachment Q-Sort at home and the Behavioural Style would be completed once the researcher had received the results of the Q-Sort. This would avoid fatigue and practice effects.

Another problem related to the sample was the size. However, it cannot go unnoted that the sample size was constrained by the number of data collection points in the study that required near-simultaneous assessment of all participants. Furthermore, detailed measures were taken of a large number of factors to provide case studies, which required long, time consuming sessions with parents and children. Although a few more volunteers would have been ideal, it must be noted that a much larger sample size would not have been

manageable. However, as most of the findings are based on small numbers, generalisations should be kept to a minimum.

8.4.2 Limitations of the Measures

The present investigation was hindered by the lack of a useful attachment measure for children of this age-group. It is suggested that perhaps the separation behaviours and reunion behaviours observed as the child leaves his/her caregivers and is later reunited with his/her caregivers on their first day are examined as potential 'naturally occurring' indicators of attachment type. It is considered very important that a reliable measure for attachment for this age group of children is developed as existing measures have not been found to be effective. Furthermore, it is suggested that when intergenerational transmission of attachment is measured, a more involved measure of adult attachment is used in future studies alongside an effective and reliable measure of child-attachment.

Additionally, it would also be important to note the procedural differences between the schools in future studies of this nature, as it was seen that the activities that occur during the parent-child separation and just after affect the children's enjoyment of their first day and their subsequent adjustment to starting school.

Although the lack of similarity between the findings from the three measures of bullying (i.e. the parent report, the teacher report and the observations) did not pose a problem to the present investigation. It is important for the design of future research to consider that one measure alone may not provide a complete picture of extent of the problem.

216

Furthermore, an understanding of the relevant background details regarding the measures

is essential: Firstly, it was evident at one school that one teacher did not report bullying

and victimisation even when she had a conversation about such behaviours with a parents

about their children (as revealed in the narratives in the telephone interviews). It is

suggested that some teachers do not like to admit that there is a bullying problem.

Furthermore, most parent reports of victimisation were not corroborated by the teachers

or the observations. It is suggested that perhaps this is evidence of the over-protective

nature of mothers of victimised children highlighted in previous research. Additionally,

the observations were limited by the fact that the numbers of observations were evenly

balanced at the schools on corresponding days of the week etc. to ensure spurious effects

were minimized. Therefore, school trips, the weather, holidays and illness dictated the

number of possible observation days available.

8.4.3   Limitations of the Observations

It is suggested that future studies of this nature should not allow the observer to meet the

children before they start school as their familiarity affects the initial observations.

Attempts should be made to employ two or more researchers in the study. Another

limitation of the observations related to the identification of bullies and victims. Despite

the fact that a definition of bullying was provided with the operational variables for

coding the observations, it was very difficult to know whether children were actually

victims, as the repetition of bullying behaviours were not observed. For future

investigations it is suggested that more observations are taken of the children, perhaps

using video equipment similar to CCTV on the playgrounds, so that the children are not

217

aware that they are being watched. Finally, the observational method used required the researcher to be able to make fast and accurate notes of the events of each minute. Although effective, this method proved to be exhausting and time consuming and all shorthand notes had to be transcribed and typed immediately for future reference. This method is also open to criticism that suggests errors due to fatigue or simply missing behaviours.

As the study provided definite evidence of participant roles in bullying situations, it is suggested that future research always considers bullying as a group process. However, a reliable measure of the participant roles in bullying situations is not available if sociometry is not an option (as in studies involving Reception Class children).

Finally, despite the non-significant findings relating to attachment style and bullying behaviours, it is suggested that future research is still required to examine the associations further. Additionally, measures of temperament could also be taken to help identify the bullies and victims. Furthermore, studies of bullying must also consider birth order and the disciplining techniques used by the caregivers.

8.5   Ideas for Intervention

As the research was conducted over three different schools, effective methods adopted by one school became apparent when they were absent at one of the other schools. Therefore, it is suggested that children are provided with an ample number of toys (e.g. skipping ropes, bean bags and balls) during the lunch playtime on the playground. These were not only used in the conventional way to amuse the child, but also as ice-breakers between children which also encouraged sharing and relieved boredom. Furthermore, a

218

designated play area for the reception class meant that the supervision provided by the Welfare Assistant was concentrated in one area and the children appeared to play better within the security of the boundaries. Furthermore, this school was able to introduce two or three older juniors to supervise and play with the children. The affect that they had on the children was amazing and was a positive experience for those involved. It is suggested that this should be encouraged in more schools to promote the confidence and wellbeing of all of those involved.

Furthermore, it is essential that schools and individual teachers accept that bullying is a real problem for children. It was seen that those school which acknowledged the potential for bullying and adopted a 'tell someone immediately' approach were able to stop the problem from escalating or spreading. Additionally, intervention was far more effective when parents and teachers worked together to combat the problem, in that the bullying stopped immediately, didn't reoccur as often and the children understood that they had support and that their problem would be stopped, which in turn encouraged more children to speak up in the first instance.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Ainsworth, M. D. S., Blehar, M. C., Waters, E., and Wall, S. (Eds.) (1978). *Patterns of Attachment: A Psychological Study of the Strange Situation*. Hillsdale, NJ: Earlbaum

Ainsworth, M. D. S., and Whittig, (1969). B.A. Attachment and Exploratory Behavior of One-year-olds in a Strange Situation. In B. M. Foss (Ed.), *Determinants of Infant Behavior IV*. London: Methuen, 1969, 111-136.

Andreou, E. (2000). Bully/Victim Problems and their Association with Psychological Constructs in 8- to 12- year old Greek Schoolchildren. *Aggressive Behaviour*. Vol. 26, 49-56.

Archer, J. and Westeman, K. (1981). Sex Differences in the Aggressive Behaviour of School Children. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 20, 31-36

Baldry, A. C. and Farrington, D. P. (1998). Parenting Influences on Bullying and Victimisation. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*. Vol. 3, 237-254

Baldry, A. C. and Farrington, D. P. (2000). Bullies and Delinquents: Personal Characteristics and Parental Styles. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 10 17-31.

Bandura, A. (1973). *Aggression: A Social Learning Analysis*. London: Prentice Hall.

REFERENCES

Bartholomew, K. and Horowitz, L. M (1991). Attachment Styles Among Young Adults. A Test of a Four Category Model. *Journal of Personality and social Psychology*, Vol. 61, No.2, 226-244.

BBC News (16.04.2000) Bullying Plea after Victims Suicide. http://news.bbc.co.uk

BBC News (06.06.2003) School Tribute to Bullied Pupil. http://news.bbc.co.uk

BBC News (19.11.2003). Anti-bullying Charter Launched. http://news.bbc.co.uk

BBC News (04.02.2005) Do You Know Your Awareness Bracelet? http://news.bbc.co.uk

BBC News (20.11.2005) Parents of Bullies to Face Court http://news.bbc.co.uk

Berndt, T. J. and Bulleit, T. N. (1985). Effects of Sibling Relationships on Preschoolers' Behaviour at Home and at School. *Developmental Psychology*, 21, 761-767.

Bernstein, J. Y. and Watson, M. M. (1997). Children who are Targets of Bullying. A Victim Pattern. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 12 No. 4, 483-498.

REFERENCES

Björkqvist, K., Ekman, K. and Lagerspetz, K. M. (1982). Bullies and Victims: Their Ego Picture, Ideal Ego Picture and Normative Ego Picture. In Baldry, A. C. and Farrington, D. P. (1998). Parenting Influences on Bullying and Victimisation. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*. Vol. 3, 237-254

Borg, M. G. (1999). The Extent and Nature of Bullying Among Primary and Secondary School Children. *Educational Research*. Vol. 41. No2 137-153

Boulton, M. J. (1993), Proximate Causes of Aggressive Fighting in Middle School Children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, *63*, 231-244.

Boulton, M. J. and Underwood, K. (1992). Bully/Victim Problems Among Middle School Children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*. 62, 73-87

Boulton, M. J. and Smith, P. K. (1994). Bully/Victim Problems among Middle School Children: Stability, Self-perceived Competence and Peer Acceptance. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 12, 315-329

Bowers, L., Smith, P. K., and Binney, V. (1994). Perceived Family Relationships of Bullies, Victims and Bully/Victims in Middle Childhood. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*. Vol. 11, 215-232

Bowlby, J. (1969). *Attachment and Loss: Vol. 1. Attachment*. New York: Basic.

REFERENCES

Bowlby, J. (1988). *A Secure Base: Clinical Applications of Attachment Theory*. London: Routledge.

Bremner, J. G. (1994). *Infancy*. Blackwell. Oxford.

Byrne, B. J. (1994). Bullies and Victims in a School Setting with Reference to Some Dublin Schools. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*. Vol. 4, 574-586.

Carver, C. S. (1997). Adult Attachment and Personality: Converging Evidence and a New Measure. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23(8), 865-884.

ChildLine – Facts and Figures (2005) www.childline.org.uk/factsandfigures

Charach, A., Pepler, D. J. and Ziegler, S. (1995). Bullying at School: A Canadian Perspective. *Education Canada* 35, 12-18.

Cohn, J. F., Campbell, S. B., Matias, R. and Hopkins, J. (1990). Face to Face Interactions of Postpartum Depressed and Non-depressed Mother-Infant Pairs at 2 months. *Developmental Psychology*. 26, 1, 15-22.

REFERENCES

Coloroso, B (2005). *The Bully, the Bullied and the Bystander: From Preschool to Secondary School - How Parents and Teachers Can Help Break the Cycle of Violence.* Piccadilly Press, London.

Coloroso, B. on GMTV (21.11.05)

Coolican, H. (1994), *Research Methods and Statistics in Psychology.* Hodder and Stoughton, London.

Cox, T. (1995). Stress, Coping and Physical Health. In Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (2001). (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized.* The Guilford Press. London.

Craig, W. M. and Pepler, D. (1995). Peer Processes in Bullying and Victimisation: A Naturalistic Study. *Exceptionality Education Canada* 4, 81-95

Craig, W. M., Pepler, D. and Atlas, R. (2000). Observations of Bullying in the Playground and in the Classroom. *School Psychology International,* Vol. 21(1): 22-36.

Crothers, L. M. and Levinson, E. M. (2004), Assessment of Bullying: A Review of Methods and Instruments. *Journal of Counseling and Development,* Vol. 82, 496-503.

REFERENCES

Day, R. W. C. (1998). Relations between Moral Reasoning, Personality Traits, and Justice Decisions on Hypothetical and Real-life Moral Dilemmas. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering.* Vol. 58 (12-B): 6795

Department of Education, (1994). *Bullying: Don't Suffer in Silence.* An Anti-bullying Pack for Schools. HMSO: London.

Duncan, R.D. (1999). Maltreatment by Parents and Peers: The Relationship between Child Abuse, Bully Victimisation and Psychological Distress. *Child Maltreatment,* Vol4, No.1, 45-55.

Dyce, J. A. (1998). Structure and Correlates of Personality Disorders. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering.* Vol. 58 (10-B): 5686

Elicker, J., Englund, M. and Sroufe, L. A. (1992). Predicting Peer Competence and Peer Relationships in Childhood from Early Parent-Child Relationships. In R. D. Parke and G. W. Ladd (Eds.), *Family Peer Relationships: Modes of Linkage.* Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Eaton, W. O. and Saudino, K. J. (1992). Prenatal Activity Level as a Temperament Dimension? Individual Differences and Developmental Functions in Fetal Movement. *Infant Behaviour and Development,* 15, 57-70

Eslea, M. and Smith, P. K. (1998). The Long-term Effectiveness of Anti-bullying Work in Primary Schools. *Educational Research,* Vol. 40, No. 2, 203-218.

REFERENCES

Farrington, D. P. (1993). Understanding and Preventing Bullying. In M. Tonry and N. Morris (Eds.), *Crime and Justice: An Annual Review of Research* (Vol. 17). Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Fauber, R., Forehand, R., Thomas, A. M. and Wierson, M. (1990). A Mediational Model of the Impact of Marital Conflict on Adolescent Adjustment in Intact and Divorced Families: The Role of Disrupted Parenting. *Child Development,* 61, 1112-1123.

Fekkes, M., Pijpers, F. I. M. and Verloove-Vanhorick, S. P. (2005). Bullying: Who does what, When and Where? Involvement of Children, Teachers and Parents in Bullying Behavior. *Health Education Research Theory and Practice.* Vol. 20 (1) 81-91.

Finnegan, R. A., Hodges, E. V. E., and Perry, D. G. (1998). Victimisation by Peers: Associations with Children's reports of Mother-Child Interaction: *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* Vol. 75 (4), Oct, 1076-1086.

(Flavell, J. H., Flavell, G. R., and Green, F. L. (1987). Young Children's Knowledge about Apparent-Real and Pretend-Real Distinctions. *Developmental Psychology,* 23, 816-822.

Frankel, K. A. and Bates, J. E. (1990). Mother-Toddler Problem Solving: Antecedents in Attachment, Home Behaviour and Temperament. *Child Development,* 61, 810-819.

REFERENCES

Garbarino, J. J. (1998). Comparisons of the Constructs and Psychometric Properties of Selected Measures of Adult Attachment. *Measurement & Evaluation in Counselling & Development*, 31(1), 28-45.

George, C.; Kaplan, N.; and Main, M. (1985). *The Attachment Interview for Adults*. Unpublished Manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.

George, C., Kaplan, N., and Main, M. (1987). *The Adult Attachment Interview*. Unpublished Manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.

George, C.; Kaplan, N.; and Main, M. (1996) *The Attachment Interview for Adults*. Unpublished Manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.

Gibbs, M.V., Reeves, D. and Cunningham, C. C. (1987). The Application of Temperament Questionnaires to a British Sample: Issues of Reliability and Validity. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry and Allied Disciplines*. Vol. 28 (1): 61-77.

Gilmartin, B. G. (1987). Peer Group Antecedents of Severe Love-shyness in Males. *Journal of Personality*, 55, 467-488.

GMTV News (21.11.05) *Anti-bullying Week – The Modern Menace*, www.gm.tv

GMTV News (21.11.05) *The Red Balloon School Article*

REFERENCES

GMTV News (22.11.05) Barbara Coloroso - *Chloe's Story*

Goodman, R. (1997). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A Research Note. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 38, 581-586.

Goodman, R. (1999). Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire www.sdqinfo.com

Green, A.H. (1998). Factors Contributing to the Generational Transmission of Child Maltreatment. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, Vol. 37(12), Dec 1334-1336.

Griffin, D. W., & Bartholomew, K. (1994). Models of the Self and Other: Fundamental Dimensions Underlying Measures of Adult Attachment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(3), 430-445.

Harris, J. R. (1995). Where is the Child's Environment? A Group Socialisation Theory of Development. *Psychological Review*, Vol. 102, No.3, 458-489.

Harris, J. R. (1998). *The Nurture assumption: Why Children Turn Out the Way They Do.* New York: Free Press

REFERENCES

Hazan, C. and Shaver, P. R. (1987). Romantic Love Conceptualised as an Attachment Process. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. Vol. 52, No. 3: 511-524

Hazler, R.J. (1996). *Breaking the Cycle of Violence: Interventions for Bullying and Victimisation*. Washington, DC: Taylor Francis.

Hazler, R. J., Carney, J. V., Green, S., Powell, R. and Scott-Jolly, L. (1997). Areas of Expert Agreement on Identification of School Bullies and Victims. In Baldry, A. C. and Farrington, D. P. (1998). Parenting Influences on Bullying and Victimisation. *Legal and Criminological Psychology*. Vol. 3, 237-254

Hetherington, E. M. (1981). Children and Divorce. In R. W. Henderson (Ed.), *Parent-Child Interaction: Theory, Research, and prospects*. New York: Academic press.

Hodges, E. V. E. and Perry, D. G. (1999). Personal and Interpersonal Antecedents and Consequences of Victimisation by Peers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 76, No.4. 677-685.

Hoffman, L. W. (1989). Effects of Maternal Employment in the Two-Parent Family. *American Psychologist*, 44, 283-292.

Hoover, J., Oliver, R., and Hazler, R. J. (1992). Bullying: Perceptions of Adolescent Victims in Midwestern USA. In Kochenderfer, B.J. and Ladd, G.W. (1996a). Peer

REFERENCES

Victimization: Manifestations and Relations to School Adjustment in Kindergarten. *Journal of School Psychology,* Vol. 34, Issue 3, 267-283.

Hughes, J. N., Cavell, T. A. and Grossman, P. B. (1997). A Positive View of Self: Risk or Protection for Aggressive Children? In Baldry, A. C. and Farrington, D. P. (1998). Parenting Influences on Bullying and Victimisation. *Legal and Criminological Psychology.* Vol. 3, 237-254

Hugh-Jones, S. and Smith, P. K. (1999). Self-reports of short- and long-term effects of Bullying on Children who Stammer. *British Journal of Educational Psychology,* 69, 141-158.

Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (2001). (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized.* The Guilford Press. London.

Kagan, J. (1984). *The Nature of the Child.* New York: Basic Books.

Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Marttunen, M., Rimpelä, A. and Ratenen, P. (1999). Bullying, Depression and Suicide Ideation in Finnish Adolescents: School Survey. In Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized.* The Guilford Press. London.

REFERENCES

Kidscape (1999). Cited in Lynch (2004). Lasting Damage. *Nursing Standard*. July 21, Vol. 18, No.45.

Klagsbrun, M. and Bowlby, J. (1976). Response to Separation from Parents: A Clinical Test for Young Children. *Projective Psychology* 21: 7-27.

Klasen H., Woerner W., Wolke D., Meyer R., Overmeyer S., Kaschnitz W., Rothenberger A., and Goodman R. (2000). Comparing the German versions of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ-Deu) and the Child Behavior Checklist. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 9, 271-276.

Kochenderfer, B. J. and Ladd, G. W. (1996a). Peer Victimization: Manifestations and Relations to School Adjustment in Kindergarten. *Journal of School Psychology*, Vol. 34, Issue 3, 267-283.

Kochenderfer, B. J. and Ladd, G. W. (1996b). Peer Victimisation: Cause or Consequence of School Maladjustment? *Child Development*, 67, 1305-1317

Ladd, G. W. (1990). Having Friends, Keeping Friends, Making Friends, and Being Liked by Peers in the Classroom: Predictors of Children's Early School Adjustment? *Child Development*, 61, 1081-1100.

REFERENCES

Ladd, G. W. and Price, J. M. (1987). Predicting Children's Social and School Adjustment Following the Transition from Preschool to Kindergarten. *Child Development*, 58, 1168-1189.

La Fontaine, J. (1991), *Bullying the Child's View*. London: Calouste Gulbenkian Foundation.

Laganiere, J., Tessier, R. and Nadeau, L. (2003). Mother-Infant Attachment and Prematurity: A Link Mediatized by Maternal Perceptions. *Enfance*. Vol 55 (2): 101-117.

Larmour, S. (1995). Temperament and Characteristics of the Mother-Child Relationship: Predictors of Behavioral Difficulties in Children Consequent to Short-term Hospitalization. *Dissertation Abstracts International: Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*. Vol. 56 (1-B) 529.

Ledley, D., Storch, E., Coles, M., Heimberg, R., Moser, J. and Bravata, E. (2005). The Relationship Between Child Teasing and Later Interpersonal Functioning. *Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment*. Vol. 28, No.1, 33-40.

Levy, M. B., and Davis, K. E. (1988). Love Styles and Attachment Styles Compared: Their Relations to Each Other and to Various Relationship Characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 5, 439-471.

REFERENCES

Lieberman, A. F. (1977). Preschoolers' Competence with a Peer: Relations with Attachment and Peer Experience. *Child Development*, 48, 1277-1287.

Loeber, R. and Dishion, T. J. (1984) Boys Who Fight at Home and School: Family Conditions Influencing Cross-setting Consistency. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 5, 759-768.

Lynch, M. (2004). Lasting Damage. *Nursing Standard*. July 21, Vol. 18, No.45.

Lyons-Ruth, K., Alpern, L. and Repacholi, B. (1993). Disorganised Infant Attachment Classification and Maternal Psychosocial Problems as Predictors of Hostile-Aggressive Behaviour in the Preschool Classroom. *Child Development*, 64, 572-585.

Manning, M., Heron, J. and Marshall, T. (1978). Styles of Hostility and Social Interactions at Nursery, at Home and at School: an Extended Study of Children. In L. A. Hersov, M. Berger and D. Shaffer (Eds), *Aggression and Anti-social Behaviour in Childhood and Adolescence*. Oxford: Pergamon.

Matsui, T., Tzuzuki, T., Kakuyama, T. and Onglatgo, M. L. (1996). Long-term Outcomes of Early Victimisation by Peers among Japanese Male University Students: Model of a Vicious Circle. In Schäfer, M., Korn, S., Smith, P. K., Hunter, S. C., Mora-Merchán, J. A., Singer, M. M. and Van der Meulen, K. (2000). Lonely in the Crowd: Recollections of Bullying. *British Journal of Development Psychology*. 22, 379-394.

REFERENCES

McDevitt, S.C. and Carey, W. B. (1975). The Measurement of Temperament in 3 to 7 Year Old Children. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry.*

Mathai J., Anderson P., and Bourne A. (2003). Use of the Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire as an Outcome Measure in a Child and Adolescent Mental Health Service. *Australasian Psychiatry*, 11, 334-337.

Miller, N. and Maruyama, G. (1976). Ordinal Position and Peer popularity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 33, 123-131.

Mynard, H. and Joseph, S. (1997). Bully/Victim Problems and their Association with Eysenck's Personality Dimensions in 8 to 13 year olds. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 67, 51-54.

Myron-Wilson, R. and Smith, P.K. (2001). *Attachment Influences on Bullying.* Unpublished, reprints obtained from the first author R.R.Myron-Wilson@psy.hull.ac.uk

NSPCC (2005) on GMTV News (21.11.05) *National Bullying Week Article.*

Olweus, D. (1973). Hackkycklingar och Översittare. Forskning om Skolmobbning. Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell. In Olweus, D. (1993a) *Bullying at School. What We Know And What We Can Do*. Oxford: Blackwell.

REFERENCES

Olweus, D. (1978). Aggression in the Schools: Bullies and Whipping Boys. Washington, DC: Hemisphere.

Olweus, D. (1983). Low School Achievement and Aggressive Behaviour In Adolescent Boys. In Olweus, D. (1993a) *Bullying at School. What We Know And What We Can Do*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (1989). Prevalence and Incidence in the Study of Antisocial Behaviour: Definitions and Measurement. In Klein, M. (Ed.) *Cross-National Research in Self-Reported Crime and Delinquency*. Dordrecht, The Netherlands: Kluwer.

Olweus, D. (1990). In Hurrelmann, K., Losel, F. and Gruyter, W. (Eds). *Health Hazards in Adolescence (Prevention and Intervention in Childhood and Adolescence)*. Vol. 8, Chpt 13 (pp 259-297)

Olweus, D. (1993a) *Bullying at School. What We Know And What We Can Do*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (1993b). Victimisation by Peers: Antecedents and Long-term Outcomes, In K. H. Rubin and J. B. Asendorpf (Eds). *Social Withdrawal, Inhibition and Shyness in Childhood*.

Owens, L., Slee, P. and Shute, R. (2000). "It hurts a hell of a lot...": The effects of Indirect Aggression on Teenage Girls. *School Psychology International*, 21, 359-376.

REFERENCES

Perry, D. G., Perry, L. C. and Boldizar, J. P. (1990). Learning of Aggression. In M. Lewis and S. Miller (eds.), *Handbook of Developmental Psychopathology* 135-146. New York: Plenum.

Perry, D. G., Perry, L. C. and Kennedy, E. (1992). Conflict and the Development of Anti-social Behaviour. In Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized.* The Guilford Press. London.

Perry, D. G., Williard, J. C. and Perry, L. C. (1990). Peers' Perception of the Consequences that Victimized Children Provide Aggressors. In Bernstein, J. Y. and Watson, M. M. (1997). Children Who are Targets of Bullying. A Victim Pattern. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, Vol. 12 No. 4, 483-498.

Pettit, G. S., Harrist, A. W., Bates, J. E., and Dodge, K. A. (1991). Family Interaction, Social Cognition and Children's Subsequent Relations with Peers at Kindergarten. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 383-402.

Pipp, S., Easterbrooks, M. A. and Harmon, R. J. (1992). The Relation Between Attachment and Knowledge of Self and Mother in One-Year-Old Onfants to Three-Year-Old Infants. *Child Development*, 63, 738-750.

Rigby, K. (1993). School Children's Perceptions of their Families and Parents as a Function of Peer-relations. *Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 154, 501-513.

REFERENCES

Rigby, K. (1997). What Children Tell Us about Bullying in Schools. In Rigby, K. (2000). Effects of Peer Victimisation in Schools and Perceived Social Support on Adolescent Well-being. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 57-68.

Rigby, K. (2000). Effects of Peer Victimisation in Schools and Perceived Social Support on Adolescent Well-being. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23, 57-68.

Rigby, K. (2001). Chapter 13 - Health Consequences of Bullying and its Prevention in Schools. In Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized*. The Guilford Press. London.

Rigby, K. and Slee, P. T. (1999). Suicidal Ideation among Adolescent Schoolchildren, Involvement in Bully/Victim Problems and Perceived Low Social Support. In Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized*. The Guilford Press. London.

Rivers, I. and Smith, P. K. (1994). Types of Bullying Behaviour and their Correlates. *Aggressive Behaviour*, Vol.20, 359-368.

Roland, E. and Galloway, D. (2002). Classroom Influences on Bullying. *Educational Research*, Vol.44, No.3, 299-312.

REFERENCES

Ruscio, A.M. (2001). Predicting the Child-Rearing Practices of Mothers Sexually Abused in Childhood. *Child Abuse and Neglect;* March, Vol. 25 Issue 3, 369-387.

Salmivalli, C., Karhunen, J. and Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1996). How do the Victims Respond to Bullying? *Aggressive Behaviour,* Vol.22, No.2, 99-109.

Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K. and Kaukiainen, (1996). Bullying as a Group Process: Participant Roles and their Relations to Social Status within the Group. *Aggressive Behaviour.* Vol. 22: 1-15.

Salmon, G., James, A. and Smith, D. M. (1998). Bullying in Schools: Self-Reported Anxiety, Depression and S-Esteem in Secondary School Children. *British Medical Journal* Vol. 317 924-5.

Schäfer, M., Korn, S., Smith, P. K., Hunter, S. C., Mora-Merchán, J. A., Singer, M. M. and Van der Meulen, K. (2000). Lonely in the Crowd: Recollections of Bullying. *British Journal of Development Psychology.* 22, 379-394.

Schaffer, H. R. & Emerson, P. E. (1964). The Development of Social Attachments in Infancy. *Monographs of the Society for Research in Child Development,* 29, 3, No.94.

REFERENCES

Schulz, L.L. (1998). Concomitants of Success in a Perinatal Substance Abuse Treatment Program. *Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities-and-Social-Sciences.* Vol 58 (12-A): 4572.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A. and Coie, J. D. (1993). The Emergence of Chronic Peer Victimisation in Boys' Play Groups. *Child Development,* 64, 1755-1772.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S. and Bates, J. E. (1997). The Early Socialisation of Aggressive Victims of Bullying. *Child Development,* Vol.68, No.4, 665-675.

Schwartz, D., Proctor, L. J. and Chien, D. H. (2001). The Aggressive Victim of Bullying. Emotional and Behavioural Dysregulation as a Pathway to Victimisation by Peers. In Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized.* The Guilford Press. London.

Shaffer, D. R. (1996). *Developmental Psychology: Childhood and Adolescence.* Brooks/Cole Publishing Company: USA.

Sharp, S. (1995). How Much Does Bullying Hurt? The Effects of Bullying on the Health, Happiness and Educational Progress of Secondary Aged Students. In Sharp, S. (1996). Self-Esteem, Response Style and Victimisation. Possible Ways of Preventing Victimisation through Parenting and School Based Training Programmes. *School Psychology International,* Vol.17, 347-357.

REFERENCES

Sharp, S. (1996). Self-Esteem, Response Style and Victimisation. Possible Ways of Preventing Victimisation through Parenting and School Based Training Programmes. *School Psychology International,* Vol.17, 347-357.

Sharp, S. and Smith, P. K. (1994). *Tackling bullying in Your School. A Practical Handbook for Teachers.* Routledge, London.

Shouldice, A. & Stevenson-Hinde, J. (1992). Coping with Security Distress: The Separation Anxiety Test and Attachment Classification at 4.5 Years. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry* 33: 331-48.

Simpson, J. A. (1990). Influence of Attachment Styles on Romantic Relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,* 59 (5), 971-980.

Slee, P. T. (1995). Peer Victimisation and its Relationship to Depression among Australian Primary School Students. *Personality and Individual Differences,* 18(1), 57-62.

Smith, P. K. (1991). The Silent Nightmare: Bullying and Victimisation in School Peer Groups. *The Psychologist,* 4, 243-248.

REFERENCES

Smith, P. K. and Levan, S. (1995). Perceptions and Experiences of Bullying in Younger Pupils. *British Journal of Educational Psychology.* 65, 489-500.

Smith, P. K. and Madsen, M. (1997). A Follow-Up Survey of the DFE Anti-Bullying Pack for Schools: Its Use and the Development of Anti-Bullying Work in Schools. In Smith, P. K. and Shu, S. (2000). What Good Schools can do about Bullying. Findings from a Survey in English Schools after a Decade of Research and Action. *Childhood,* Vol.7(2): 193-212.

Smith, P. K. and Myron-Wilson, R., (1998). Parenting and School Bullying. *Clinical Child Psychology and Psychiatry.* Vol. 3(3): 405-417.

Smith, P. K. and Shu, S. (2000). What Good Schools can do about Bullying. Findings from a Survey in English Schools after a Decade of Research and Action. *Childhood,* Vol.7(2): 193-212.

Smith, P. K., Shu, S. and Madsen, K. (2001). Chapter 14 – Characteristics of Victims of School Bullying. In Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (2001). (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized.* The Guilford Press. London.

Smith, P. K., Singer, M., Hoel, K. and Cooper, C. (2003). Victimisation in the School and the Workplace: Are there any links? *British Journal of Psychology,* 94, 175-188.

REFERENCES

Sourander, A., Helstelä, L., Helenius, H. and Piha, J. (2000). Persistence of Bullying from Childhood to Adolescence – A Longitudinal 8-year Follow-up Study. *Child Abuse and Neglect,* Vol. 24, No.7, 873-881.

Sroufe, L. A. (1985). Attachment Classification from the Perspective of Infant-Caregiver Relationships and Infant Temperament. *Child Development.* 56, 1-14.

Stevenson, P. and Smith, D. (1989). Bullying in the Junior School.' In: Tattum, D.P. and Lane, D. A. (Eds.) Bullying in Schools. Stoke on Trent Trentham Books, 45-57.

Sutton, J. and Smith, P. K. (1999). Bullying as a Group Process: An Adaptation of the Participant Role Approach. *Aggressive Behaviour,* Vol.25, No.2, 97-111.

Tattum, D. P. and Lane, D. A. (1989). (Eds.) Bullying in Schools. Stoke on Trent Trentham Books.

Thomas, A. and Chess, S. (1977). *Temperament and Development.* New York: Brunner/Mazel.

Torrance, D. A. (2000), Qualitative Studies into Bullying within Special Schools. *British Journal of Special Education.* Vol. 27, No.1, 16-21.

Trapnell, P. D. and Wiggins, J. S. (1990). Extension of the Interpersonal Adjective Scales to Include the Big Five Dimensions of Personality. *Journal of Personality and Social*

REFERENCES

Psychology. Vol. 59 No.4, 781-790

Turner, P. (1991). Relations Between Attachment, gender and Behaviour with Peers in Preschool. *Child Development* 62: 1475-88.

Troy, M. and Sroufe, L. A. (1987). Victimisation Among Preschoolers: Role of Attachment Relationship History. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry.* 26: 166-172

Van IJzendoorn, M. H., Juffer, F. and Duyvesteyn, M. G. C. (1995). Breaking the Intergenerational Cycle of Insecure Attachment: An Review of the Effects of Attachment Based Interventions on Maternal Sensitivity and Infant Security. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 36, 225-248.

Vaughn, B. E., Lefever, G. B, Seifer, R. and Barglow, P. (1989). Attachment Behaviour, Attachment Security and Temperament during Infancy. *Child Development*, 60, 728-737.

Vaughn, B. E., Stevenson-Hinde, J., Waters, E., Kotsaftis, A., Lefever, G. B., Shouldice, A., Trudel, M., and Belsky, J. (1992). Attachment security and Temperament in Infancy and Early Childhood: Some Conceptual Clarification. *Developmental Psychology*, 28, 463-473.

REFERENCES

Waters, E. (1987). *Attachment Q-Set (Version 4.0)*. State University of New York at Stony Brook. Stony Brook, NY. 11794

Waters, E., Wippman, J. and Sroufe, L. A. (1979). Attachment, Positive Affect and Competence in the peer Group: Two Studies in Construct Validation. *Child Development, 50*, 821-829.

West, D. J and Farrington, I. D. P. (1997). *The Delinquent Way of Life*. London: Heinemann Educational Books.

Whitney, I. and Smith, P. K. (1993). A Survey of the Nature and Extent of Bullying in Junior/Middle and Secondary Schools. *Educational Research. 35(1)*, 3-25.

Williams, K., Chambers, M., Logan, S. and Robinson, D. (1996). Association of Common Health Symptoms with Bullying in Primary School Children. In Juvonen, J. and Graham, S. (Eds.) *Peer Harassment in School – The Plight of the Vulnerable and Victimized*. The Guilford Press. London.

APPENDICES

Appendices

HEAD TEACHER INTERVIEW GUIDE

- ❑ Introduce self and explain intended research
- ❑ Explain programme of research

- ❑ Ask permission to conduct research at the school
- ❑ Clarify the following:

Full Name of School..
....
....
Telephone number..

Head teacher's name...

Reception Class teacher's name...

No pre-school centre/nursery attached to school........................

Number of Children expected in September's intake....................

Details regarding the target children's experience with the school pre-September, e.g. induction days, half-day visits........................
....
....
....

- ❑ Obtain head-teacher's consent to observe September 2001 reception class children:
  - as they enter school on their first day in September > date:
  - during the 1st week of term > date:
  - during the week they start school full-time > date:
  - in January 2002
  - and to allow teacher & children to complete Participant Role Q

As the head-teacher, I give Amanda Potter my consent to conduct her research at this school.

Signature...

- ❑ Arrange for letters to be sent to parents
- ❑ Ask if head-teacher would like a number to contact me on

PROGRAMME OF RESEARCH

Baseline Assessment: Children aged 3-4 yrs (June 2001)

Parent's interview at home, to obtain:
- parental consent
- demographic details (incl: child's birth order & day care arrangemts)
- present family situation (& any negative life events)
- parental & disciplinary styles of both parents
- parent's attachment histories & personality characteristics & bully/victim experiences
- target child's & sibling's attachment histories & temperaments

Observation of family interactions:
- with particular focus on target child

1st Re-assessment: Children aged 4-5 yrs (September - October 2001)

Observations at school:
- of target children as they are left for the first time by caregivers
- of the reception class (classroom & playground) during the 1st week
- as children start school full-time (5-6 weeks into the term)

Parent & Teacher Questionnaire:
- regarding children's adjustment to starting school.

2nd Re-assessment: Children aged 4 -5 yrs (January 2002)

Parent's interview at home:
- same measurements as in Baseline Assessment (any changes?)

Observation of family interactions:
- with particular focus on target child

Observations at school:
- of the reception class (classroom & playground)

Child & Teacher Questionnaire:
- teacher & children to complete Participant Role Questionnaire

Appendix 3

Psychological Research

29 June 2001

Dear Mr Sloan,

Thank you very much for kindly allowing me to involve your school in my research.

Please find the attached copy letter from my Supervisor at University. I hope that this is suitable confirmation of my research. If you would like any further information please do not hesitate to contact me on 01772 492213 or you can contact Mike Elsea directly at the University.

Please also find the letters and envelopes that you have agreed to issue for me. As you requested, I have asked the parents to return their responses to the school.

I would be very grateful if you could contact me as soon as the parents' responses start to arrive back at school, as I need to start interviewing these parents as soon as possible.

Yours truly,

Amanda Potter

INVESTOR IN PEOPLE

UNIVERSITY
OF CENTRAL
LANCASHIRE

Department of Psychology

University of
Central Lancashire
Preston PR1 2HE

Tel 01772 893420
Fax 01772 892925
http://www.uclan.ac.uk

Head of Department
Dr Paul Pollard

Dear Parent/Guardian,

I am a research student at the University of Central Lancashire and I am studying children's development. My research looks at how children's experiences (before they start school) can affect how they adjust to starting school and how they develop friendships with their classmates.

Mr .... at .... Primary School has kindly given me permission to watch his new reception class of children as they play together at school. However, watching your child play with new friends at school is actually only the second part of my study and this is why I am writing to you. For the first part of my study I desperately need to meet with you, before September, to ask you some questions about you and your child.

I would really appreciate it if you would be willing to take part, as the second part of my study will be pointless if we do not complete the first part together. As a parent of two infant school children myself, I know that there isn't enough time in the day, but I assure you that I will only take up half an hour of your time. I also sincerely promise you that I will deal with everything I see or anything that we discuss in the strictest of confidence and I guarantee that you and your family will remain completely anonymous.

I can't do it without you!

I would be very grateful if you would complete and detach the bottom of this letter and return it in the envelope provided to school as soon as possible.

Yours truly,
Amanda Potter

✂...

Please complete the information below and return to school in the envelope attached.

I would like to help you with your research and my telephone number is: ....

I would not like to help you with your research

My name is: ....

My child's name is: ....

TELEPHONE BRIEFING

❖ My name is Amanda Potter and I am a student at the University of Central Lancashire.

❖ My research is concerned with family interactions and the social adjustment of children in reception class

❖ If you were to volunteer to take part in the research, I would need to ask questions about you and your family and in particular about your child who starts school in September.

❖ I will also need to observe your child at school during their first year, but I assure you that this will not be disruptive to their learning

❖ I guarantee that I will deal with everything I see or anything that we discuss in the strictest of confidence and I guarantee that you and your family will remain completely anonymous.

❖ Would you like to volunteer to take part in my research?

❖ Can I visit you in your home to interview you before September?

❖ Ask questions to complete the top of the Checklist

❖ I'd like to thank you very much for your time

❖ Finally, before I go I'd like you to know that you can withdraw from the research at any time all you have to do is let me know and I wont be offended

Appendix 6

Name of Child ……………………………………………………………....**Participant No.**

School & Class……………………………………………………………………………………

Attendance on 1st day?………………………………………………………………………………

Parent's name ……………………………………………………………………………………

Parent's contact number …….……………………………………………………………………

Venue for interview.…………………………………………………………………………………

Time and date of interview.……………………………………………………………………

<u>Parent's Interview:</u>

☐ Caregiver's Questionnaire (primary)   **Signed Consent?   Photo**

☐ Attachment Measure (Child)

☐ Temperament Measure (Child)

☐ Attachment Measure (Primary caregiver)

☐ Personality Measure (Primary caregiver)

☐ Attachment Measure (Secondary caregiver)

☐ Personality Measure (Secondary caregiver)

<u>Child at School:</u>

☐ Observation of separation on 1st day at school

☐ Adjustment Scale

☐ Adjustment Questionnaire (Telephone Q1)

☐ Observations of child during 1st full week at school

☐ Peer Interaction Scale 1   R1   R2

☐ Observations of child during last term of 1st year

☐ Peer Interaction Scale 2   R1   R2

☐ Adjustment Questionnaire (Telephone Q2)

☐ Teacher's Questionnaire

☐ Thank You Letter (+ photo)

PRE – BRIEFING EXERCISE

- ❖ Thank parents for allowing me to visit them in their home

- ❖ Explain what my research is about in more detail

- ❖ Explain what their involvement in the research would be

- ❖ Explain what their child's involvement in the research would be
  (this will not be disruptive to their learning)

- ❖ Stress confidentiality and guarantee anonymity again

- ❖ Ask for the parent's consent to participate and obtain their signature

- ❖ Reassure parents that they can withdraw from the research at any time

- ❖ Ask if I can take or borrow a photograph of the child/children so that I can
  identify them at school (promise to give or return the photos to them at the end
  of the research)

- ❖ Ask if they will give their child/children a sugar-free lollipop

- ❖ Thank parents for their time

For Parents to keep

Thank you for agreeing to take part in my research and for allowing me to observe your child / children at home and at school.

I promise that will keep you and your family completely anonymous and I also promise that I will treat all information that I receive or record, about you and your family, in the strictest of confidence.

Please do not hesitate to contact me with any questions or worries at the above address.

Amanda Potter

Signature: .... Date: ....

ɿ...

For Parents to complete

I consent to take part in Amanda Potter's research and allow her to observe my child / children at school and at home.

I understand that anonymity is guaranteed for all members of my family and that all information Amanda receives or records about my family and myself will be dealt with in the strictest of confidence

Print name: ....

Sign name: .... Date: ....

Caregiver's Questionnaire

1. Name of the child who starts school in September

   ....

2. Date of birth of this child ....

3. Your name ....

4. Your date of birth ....

5. What is your relationship with the child?

          Mother   Father   Grandmother   Grandfather   Guardian

6. Are you the child's main/primary caregiver?   Yes/No

7. What is your occupation? ....

Questions 8 - 10 are for the biological mother of the child only

8. How would you describe the birth of this child?

          Easy   Normal   Difficult

9. How would you describe the first 6 months of this child's life?

          Easy   Normal   Difficult

10. Did you suffer from post-natal depression following the birth of this child?
                                           Yes/No

11. How many hours per week do you spend with this child?.............................

12. How would you describe your relationship with the child?

           Easy   Normal   Difficult

13. How many adults are regularly responsible for this child's care?

      1   2   3   4   5   more than 5

14. What were the child's day care arrangements before starting school? (**including** the name of nursery, pre-school centre)

   Pre-school   hrs per wk =
   Nursery   hrs per wk =
   Play group   hrs per wk =
   Child minder   hrs per wk =
   Related carer e.g. Grandma   hrs per wk =

15. How many times has the child visited their new school?

      1   2   3   4   5   more than 5

16. What is the child's attitude to starting school?

   Doesn't want to go at all
   Sometimes doesn't want to go and sometimes does
   Not bothered either way
   Is looking forward to it
   Is really very excited about it
   Other (please describe)

   ....

17. How many brothers and sisters does the child have? ....

18. **If applicable :** What are the siblings' dates of birth?

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

   ....

19. How often is the child naughty when in your care?
    (**not including** dangerous behaviour, e.g. reaching for a pan on the cooker, putting things into plug sockets)

    always most of the time   half of the time   sometimes   never

20. Please give examples of what you consider to be naughty behaviour:

    i. ....

    ii. ....

    iii. ....

21. How do you deal with this child's naughty behaviour?

    ....

    ....

    ....

    ....

22. How often is the child good when in your care?

    always most of the time   half of the time   sometimes   never

23. Please give examples of the good behaviour:

    i. ....

    ii. ....

    iii. ....

24. How do you deal with this child's good behaviour?

    ....

    ....

    ....

    ....

25. Has this child experienced any major life events? (e.g. death of a close family member, separation of parents).

Yes/No

26. **If 'Yes'** : please give details (including the age of the child at the time)

....

....

....

27. Do both of the child's parents live with the child?   Yes/No

ONLY continue with questions 28 - 30 if the answer to this question is 'No'

28. How long have the child's parents been separated?

Less than 6 months
6 - 12 months
1 - 2 years
2 - 4 years
More than 4 years

29. How often does the child see the non-custodial parent?

....

....

....

....

30. Describe the child's family:

Child lives alone with   Mother / Father / Grandparent / Guardian

Child lives alone with   Mother and her partner / Father and his partner
                                Grandparents / Guardians

Child lives with siblings and   Mother / Father / Grandparent / Guardian

Child lives with siblings and   Mother and her partner / Father and his partner
                                Grandparents / Guardians

Information for Caregiver's regarding the Exercises

The following exercises look at either your child's behaviour or your own behaviour.

These exercises require judgements from you that should be based on most recent and current behaviour (over the last 4 to 6 weeks)

Consider only your own impressions and observations

Judge each question or statement independently. Do not purposefully try to present a consistent picture of your child or of yourself

There are no right or wrong answers

Use extreme ratings on questionnaires where appropriate and avoid rating only near the middle of the scale

Make your judgements quickly (if you cannot decide, skip the statement and come back to it later)

Rate every statement. (If you are unable to judge a statement because of a lack of information or because it doesn't apply to your child, please circle the number of the statement to show that you have not missed it in error)

NAME ....

Which of the following best describes your feelings? (please tick one box only)

☐ I find it relatively easy to get close to others and am comfortable depending on them and having them depend on me. I don't often worry about being abandoned or about someone getting too close to me.

☐ I am somewhat uncomfortable being close to others; I find it difficult to trust them completely, difficult to allow myself to depend on them. I am nervous when anyone gets too close, and often, love partners want me to be more intimate than I feel comfortable being.

☐ I find that others are reluctant to get as close as I would like. I often worry that my partner doesn't really love me or won't want to stay with me. I want to get very close to my partner and this desire sometimes scares people away.

Extremely Inaccurate 1	Very Inaccurate 2	Quite Inaccurate 3	Slightly Inaccurate 4	Slightly Accurate 5	Quite Accurate 6	Very Accurate 7	Extremely Accurate 8

Your name...

The following is a list of adjectives that describe various personality traits. Please indicate how accurately you feel these adjectives describe yourself (using the scale above).

Adjective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Dominant	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Tender-hearted	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Organised	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Worrying	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Philosophical	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Assertive	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Gentle-hearted	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Orderly	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Tense	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Abstract-thinking	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Domineering	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Soft-hearted	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Tidy	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Anxious	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Imaginative	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Forceful	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Kind	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Neat	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Nervous	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Inquisitive	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Self-confident	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Tender	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Efficient	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Fretful	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Reflective	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Self-assured	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Charitable	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Planful	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Hypersensitive	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Literary	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Firm	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Sympathetic	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Systematic	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Guilt-prone	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Questioning	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Persistent	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Accommodating	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Thorough	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Self-conscious	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Individualistic	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑
Meek	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑	❑

Extremely Inaccurate 1	Very Inaccurate 2	Quite Inaccurate 3	Slightly Inaccurate 4	Slightly Accurate 5	Quite Accurate 6	Very Accurate 7	Extremely Accurate 8

Adjective	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Ruthless	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Self-disciplined	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Highly-strung	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unconventional	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Bashful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Warmthless	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Reliable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Over-excitable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Broadminded	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Timid	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Uncharitable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Forgetful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unself-conscious	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Conventional	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Forceless	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cruel	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unreliable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unmoody	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unartistic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unbold	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Iron-hearted	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Impractical	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Stable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unliterary	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Shy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Uncharitable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Undisciplined	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unanxious	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unreflective	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unaggressive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unsympathetic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inefficient	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unagitated	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Uncomplex	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unauthoratative	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Cold-hearted	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unplanful	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Calm	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unimaginative	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Untidy	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
At ease	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unabstract	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unsystematic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Relaxed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unsearching	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unorderly	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unnervous	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Uninquisitive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Disorganised	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unworrying	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Unphilosophical	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1	2	3	4	5	6

Child's name..

Using the scale shown above, please circle the number that tells how often your child's recent and current behaviour has been like the behaviour described in each statement

1. Your child is moody for more than a few minutes when corrected or disciplined

    1   2   3   4   5   6

2. Your child seems not to hear when involved in a favourite activity

    1   2   3   4   5   6

3. Your child can be coaxed out of a forbidden activity

    1   2   3   4   5   6

4. Your child runs ahead when walking with you

    1   2   3   4   5   6

5. Your child laughs or smiles while playing

    1   2   3   4   5   6

6. Your child moves slowly when working on a project or activity

    1   2   3   4   5   6

7. Your child responds intensely to disapproval

    1   2   3   4   5   6

8. Your child needs a period of adjustment to get used to changes in pre-school or at home

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1	2	3	4	5	6

9. Your child enjoys games that involve running or jumping

    1   2   3   4   5   6

10. Your child is slow to adjust to changes in household rules

    1   2   3   4   5   6

11. Your child has bowel movements at about the same time each day

    1   2   3   4   5   6

12. Your child is willing to try new things

    1   2   3   4   5   6

13. Your child sits calmly while watching TV or listening to music

    1   2   3   4   5   6

14. Your child leaves or wants to leave the table during meals

    1   2   3   4   5   6

15. Changes in plans bother your child

    1   2   3   4   5   6

16. Your child notices minor changes in your dress or appearance (clothing, hairstyle, etc.)

    1   2   3   4   5   6

17. Your child does not acknowledge a call to come if involved in something

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1	2	3	4	5	6

18. Your child responds to mild disapproval from you (a frown or shake of the head)

    1   2   3   4   5   6

19. Your child settles arguments with playmates within a few minutes

    1   2   3   4   5   6

20. Your child shows strong reaction to things, both positive and negative

    1   2   3   4   5   6

21. Your child had trouble leaving you when he/she visited school recently

    1   2   3   4   5   6

22. Your child picks up the nuances or subtleties of parental explanations (e.g. implied meanings)

    1   2   3   4   5   6

23. Your child falls asleep as soon as he/she is put to bed

    1   2   3   4   5   6

24. Your child moves about actively when he/she explores new places

    1   2   3   4   5   6

25. Your child likes to go to new places rather than familiar ones

    1   2   3   4   5   6

26. Your child sits quietly while waiting

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1	2	3	4	5	6

27. Your child spends over an hour reading a book or looking at the pictures

1	2	3	4	5	6

28. Your child learns new thing <u>at his/her level</u> quickly and easily

1	2	3	4	5	6

29. Your child smiles or laughs when he/she meets new visitors at home

1	2	3	4	5	6

30. Your child is easily excited by praise

1	2	3	4	5	6

31. Your child outgoing with strangers

1	2	3	4	5	6

32. Your child fidgets when he/she has to stay still

1	2	3	4	5	6

33. Your child says that he/she id 'bored' with his/her toys and games

1	2	3	4	5	6

34. Your child is annoyed at interrupting play to comply with a parental request

1	2	3	4	5	6

35. Your child practices an activity until he/she masters it

1	2	3	4	5	6

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6

36. Your child eats about the same amount at supper from day to day

   1   2   3   4   5   6

37. Unusual noises (sirens, thunder etc.) interrupt your child's behaviour

   1   2   3   4   5   6

38. Your child complains when tired

   1   2   3   4   5   6

39. Your child loses interest in a new toy or game the same day

   1   2   3   4   5   6

40. Your child becomes engrossed in an interesting activity for half an hour or more

   1   2   3   4   5   6

41. Your child cries intensely when hurt

   1   2   3   4   5   6

42. Your child reacts strongly to kidding or light-hearted comments

   1   2   3   4   5   6

43. Your child approaches children his/her age that he/she doesn't know

   1   2   3   4   5   6

44. Your child plays quietly with his/her toys and games

   1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6

45. Your child is outwardly expressive of his/her emotions

    1   2   3   4   5   6

46. Your child is enthusiastic when he/she masters an activity and wants to show everyone

    1   2   3   4   5   6

47. Your child is sleepy at his/her bed-time

    1   2   3   4   5   6

48. Your child stops an activity because something else catches his/her attention

    1   2   3   4   5   6

49. Your child is hungry at dinner time

    1   2   3   4   5   6

50. Your child holds back until sure of himself/herself

    1   2   3   4   5   6

51. Your child looks up when someone walks passed the door way

    1   2   3   4   5   6

52. Your child becomes upset if he/she misses a regular TV programme

    1   2   3   4   5   6

53. Your child reacts strongly (cries or complains) to a disappointment or failure

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6

54. Your child accepts new foods within one or two tries

    1   2   3   4   5   6

55. Your child has difficulty getting used to new situations

    1   2   3   4   5   6

56. Your child will avoid misbehaviour if punished firmly once or twice

    1   2   3   4   5   6

57. Your child is sensitive to noises (telephone, doorbell) and looks up right away

    1   2   3   4   5   6

58. Your child prefers active outdoor play to quiet play inside

    1   2   3   4   5   6

59. Your child dislikes milk or other drinks if not ice-cold

    1   2   3   4   5   6

60. Your child notices differences or changes in the consistency of food

    1   2   3   4   5   6

61. Your child adjusts easily to changes in his/her routine

    1   2   3   4   5   6

62. Your child eats about the same amount at breakfast from day to day

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6

63. Your child seems to take setbacks in his/her stride

    1   2   3   4   5   6

64. Your child cries or whines when frustrated

    1   2   3   4   5   6

65. Your child repeats behaviour for which he/she has previously been punished

    1   2   3   4   5   6

66. Your child looks up from playing when the telephone rings

    1   2   3   4   5   6

67. Your child is willing to try new foods

    1   2   3   4   5   6

68. Your child needs encouragement before he/she will try new things

    1   2   3   4   5   6

69. Your child cries or whines when ill with a cold or an upset stomach

    1   2   3   4   5   6

70. Your child runs to get where he/she wants to go

    1   2   3   4   5   6

71. Your child's attention drifts away or lapses when listening to parental instructions

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6

72. Your child becomes angry with one of his/her playmates

    1   2   3   4   5   6

73. Your child is reluctant to give up when trying to do a difficult task

    1   2   3   4   5   6

74. Your child reacts to mild approval from you (a nod or a smile)

    1   2   3   4   5   6

75. Your child requests 'something to eat' between meals and regular snacks

    1   2   3   4   5   6

76. Your child rushes to greet you or greets loudly after absence during the day

    1   2   3   4   5   6

77. Your child looks up when he/she hears voices in the next room

    1   2   3   4   5   6

78. Your child protests when you deny a request

    1   2   3   4   5   6

79. Your child ignores loud noises when reading or looking at pictures in a book

    1   2   3   4   5   6

80. Your child dislikes food that he/she had previously seemed to accept

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6

81. Your child stops what he/she is doing and looks up when you enter the room

    1   2   3   4   5   6

82. Your child cries for more than a few minutes when hurt

    1   2   3   4   5   6

83. Your child watches a long (1 hour or more) TV programme without getting up to do something else

    1   2   3   4   5   6

84. Your child spontaneously wakes up at the usual time at weekends and holidays

    1   2   3   4   5   6

85. Your child responds to sounds or noises unrelated to his/her activity

    1   2   3   4   5   6

86. Your child avoids new guests or visitors

    1   2   3   4   5   6

87. Your child fidgets when a story is being read to him/her

    1   2   3   4   5   6

88. Your child becomes upset or cries over minor falls or bumps

    1   2   3   4   5   6

89. Your child interrupts an activity to listen to conversation around him/her

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never	Rarely	Usually does not	Usually does	Frequently	Almost always
1	2	3	4	5	6

90. Your child is unwilling to leave a play activity that he/she has not completed

    1   2   3   4   5   6

91. Your child is able to fall asleep when there is conversation in a nearby room

    1   2   3   4   5   6

92. Your child becomes highly excited when presented with a new toy or game

    1   2   3   4   5   6

93. Your child pays attention from start to finish when you try to explain something to him/her

    1   2   3   4   5   6

94. Your child speaks so quickly that it is sometimes difficult to understand him/her

    1   2   3   4   5   6

95. Your child wants to leave the table during meals to answer the door or telephone

    1   2   3   4   5   6

96. Your child complains of events in pre-school or with playmates that day

    1   2   3   4   5   6

97. Your child frowns when you ask him/her to do a chore

    1   2   3   4   5   6

98. Your child tends to hold back in new situations

    1   2   3   4   5   6

Almost never 1	Rarely 2	Usually does not 3	Usually does 4	Frequently 5	Almost always 6

99. Your child laughs hard while watching TV cartoons or comedy

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5   6

</div>

100.   Your child has 'off' days when he/she is moody or cranky

<div align="center">

1   2   3   4   5   6

</div>

INSTRUCTIONS FOR PARENT Q-SORTS

You can provide an extremely accurate and valuable description of your child's behavior using the 90 Q-sort cards we have provided. Only three things are necessary. First, you have to become familiar with the cards. Second you have to observe your child for about a week with these cards in mind. Finally, you provide a description of your child's behavior by sorting the cards into 9 piles. Cards that are most like your child end up in "HIGH" numbered piles. Cards that are unlike your child end up in "LOW" numbered piles.

Overview

The Q-sort items we have provided can be thought of as a vocabulary for describing your child's behavior. The sorter's task is to divide the entire set of 90 cards into 9 piles of ten cards each. Cards that are most like your child go in PILE 9. Cards that are most unlike your child go into PILE 1. Most parents can do the sorting in about 45 minutes.

In brief, you start with 90 cards and end up with:

90   CARDS

↓

9 PILES

#9	#8	#7	#6	#5	#4	#3	#2	#1
10 Cards	10 Cards	10 Cards	10 Cards	10 Cards	10 Cards	10 Cards	10 Cards	10 Cards

Most like   Like   Neither Like   Unlike   Very Unlike
my child   my child   nor Unlike   my child   my child

1.

You should keep the following in mind:

1.   You are serving as a skilled and informed
     observer. Describe your child's behavior as
     fairly and accurately as possible. You should
     give the same description we would get if one of
     us could be with you and your child all the time.

2.   Descriptions are only accurate if you are familiar
     with the cards before you start observing your
     child. Good observers have to know what behavior
     they should pay attention to, <u>before they start
     observing</u>.

3.   You can't depend on existing knowledge of your
     child. To be a good observer, you must now look
     more closely at your child's behavior than you
     have needed to as a parent. In addition, you have
     to observe your child with <u>the intention to
     remember his behavior</u>.

4.   A word about behavior that annoys or embarrasses
     you: Describe it anyway. We've heard it all
     before. Besides, the cards describe things that
     will give way to different behaviors as your child
     gets older.

<div align="center">Q-SORTING PROCEDURE</div>

STEP 1: Get familiar with the behavior described on each card.

     The best way to do this is to sort the entire set of cards
into 3 piles. Read the cards completely, one by one. If a card is
<u>like</u> your child, place to your left. If it is <u>unlike</u> or the
<u>opposite</u> of your child, place it to your right. Cards that are
<u>neither like nor unlike</u> your child should go into a middle pile,
right in front of you. This procedure should only take 15-20
minutes. When you finish, you will know what to look for during
a week of observing and remembering you child's behavior.

Notice that each card describes a different behavior. If a card is very descriptive of your child, you will place it "HIGH" in your final 9 pile sort (i.e. in pile 9, 8 or 7). If a card describes behavior that is uncharacteristic or the opposite of your child's behavior, you will place it "LOW" in your final sort (i.e. in pile 3, 2, or 1). The opposite of each behavior (i.e. the kind of behavior that should send the card into a "LOW" pile) is labeled "LOW:" and defined at the bottom of each card, unless it is obvious.

A few cards have a starred (**) message at the bottom. These are usually cards that describe how a child goes about some specific behavior (e.g. quickly vs. slowly). If the child doesn't do the behavior at all, or is too young to do it, then you can't say anything one way or the other, and the card goes in the middle.

After you have become familiar with the cards by sorting them into three piles, be sure to shuffle them thoroughly before you do any real sorting.

STEP 2: After observing for a week, sort the cards into 3 groups.

For right now, it won't matter how many cards you put in each group. In addition, you don't have to be totally confident about where you place a card at this point. You will have a chance to move them around in the steps that follow. Just sort the cards as follows:

90 CARDS

Group A	Group B	Group C
To your left if it is like your child	In front of you if it neither like nor unlike	To your right if it is unlike your child

3.

STEP 3: Divide Group A cards into three piles (#9,#8,#7).

Again, it doesn't matter how many cards are in each pile at this point. And you don't have to be totally confident about which pile to put a card in. You will have a chance to move them around a bit in steps that follow. Just sort the Group A cards as follows:

Group A

Pile 9	Pile 8	Pile 7
Very much like my child	Like my child	Somewhat like my child

STEP 4: Divide the Group B cards into three piles (#6,#5,#4).

As above, it doesn't matter how many cards are in each pile at this point and you don't have to be totally confident about where you place them yet. Just sort the Group B cards as follows:

Group B

Pile 6	Pile 5	Pile 4
More like than unlike my child	Neither like nor unlike my child	More unlike than like my child

Note: If a card does not apply to your child for the reasons stated at the bottom of the card (**), it should be placed in one of these MIDDLE piles. The farther away from the middle you place a card, the more strongly you are using it.

4.

STEP 5: Divide the Group C cards into three piles (#3,#2,#1).

As in steps 3 and 4 above, it doesn't matter how many cards are in each pile at this point. And you don't have to be totally confident about which pile to put a card in. Just sort the Group C cards as follows:

Group C

Pile 3	Pile 2	Pile 1
Somewhat <u>un</u>like my child	<u>Un</u>like my child	Very much <u>un</u>like my child

STEP 6: Now the cards are in 9 piles. Cards most like your child are in Pile 9 (far left). Cards most <u>un</u>like your child are in Pile 1 (far right). The last step in the procedure is to adjust the piles so that you have <u>exactly 10</u> cards in each pile.

Look at the cards in Pile 9 (Most like my child). Keep the ten that are very most like your child in this pile, and move the rest toward the middle to Pile 8. (If you have fewer than ten cards in Pile 9, simply mix Piles 9 & 8 together; pick the ten you need for Pile 9 and put everything else in Pile 8).

Now look at the cards in Pile 8 (one pile closer to the center). Keep the 10 that are most like your child in this pile, and move the rest to Pile 7. (As above, if you have fewer than ten cards in the pile you are working on, get what you need by adding in the items from the pile one step closer to the center).

Use the same procedures to find 10 items for Pile 7. Put any leftovers in Pile 6.

Use the same procedures to find 10 items for Pile 6. Put any leftovers in Pile 5.

STOP!   STOP!   STOP!

5.

Now move all the way across to the cards in Pile 1 (Most unlike my child). Just as you were doing above, look at the cards in Pile 1. Keep the ten that are very most _unlike_ your child in Pile 1, and move the rest toward the middle to Pile 2. (If you have fewer than ten cards in Pile 1, add in the cards from Pile 2 and pick the ten most _unlike_ your child. Put any leftover cards in Pile 2.

Now look at the cards in Pile 2 (one pile closer to the center). Keep the ten that are most _unlike_ your child there and move the rest closer to the center, to Pile 3.

Use the same procedures to find ten cards for Pile 3, and move any leftovers (cards that are not quite so _unlike_ your child) toward the center, to Pile 4.

Now find the ten cards you want for Pile 4, and put the rest in the middle. If everything is right, you won't have to adjust Pile 5 at all. It will contain ten cards by default.

FINISHED!   FINISHED!   ALMOST!

Count the cards in each pile to make sure there are ten in each one. If you have too many in one pile, and too few in a pile next to it, you can just find one card in the bigger pile that would be appropriate to move to the short pile. If you find too many in one pile and too few in a pile several steps away, _just_ _leave_ _things_ _as_ _they_ _are_. You would have to do a lot of re-sorting to fix this. Your description will still be fine.

REPORTING YOUR RESULTS

To report the results of your Q-sort you either place the cards from each pile in the pre-numbered envelopes provided for your study, or you go through each pile and write the number of the cards it contains on the score sheet attached to these instructions. If you are using envelopes, be careful to put Pile 9 in Envelope 9, etc. Sometimes things get reversed.

If you are writing item numbers onto the attached score sheet, just be careful to write clearly. There are ten spaces on the score sheet for each pile. If you don't find ten cards, Look again. Sometimes they stick together.

Items of the Q-Sort Task

1. Your child readily shares things with you or lets you hold things if you ask to

2. When your child returns to you after playing, he/she is sometimes fussy for no clear reason

3. When upset or injured, your child will accept comforting from adults other than yourself

4. Your child is careful and gentle with toys and pets

5. Your child is more interested in people than in things

6. When your child is near you and sees something he/she wants to play with, he/she fusses or tries to drag you over to it

7. Your child laughs and smiles easily with a lot of different people

8. When your child cries, he/she child cries hard

9. Your child is light-hearted and playful most of the time

10. Your child often cries or resists when you take him/her to bed for naps or at night

11. Your child often hugs or cuddles you, without you asking or inviting him/her to do so

12. Your child quickly gets used to people or things that initially made him/her shy or frightened

13. When your child gets upset because you are leaving, he/she continues to cry or even gets angry after you have gone

14. When your child finds something new to play with, he/she will carry it to you or show it to you from across the room

15. If you ask him/her to, your child is willing to talk to new people, show them toys, or show them what he/she can do

16. Your child prefers toys that are modelled on living things (e.g. dolls, stuffed animals)

17. Your child quickly loses interest in new adults if they do anything that annoys him/her

18. Your child follows your suggestions readily, even when they are clearly suggestions rather than orders

Items of the Q-Sort Task

19. When you tell your child to bring or give you something he/she obeys (don't include refusals that are playful or part of a game)

20. Your child ignores most bumps, falls, or startles

21. Your child keeps track of your location when he/she plays around the house

22. Your child acts like an affectionate parent toward dolls, pets, or infants

23. When you sit with other family members, or when you are affectionate with them, your child tries to get your affection for himself/herself

24. When you speak firmly or raise your voice at your child, he/she becomes upset, sorry or ashamed about displeasing you (do not count if child is simply upset by the raised voice or is afraid of getting punished)

25. Your child is easy to lose track of when he/she is playing out of your sight

26. Your child cries when you leave him/her at home with a babysitter, father, or grandparent

27. Your child laughs when you tease him/her

28. Your child enjoys relaxing on your knee

29. At times, your child attends so deeply to something that he/she doesn't seem to hear when people speak to him/her

30. Your child easily becomes angry with toys

31. Your child wants to be the centre of your attention and if you are busy or talking to someone, he/she will interrupt

32. When you say "no" or you punish your child, he/she stops misbehaving and doesn't have to be told twice

33. Your child sometimes signals or gives you the impression that he/she wants to be put down and then fusses or wants to be picked up again

34. When your child is upset about you leaving, he/she will cry but will sit right where he/she is and will not try to go after you

35. Your child is independent with you (leaves you easily) and prefers to play on his/her own

36. Your child uses you as a base from which to explore (e.g. he/she moves away from you to play and returns or plays near you and moves away to play again, etc.)

Items of the Q-Sort Task

37. Your child is very active. He/she is always moving around and prefers active games to quiet ones

38. Your child is demanding and impatient with you. He/she fusses and persists unless you do what he/she wants right away

39. Your child is often serious and businesslike when playing away from you or alone with toys

40. Your child examines new objects or toys in great detail and tries to use them in different ways or to take them apart

41. Your child follows when you ask him/her to do so

42. Your child recognises when you are upset (e.g. he/she becomes quiet or upset and tries to comfort you, asking 'what is wrong' etc.)

43. Your child stays closer to you or returns to you more often than the simple task of keeping track of you requires

44. Your child asks for and enjoys having you hold, hug and cuddle him/her

45. Your child enjoys dancing or singing along with music

46. Your child walks and runs around without bumping, dropping or stumbling

47. Your child will accept and enjoys loud sounds or being bounced around in play, if you smile and show that it is supposed to be fun

48. Your child readily lets new adults hold or share things he/she has

49. Your child runs to you with a shy smile when new people visit the home

50. Your child's initial reaction when people visit the home is to ignore or avoid them, even if he/she eventually warms up to them

51. Your child enjoys crawling all over visitors when he/she plays with them

52. Your child has trouble handling small objects or putting small things together

53. Your child puts his/her arms around you or puts his/her hand on your shoulder when you pick him/her up

54. Your child expects you to get involved with his/her activities when you are simply trying to help him/her with something

55. Your child copies a number of behaviours or ways of doing things from watching you

Items of the Q-Sort Task

56. Your child becomes shy or loses interest when an activity looks like it might be difficult

57. Your child is fearless

58. Your child largely ignores adults who visit the home and finds his/her own activities more interesting

59. When your child finishes with an activity or toy, he/she generally finds something else to do without returning to you between activities

60. If you reassure your child with "It's okay" or "It won't hurt you", he/she will approach or play with things that initially made him/her cautious/afraid

61. Your child plays roughly with you and bumps, scratches, or bites during active play

62. When your child is in a happy mood, he/she is likely to stay that way all day

63. Even before trying something himself/herself, your child tries to get someone to help him/her

64. Your child enjoys climbing all over you when he/she plays

65. Your child is easily upset when you make him/her change from one activity to another

66. Your child easily grows fond of adults who visit your home and are friendly to him/her

67. When the family has visitors, your child wants them to pay him/her a lot of attention

68. On average, your child is more active than you are

69. Your child rarely asks you for help

70. Your child quickly greets his you when you enter the room (e.g. with a big smile, shows you a toy, gestures or says "Hello")

71. If held in your arms, your child stops crying and quickly recovers after being frightened or upset

72. If visitors laugh at or approve of something your child does, he/she repeats it again and again

73. Your child has a cuddly toy or security blanket that he/she carries around, takes to bed or holds when upset

Items of the Q-Sort Task

74. When you don't do what your child wants you to do right away, he/she behaves as if you were not going to do it at all

75. At home, your child gets upset or cries when you walk out of room and may even follow you

76. When given a choice, your child would rather play with toys than with adults

77. When you ask your child to do something, he/she readily understands what you want, even if he/she does or does not do it

78. Your child enjoys being hugged or held by people (other than by you or his/her grandparents)

79. Your child easily becomes angry with you

80. Your child uses your facial expressions as a good source of information when something looks risky or threatening

81. Your child cries as a way of getting you to do what he/she wants

82. Your child spends most of his/her play time with just a few favourite toys or activities

83. When your child is bored, he/she comes to you looking for something to do

84. Your child makes at least some effort to be clean and tidy around the house

85. Your child is strongly attracted to new activities and new toys

86. Your child tries to get you to imitate him/her, or quickly notices and enjoys it when you imitates him/her on your own

87. If you laugh at or approve of something your child has done, your child repeats it over and over again

88. When something upsets your child, he/she stays where he/she is and cries

89. Your child's facial expressions are strong and clear when he/she is playing with something

90. If you move away from your child, he/she will follow to be near you (not having to be called or carried and doesn't stop playing or get upset)

Q-Sort Score Sheet

Please complete and return in the pre-paid envelope provided

	Pile 1	Pile 2	Pile 3	Pile 4	Pile 5	Pile 6	Pile 7	Pile 8	Pile 9
1									
2									
3									
4									
5									
6									
7									
8									
9									
10									

Helpline numbers

Hyperactive Children's Support Group
01903 725182

NSPCC Child Protection Helpline
0808 800 5000

Childline
0800 1111

Parentline – free confidential helpline for
anyone in a parenting role
0808 800 2222

Parent's Friend
0113 267 4627

Relate
01772 717597

Adjustment Questions (telephone)

Child's name : ....

Primary caregiver's name / Parent answering the telephone questionnaire :

....

1. **How was your child before he/she went to school on their first day?**

....

....

2. **Who took your child to school on their first day?**

....

....

3. **What did your child do when you left him/her at school for the first time?**

....

....

....

....

4. **How did you feel about leaving your child on his/her first day?**

....

....

....

....

5. How do you feel now?

....

....

....

....

6. What is your child's attitude to attending school?

Doesn't want to go at all
Sometimes doesn't want to go and sometimes does
Not bothered either way
Looks forward to going
Is really very excited about going

7. What does your child do at lunchtime?

Has school dinners
Takes a packed lunch
Comes home for lunch

8. How does your child feel about his/her new teacher(s)?

Doesn't like her at all
Hasn't said
Really likes her

9. Does your child talk about at least one friend he/she has made at school?

Yes/No

10. If "Yes" : How does your child feel about his/her new friends?

Doesn't like them at all
Hasn't said
Really likes them

11. How would you describe your relationship with your child since he/she started school?

Easy   Normal   Difficult

12. **How often has your child displayed naughty behaviour since he/she started school?** (not including dangerous behaviour, e.g. reaching for a pan on the cooker, putting things into plug sockets)

    always most of the time   half of the time   sometimes   never

13. **How often has your child displayed good behaviour since he/she started school?**

    always most of the time   half of the time   sometimes   never

14. **Are there any changes in your child's behaviour since he/she started school?** (e.g. wetting the bed)

    Yes/No

15. **If 'Yes' : please give details :**

....

....

....

....

16. **Has your child experienced any major life events since I saw you last?**

    Yes/No

17. **If 'Yes' : please give details :**

....

....

....

....

OBSERVATION 2
Interaction with peers during free play in the classroom

PART 1: Friday afternoon, 28th September 2001

Participant 19

Mrs L – School B

She comes in from her classroom, walks right through the room and sits on a chair on the steps outside the classroom door. She watches 2 girls talk to each other.

She wanders back into the classroom and then dawdles back outside again. She walks back into the room and over to the large building blocks where 4 boys are building and playing. She looks around the classroom as she walks around the construction. She then walks all around the classroom and eventually stops at the colouring table (just next to the construction). She makes no conversation with any of the 6 girls at this table she just watches what they're doing.

She is on the steps outside watching the activities outside. She starts running around wanting to be a part of the chasing game where the helper is 'on'. She stops for a few seconds at the railings and looks through them at a different class's P.E. lesson. She then rushes to the mat where the helper and a few other children are sat playing with cars and she sits there watching them all. She then runs back to the railings and continues to run around the outskirts of all of the outside activities, looking as she goes.

She is sitting on a chair in the back row of a group of children who are listening to a story that is being read by the helper. She is actually watching a girl who is pretending to read a book aloud and who is sitting on a chair at the bottom of the steps facing the group. She then looks around at the other children and then at the activities of children from the class next door who are busy with apparatus just outside their classroom door. She gets up and goes to the railings to get a better view of these children.

She is sitting at the colouring table alone. She is gluing pieces of paper onto a larger sheet of paper. She then takes a photograph of me using the camera and then continues to cut up paper. Although she appears to be busy with her task, she continually looks around the room and is more interested in the activity of others in the room.

OBSERVATION 2
Interaction with peers during free play in the classroom

PART 1: Friday afternoon, 28th September 2001

Participant 9

Mrs E – School B

He is playing at the sink. He talks to the helper who is looking on and watches the other child (girl) who is also playing at the sink. He pushes the plastic boat up the wall and keeps looking back at the helper as he does so. He starts to play in the water a little bit, but would rather watch the other child's activity or the helper. He then does something in the water and asks the helper to watch him do it.

He is playing outside with 2 other boys. They are on the mat with the helper playing with cars. A girl comes over and tries to snatch his toy. He says nothing, but keeps a tight grip and looks toward the helper. The girl lets go and then P9 talks to the helper and shows her the car.

He is running around the playground and then stops to watch the helper who is walking and holding P28. He runs away from the helper, which is all part of the game of 'tig' that the helper is playing with a number of the children. P9 runs up and down the steps and then starts to chase the others. He smiles throughout this activity.

With a policeman's helmet on, P9 sits between the helper's legs on the steps outside. A number of children are crowded around listening to the story that the helper is reading from a book. P9 fiddles with the strap off the helmet and listens quietly and carefully. He isn't even distracted from the story when a couple of boys nearby start messing about.

P9 is looking at books. He stops to help another boy tidy up the big blocks. He goes over to the teacher and then continues to walk around the room tidying things up as he goes.

OBSERVATION 2
Interaction with peers during free play in the classroom

PART 2: Monday afternoon, 8th October 2001

Participant 19

Mrs L – School B

She is sitting on the Lego mat outside. She is sitting in the sun with one other girl. The girls are not talking and no reaction from P19 as P25 introduces himself. P19 is very busy and quiet and only stops what she is doing to watch another boy who is noisily pushing a large plastic car down the steps. She smiles at this activity.

She is pushing a large car (the same one that the boy pushed down the steps earlier) around outside. It goes under the railings and P19 immediately open the gate to go and get it. It hasn't gone far, but she continually looks back at me for my reaction to her opening the gate. She brings the car to the top of the steps and smiling she (not brave enough to let the car go) she bumps it down the steps herself by hand. She then pushes the car passed a boy and leaves in with him and comes inside.

She approaches the dry wipe board table where 2 other girls and 2 boys are sitting. She speaks to P27 about a pen and then sits down, but does not start to colour. She listens and watches the others at the table. One of the girls tells P19 that she needs a board eraser and P19 passes her one, at the same time nodding at the girls following question (not heard). P19 continues to sit there without picking up a pen to colour.

P19 is still sitting at the dry wipe board table where 2 other girls and 2 boys are sitting. She now has a pen in her hand, but has not used it yet. She still prefers to watch and listen to the others.

OBSERVATION 2
Interaction with peers during free play in the classroom

PART 2: Monday afternoon, 8th October 2001

Participant 9

Mrs E – School B

He is at the colouring table and quickly scribbles on a piece of paper, before he runs off. He stops abruptly to watch what is happening at the table where the Teachers are sitting listening to children reading. He moves to the next table where there is a trough of Lego and takes a large piece. He starts taking pieces off the block and smiles as though deep in thought. P9 then runs outside and get a Tonka Digger from the box and begins playing with it on the car mat.

P9 is at the Lego table looking for pieces in the trough. He calls out to a girl on the computer and continues building. A boy comes in and says something to P9 and P9 then runs outside with the boy to the car mat. The boy starts chasing P9 around and then P9 returns to the Lego table on his own.

P9 is playing quietly on the car mat outside. He stops and looks around and jumps up and runs inside. He stops (rubbing his hands together) and talks to a girl, she tries to pull him outside by yanking his arm. Smiling he releases himself from her grasp by pulling his arm back and then he turn and settles on the floor by a crate of small wooden blocks.

P9 is sitting on his own at the computer. He is obviously concentrating and is very quiet. He is creating a funny picture using a programme designed to help with numbers. No one else comes near P9 and he continues on the computer quietly.

OBSERVATION 3
Interaction with peers during lunchtime on the playground

Day 4: Monday 24.06.02

PARTICIPANT 13

Mrs G – Cottam

ENTERS THE PLAYGROUND AFTER HAVING LUNCH

P13 is playing with 6 girls, P7 and P3. They all laugh as P3 puts P13's headband on P7. P13 takes the head band off P7 and puts it on her own head, but around her forehead. P13 squeals and laughs (with everyone else) at P3 who puts P18's pink head band on his own head. P13 points at it and hops closer to the girls. She watches P18 take the head band back off P3 and put it across her own eyes and then P10 jumps and moves away from the group and over to the grass where she falls. P13 and the other girls all run over to P10 and flop on top of her.

P13 is walking around the playground alone. She stops to chat to the Welfare Assistant and a junior girl comes over to them. The junior puts her arms around P13's waist (with P13's back into her stomach) and she picks P13 up and dangles her in mid air. P23 comes over and takes the junior over to 2 other junior children sitting on the grass. P13 wanders after them and then changes direction. She goes over to P7, P16 and P3 and crouches down with them and they all look at the floor by the edge of the flower bed.

OBSERVATION 3
Interaction with peers during lunchtime on the playground

Day 5: Thursday 27.06.02

PARTICIPANT 22

Mrs G – Cottam

ENTERS THE PLAYGROUND AFTER HAVING LUNCH – THE RECEPTION
CLASS ARE PLAYING IN THE INFANTS PLAYGROUND TODAY

P22 is being told off by the Welfare Assistant and is told to go and stand against the wall.
He scrapes a stick up and down the wall and then stabs the wall a few times. He has a
sulky, embarrassed look on his face. He looks over to the Welfare Assistant and then
turns his face back to the wall.

P22 is sitting on a bench with a boy and is talking through the railings to another boy. He
moves away and across the playground making noises and moving his arms around in the
air. He stops to chat to the boy he was sitting next to on the bench and then runs off
across the playground making noises again. He bends down to pick up a stick and then
runs back to the boy shouting.

P22 is with a boy on the raised area of the playground. He is making a "Wharr harr!"
noise as he runs over to the tree and then runs around it. He stops and rubs his hand up
and down the trunk of the tree. The boy runs away and P22 follows him down onto the
playground. The boy suggests to P22 that the playground could be the sea and P22 jumps
back up onto the raised area and pulls the boy back up too. They run off around the tree.

OBSERVATION 3
Interaction with peers during lunchtime on the playground

Day 5: Thursday 27.06.02

PARTICIPANT 4

Miss M – Cottam

ENTERS THE PLAYGROUND AFTER HAVING LUNCH – THE RECEPTION CLASS ARE PLAYING IN THE INFANTS PLAYGROUND TODAY

P4 skips and runs around alone. She runs over to the raised area of the playground that has the big old tree in the middle. She stops and turns back and runs across the playground. She stops to talk to 2 girls and the 3 of them walk over to the raised area, talking all of the time.

P4 is standing by the railings alone. She has a skipping rope, but has a sad expression on her face. She walks across the playground and occasionally does a half-hearted skip. She then starts to skip properly over to the raised area and jumps up onto it. She stands looking down at the Welfare Assistant as she deals with another child. P4 then goes to the Welfare Assistant and listens to her, smiling all of the time.

P4 is playing with 4 girls (one is P5) and a junior girl. They are all holding hands in a chain and P4 is on the end with a skipping rope in her other hand. They are pulled all over the playground by the junior and smile and squeal as they go. The junior jumps up onto the raised area leaving the girls on the playground below her. She turns to face them and shouts "Attention turn around!" and the girls follow her command and walk across the playground. P4 giggles with a few of the other girls.

OBSERVATION 3
Interaction with peers during lunchtime on the playground

Day 7: Monday 15.07.02

PARTICIPANT 12

Mrs G – Cottam

ENTERS THE PLAYGROUND AFTER HAVING LUNCH

P12 is standing by the door bar watching a boy. She wanders up and down in front of the door alone and smiles to herself. The Welfare Assistant approaches and P12 runs off into the middle of the playground. She looks back towards the door as she passes a girl who shouts "Quick, just run!" and She, P12 and a few other girls run as fast as they can across the playground.

P12 is playing with a skipping rope alone. She isn't very successful and then starts to twirl the rope around. She then wanders around the playground and appears to be in a world of her own. She looks around the playground and then goes over to the bench. After a while she skips across the playground.

P12 is with P5 and they loll over the door bar talking to each other. The Welfare Assistant comes over to get a skipping rope out of the toy box. P12 finds one for her and gives it to her. She then returns to P5 at the door bar. P5 takes P12's arms and forcibly puts them onto the door bar.

2nd Adjustment Questionnaire (telephone)

Child's name : ....

Respondent's name...

1. What is your child's current attitude to attending school?
    Doesn't want to go at all
    Sometimes doesn't want to go and sometimes does
    Not bothered either way
    Looks forward to going
    Is really very excited about going

2. Would you say that your child has settled at school?   Yes/No

3. What does your child do at lunchtime?
    Has a school dinner
    Takes a packed lunch
    Comes home for lunch

4. How does your child feel about his/her teacher?
    Doesn't like her at all
    Hasn't said
    Really likes her

5. Does your child talk about at least one other child from school?   Yes/No

6. **If "Yes"** : How does your child feel about his/her new friend(s)?
    Doesn't like them
    Hasn't said
    Likes them

7. Has your child been involved in any of the following behaviour at school?
    ...been accused of picking on another child/children   Yes/No
    ...been picked on by another child/children   Yes/No

8. **If 'Yes'** to either part of the above question, please give details:

....

....

....

....

9. How would you describe your relationship with your child since he/she went back to school after the Christmas holidays?

                Easy   Normal   Difficult

10. How often has your child displayed naughty behaviour since he/she went back to school after the Christmas holidays? (not including dangerous behaviour, e.g. reaching for a pan on the cooker, putting things into plug sockets)

   Always   most of the time   half of the time   sometimes   never

11. How often has your child displayed good behaviour since he/she went back to school after the Christmas holidays?

   Always   most of the time   half of the time   sometimes   never

12. Have there been any changes in your child's behaviour since he/she went back to school after the Christmas holidays? (e.g. wetting the bed)   Yes/No

13. **If 'Yes'** : please give details :

....

....

14. Has your child experienced any major life events since starting school last September? (e.g. death of a friend/family member, separation of parents, serious illness/accident or a stay in hospital)   Yes/No

15. If 'Yes' : please give details :

....

....

16. Is there anything else you can tell me about your child's adjustment to starting school that I have not covered here?   Yes/No

17. **If 'Yes'** : please give details :

....

....

Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire

For each item, please mark the box for Not True, Somewhat True or Certainly True. It would help us if you answered all items as best you can even if you are not absolutely certain or the item seems daft! Please give your answers on the basis of the child's behaviour over the last six months or this school year.

Child's Name .... Male/Female

Date of Birth ....

	Not True	Somewhat True	Certainly True
Considerate of other people's feelings	☐	☐	☐
Restless, overactive, cannot stay still for long	☐	☐	☐
Often complains of headaches, stomach-aches or sickness	☐	☐	☐
Shares readily with other children (treats, toys, pencils etc.)	☐	☐	☐
Often has temper tantrums or hot tempers	☐	☐	☐
Rather solitary, tends to play alone	☐	☐	☐
Generally obedient, usually does what adults request	☐	☐	☐
Many worries, often seems worried	☐	☐	☐
Helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill	☐	☐	☐
Constantly fidgeting or squirming	☐	☐	☐
Has at least one good friend	☐	☐	☐
Often fights with other children or bullies them	☐	☐	☐
Often unhappy, down-hearted or tearful	☐	☐	☐
Generally liked by other children	☐	☐	☐
Easily distracted, concentration wanders	☐	☐	☐
Nervous or clingy in new situations, easily loses confidence	☐	☐	☐
Kind to younger children	☐	☐	☐
Often lies or cheats	☐	☐	☐
Picked on or bullied by other children	☐	☐	☐
Often volunteers to help others (parents, teachers, other children)	☐	☐	☐
Thinks things out before acting	☐	☐	☐
Steals from home, school or elsewhere	☐	☐	☐
Gets on better with adults than with other children	☐	☐	☐
Many fears, easily scared	☐	☐	☐
Sees tasks through to the end, good attention span	☐	☐	☐

Signature .... Date...

Parent/Teacher/Other (please specify:)

Thank you very much for your help

© Robert Goodman, 1999

articipant 1 > Attachment Category - **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

rimary Caregiver – Mum (in employment 3days a week/8 hours)

ecure Attachment & Even Personality

econdary Caregiver - Dad

ecure Attachment & Even Personality and slightly organised, efficient & neat

o depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

st born child is excited about going to school & No experience of major life events

aughty sometimes (e.g. not listening, answering back) &Good most of the time (e.g. helpful, looks after sister)

iscipline - bad behaviour (e.g. verbal, shouts, doesn't smack often, avoids smacking) & Good behaviour (e.g. Rewards and treats)

rimary caregiver is happy about her going to school and she looks forward to going

he really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

he relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal

he displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

here have been a few changes in behaviour (e.g. more tired in an evening and reluctant to anything then) & no major life events

he has settled at school and looks forward to going, she really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

he relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy this school term

ie displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

iere have been a few changes in behaviour (e.g. she's become cheeky and answers back)

ie has experienced a major life event this term – an operation on her eye in Feb.

illying Responses

rent = 0

servation = 0

acher = 0

Participant 2 > Attachment Category – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in full-time employment)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Unsympathetic, ruthless, cold & even cruel

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Avoidant Attachmt & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; unsympathetic, ruthless, cold & cruel; organised, efficient & neat

No postpartum depression, but has suffered with depression since & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

later-born & younger sibling - does & doesn't want to go to school & experienced 1 major life event – hospitalized for 1 night

Naughty sometimes (e.g. fights with sisters, wanting & not sharing) & Good most of the time (e.g. very helpful, does as she is told)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. tell her off) & good behaviour (e.g. praise and sweets)

The primary caregiver is happy about her going to school & she is excited about going to school

She likes her teacher talks about an old friend at school, but hasn't said how she feels about him

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since the child started school

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes & good behaviour most of the time

There haven't been any changes in the child's behaviour since she started school & no major life events

Settled at school, isn't bothered either way about going, really likes her teacher & talks about friends & likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal this school term

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes & good behaviour most of the time

There haven't been any changes in her behaviour during this term & no major life events

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

articipant 3 > Attachment Category – Secure & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

rimary Caregiver – Mum (in employment 3 ½ days a week)

voidant Attachment & Tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung; slightly timid & shy personality

econdary Caregiver - Dad

ecure Attachment & Even Personality

light postpartum depression, but no other depression & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

ater-born child is looking forward to going to school & Experienced 1 major life event – hospitalized for one night

aughty sometimes (e.g. pulls dominant girlfriends hair when she winds him up, toilet language) & Good most of the time (e.g.

bedient, complies with suggestions to do things, will put toys away)

iscipline - bad behaviour (e.g. tell him not to) & good behaviour (e.g. little car every so often)

he primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he isn't bothered either way about going

e really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

he relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy

e displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

here have been changes in behaviour (e.g. he constantly straightens his clothes and has started screwing his nose up)

e has experienced a major life event since starting school – his sister announced that she is pregnant and there have been a lot of

isty discussions about it within his earshot. He can probably feel the tension

e has settled at school & looks forward to going, he really likes his teacher, talks about at least 1 friend & likes them

ie relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal this school term

displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

iere haven't been any changes in his behaviour during this term

has experienced major life events – Grandma died and sister had her baby 4 months ago

illying Responses

rent = 0

servation = 0

acher = 0

Participant 4 > Attachment Category – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment 1 hr a day + weekends/evenings)

Secure Attachment & Even personality and slightly organised, efficient & neat

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Even Personality

No depression & easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

Only child (mum expecting) is looking forward to going to school & Had 2 major life events – 2 deaths in family

Naughty sometimes (e.g. whinging & moaning when very tired or hungry) & Good most of the time (e.g. plays nice, chatty &

pleasant, does as she is told)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. try to entertain her) & good behaviour (e.g. praise and treats)

The primary caregiver is happy about her going to school & she looks forward to going to school

She really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in the child's behaviour (e.g. tiredness and naughtiness, bed earlier)

She hasn't experienced any major life events since starting school, but had problems at first, with the school dinners.

She has settled at school, looks forward to going, really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been difficult this school term*

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour sometimes

There have been a few changes in her behaviour during this term (e.g., she's become more independent)

She has experienced a major life event – *mum had the baby in January

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = BULLY

Participant 5 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Difficult**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (child minder and works from home)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Not forceful, more timid & shy; very kind, tender & charitable; organised, efficient & neat

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Even Personality

No depression & difficult relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later born with younger sibling, looking forward to going to school, had 1 major life event – mum into hospital to have baby

Naughty most of the time, but never 1 month ago (e.g. temper tantrums, screaming, cheek) & Good sometimes (e.g. very kind and helpful, does as she is told, pleasant, affectionate)

Discipline - bad behav. (e.g. tell off sharply & shout) & good (e.g. praise, hugs, kisses & sweets)

The primary caregiver is apprehensive and reluctant about her going to school and child sometimes does & doesn't want to go

She doesn't like her teacher and doesn't really talk about a friend at school

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since starting school

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in her behaviour (e.g. happy to go in school, but upset, sometimes hysterical, & clingy when comes out)

She's not experienced any major life event, but has had traumas at school

She has settled at school and looks forward to going, she thinks her teacher is ok, but doesn't talk about friends from school

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal this term

She displays naughty behaviour half of the time and good behaviour sometimes

There have been changes in her behaviour (e.g. temper tantrums, cries at everything and shouts at mum about things)

No major life events

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 6 > Attachment Cluster – **Unclassified** & Temperament Cluster - **Difficult**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in full time employment, 26 – 30 hrs a week)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Kind, tender & charitable; organised, efficient & neat

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Anxious-Ambivalent Attachment & Personality - Not forceful, more timid & shy; forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised; tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung

No depression & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

Only child is looking forward to going to school & Experienced 3 major life events – met step bro, Grandparents split, Gran died

Naughty half of the time (e.g. doesn't do as told, attention seeking) & Good half of the time (e.g. plays nice and behaves)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. shout, time out, telling off, smack when needed) & good (e.g. treats)

The primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he looks forward to going

He really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy

He displays naughty behaviour half of the time and good behaviour half of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. he does things better now, like getting dressed and eating all his meals)

He has not experienced any major life events since he started school

He has settled at school & looks forward to going to school, really likes his teacher, he talks about at least one friend & likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal this school term

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour during this term (e.g. cheeky and wouldn't do as told especially over the holidays. He didn't listen and only watched TV, but he's got better)

No major life events

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 7 > Attachment Cluster – **Insecure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment – child minder within the home)

Insecure Attachment & Personality - Unsympathetic, ruthless, cold & even cruel

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Personality - Reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

No depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born child is looking forward to going to school & Not experienced a major life event

Naughty sometimes (e.g. tantrums if he doesn't get his way, slightly violent sometimes & can kick out occasionally, aggressive)

Good most of the time (e.g. very helpful, kind, shares, is very honest)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. tell him its wrong & send to his room) & good (e.g. rewards, quality time, chose TV prog.)

Primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he looks forward to going

He really likes teacher and talks about friends he likes

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since the child started school

He never displays naughty behaviour & displays good behaviour most of the time

There was a change in behaviour (e.g. he'd go off for some quiet/alone time & then he would come back and join everyone)

He has not experienced any major life events since he started school

He has settled at school and looks forward to going, he really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal this school term

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been a few changes in his behaviour during this term (e.g. he's become cheeky and answers back)

No major life events

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

articipant 8 > Attachment Cluster – **Insecure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

rimary Caregiver - Mum (in employment 5 hrs a day, 5 days a week)

ecure Attachment & Even Personality

econdary Caregiver - Dad

o information for Attachment or Personality

o depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

ater-born child is looking forward to going to school & Experienced 1 major life event –Grandfather died

aughty sometimes (e.g. doesn't always do as told right away, a bit of cheek, tantrums) & Good most of the time (e.g. very

elpful, very loving)

iscipline - bad behaviour (e.g. tell him that he's upset me and that I need him to help me, smack on bottom for tantrums) & good

ehaviour (e.g. praise)

he primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he looks forward to going

e really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

he relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since the child started school

e displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

o changes in his behaviour since he started school & no major life events

e has settled at school and looks forward to going, he really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

ie relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

e displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

iere have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. cheeky, more confident)

) major life events

illying Responses

rent = 0

servation = VICTIM + OUTSIDER

acher = 0

Participant 9 > Attachment Cluster – Secure & Temperament Cluster – Slow to Warm Up

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment part time, 3 days a week)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Unsympathetic, ruthless, cold & even cruel; forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Avoidant Attachment & No information for Personality

Slight postpartum depression, but no depression since & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

First Born child is looking forward to going to school & No major life event

Naughty half of the time (e.g. fighting with brother, back chat) & Good half of the time (e.g. very helpful, tidies toys away)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. cut out treats, send to room) & good behaviour (e.g. rewards)

The primary caregiver feels apprehensive and reluctant about him going to school & he sometimes does & doesn't want to go

Hasn't said whether he likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend, but hasn't said whether he likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since the child started school

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There has been one change in his behaviour since starting school (e.g. more cheeky)

No major life events since starting school, but he isn't enjoying school at all, he didn't want to go in after the second day

He has settled at school & isn't bothered either way about going, really likes teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. complete and utter liar all of the time, can't believe him about anything. He even told lies about someone picking on him)

He has experienced a major life event– Mum had to go into hospital in February, but it didn't bother him at all

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 10 > Attachment Cluster – **Unclassified** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment 9 hours a week)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; very kind, tender & charitable; almost organised, efficient & neat; reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Personality - Very kind, tender & charitable; organised, efficient & neat; very tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung; reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

No depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born child is excited about going to school & Experienced 1 major life event – great grandma died

Naughty sometimes (e.g. smacking brother) & Good most of the time (e.g. gets up and dressed on own, tidies up, brushes teeth)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. raise voice) & good (e.g. treats & prizes from toy shop)

Primary caregiver's happy about her going, she is excited about going, really likes teacher, talks about friends & likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy

She never displays naughty behaviour and always displays good behaviour

No changes in her behaviour

She has experienced a major life event – she fell when running & cut her chin open. A & E put steri-strips on, but it got infected

She has settled at school and is really excited about going, really likes teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy

She never displays naughty behaviour and is always good

There have been a few changes in her behaviour during this term (e.g. she's become cheeky and answers back)

No major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 11 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver – (Grandma at the moment)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Kind, tender & charitable

Secondary Caregiver - Aunt

No information for Attachment or Personality

Biological Mother had postpartum depression & still depressed & Easy relationship between primary caregiver & child

Only Child (Later born in her family of cousins) and is excited about going to school

Naughty sometimes (e.g. tantrums if can't get own way & tired) & Good most of the time (e.g. very helpful, plays & reads nicely)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. time out on naughty stairs) & good behaviour (e.g. treat)

Experienced many major life events – Mother couldn't cope after her birth. Biological parents had a bad break up, child was passed between them since birth and lives with Grandma. Dad is in prison and she visits every week. Death of older family relatives

The primary caregiver is happy about her going to school & she is excited about going

She really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since the child started school

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes & good behaviour most of the time

There have been a few changes in her behaviour since she started school*

Experienced major life events– *Primary caregiver had problems with boyfriend, child witnessed violence & damage to property. She was very frightened & was screaming especially at the sight of the blood. Police came & Aunt/Step-mum took her away

She has settled at school & looks forward to going, really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in her behaviour (e.g. naughty, scribbling on the wall, putting nail varnish on the bed covers & cousin's legs and she wet the bathroom through. There's no malice with it though, she's just playing.)

She has experienced a major life event - Dad came out of prison & she moved back to living with him.

Bullying Responses

Parent = BULLY + VICTIM

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 12 > Attachment Cluster - **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Slow to Warm Up**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (not in employment)

Secure Attachment & Even Personality and slightly more timid & shy; slightly tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung

Secondary Caregiver - Dad (works away)

No information for Attachment or Personality

Suffered postpartum depression & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

1st born child is excited about going to school

Naughty sometimes (e.g. hitting sister, nagging, when tired) & Good most of time (e.g. polite, quiet, well behaved, nice to sister)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. shouting or send to bed if really naughty) & good (e.g. praise)

Experienced 2 major life events – birth of sister and Dad started working away from home

Primary caregiver is apprehensive & reluctant about her going to school, she looks forward to going

She really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since starting school

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in behaviour (e.g. she seems more grown up and is interested in her friends more than she was)

She has not experienced any major life events since she started school

She has settled at school, but has mixed feelings about going, really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

No changes in her behaviour & no major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

articipant 13 > Attachment Cluster - **Insecure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

rimary Caregiver - Mum (in part- time employment, 3 ½ days a week)

ecure Attachment & Personality - Organised, efficient & neat; tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung

econdary Caregiver- Dad

ecure Attachment & Personality - Very bold, assertive & persistent; unsympathetic, ruthless, cold & cruel; very relaxed & calm

nd definitely not self-conscious; reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

o depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

ater-born child is looking forward to going to school & no major life event

aughty sometimes (e.g. fighting with sister, not doing as asked) & Good most of the time (e.g. very helpful, does as she is told)

iscipline - bad behaviour (e.g. ask again, count, raise voice, smack if really naughty, but not often, avoid it) & good (e.g. praise)

rimary caregiver is happy about her going to school, she looks forward to going

eally likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend, but hasn't said how she feels about them

he relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since the child started school

he displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

o changes in her behaviour since she started school

he has experienced a major life event – Grandad died a few days before she started school

ie has settled at school and looks forward to going, she really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

ie relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

ie displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

o changes in her behaviour during this term

o major life event this term, but didn't come to terms with Grandad's death until after Xmas, would only talk about it at school

illying Responses

rent = 0

iservation = 0

acher = 0

articipant 14 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Difficult**

rimary Caregiver - Mum (in part time employment 3 hours a week)

ecure Attachment & Even Personality

econdary Caregiver - Dad

ecure Attachment & Even Personality

o depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

ater-born child is excited about going to school & No major life event

aughty sometimes (e.g. repeatedly asks if told no, plays parents off against each other) &Good most of the time (e.g. dresses

mself, plays with the dog and eats all his food up)

iscipline - bad behaviour (e.g. shout) & good behaviour (e.g. treats)

he primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he is excited about going

asn't said if he likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and really likes them

he relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since he started school

e never displays naughty behaviour and always displays good behaviour

o changes in his behaviour since he started school & no major life events since starting school

e has settled at school, but does and doesn't want to go, really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

ie relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy

e never displays naughty behaviour and is always good

iere have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. nightmares for 3 weeks, really scared & screams in sleep, doesn't remember them

ɔ major life event this term

illying Responses

rent = VICTIM

ɔservation = 0

acher = BULLY AND VICTIM

Participant 15 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary - Mum (not in employment)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised

Secondary- Dad

No information for Attachment or Personality

No depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born child is excited about going to school & Experienced 3 major life events – Paternal Grandfather & 2 great Grans died

Naughty sometimes (e.g. demanding what he wants and shouts) & Good most of the time (e.g. polite, caring and good manners)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. tell her off, sometimes sent to room, but not often) & good behaviour (e.g. praise, cuddles and kisses)

The primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he isn't bothered either way about going

Hasn't said if he likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and hasn't said if he likes them (old friendship)

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since he started school

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour sometimes

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. more tired, shouting more because of it, but he also wants more hugs and kisses)

No major life events, but on 2nd day, he came home crying because he'd lost his new lunchbox & it changed his attitude to going

Settled at school, but sometimes does and doesn't want to go, really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been difficult

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour half of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g., overtired so he's demanding, especially if not get his own way)

Has experienced a major life event – Grandma had been very ill before school started, he's saw her get worse as she lived with the family until November, it was very stressful, and she died in January

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 16 > Attachment Cluster - **Insecure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment 2 ½ days a week)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised; not self-conscious, not worry unnecessarily, relaxed & calm

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Even Personality and slightly unsympathetic, ruthless, cold & cruel

No depression & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born child is looking forward to going to school & Experienced 1 major life event – best friend moved to Australia

Naughty half of the time (e.g. biting his clothes, stamping feet, turning his toys out) & Good most of the time (e.g. thoughtful, caring and sharing)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. distraction & chat to explain) & good (e.g. praise and treats)

The primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he is excited about going to school,

He really likes his teacher, but doesn't talk about friends, he says he hasn't got any (has been playing with some old friends & other parents have said that their children like him)

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since he started school

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. he is more grown up & his play topics have changed, based more on school)

No major life events since starting school

He has settled at school and looks forward to going to school, really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g., wets the bed less, no longer once a week, it only happens every now and again)

He has experienced a major life event – Had a baby sister. He was worried about his mum going into hospital

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = 0

Teacher = BULLY + VICTIM

Participant 17 > Attachment Cluster – Secure & Temperament Cluster - Easy

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment within the home)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Quite timid & shy; very unsympathetic, ruthless & cruel; forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised; very relaxed & calm and not self-conscious; very conventional, unimaginative & definitely not inquisitive/philosophical

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Personality - Quite timid & shy; very unsympathetic, ruthless & cruel; forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised; relaxed & calm and not self-conscious; very conventional, unimaginative & definitely not inquisitive/philosophical

No depression & Easy relationship for primary caregiver and child

Later-born child, looking forward to going to school, experienced 2 major life events – hospital & a man tried to abduct her

Naughty sometimes (e.g. fighting, cheeky, answering back) Good most of the time (e.g. does as told and tidies up)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. slapped leg & sent to room) & good (e.g. praise & pat on the back)

The primary caregiver is apprehensive about her going to school (child doesn't like going) & she does & doesn't want to go

She really likes her teacher, but she doesn't talk about any friends at school

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since she started school

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour sometimes

No changes in her behaviour & no major life events since she started school

She has settled at school, but sometimes he wants to go to school & sometimes he doesn't, really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

No changes in her behaviour during this term

She has experienced a major life event – Dad's been in and out of hospital (unstable angina) once every couple of months. Once he had an attack and went in an ambulance (she wakes up crying every night he is away)

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 25 > Attachment Cluster – **Insecure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver- Mum (not in employment)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Not forceful, more timid & shy; not self-conscious, don't worry unnecessarily & more relaxed and calm

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Even Personality

No depression & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born child is looking forward to going to school & No major life events

Naughty sometimes (e.g. fighting with sister, total disregard for toys) & Good most of the time (e.g. does as asked, gets dressed)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. withdraw treats, smack) & good behaviour (e.g. praise)

The primary caregiver is apprehensive and reluctant about him going to school, but he looks forward to going to school

He quite likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend but hasn't said how he feels about them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since he started school

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

No changes in his behaviour & no major life events since he started school

He has settled at school (not as well as mum had hoped though, not many invites to parties, got a couple of friends last term) and he looks forward to going to school, he really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and sometimes likes them & sometimes doesn't

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been difficult

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour half of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g., he's answers back far more, especially at the end of the day when he's tired)

No major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 19 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment and works 3 days a week)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Organised, efficient & neat; conventional, unimaginative & not inquisitive or philosophical

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Personality - Not forceful, more timid & shy; forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised

No depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

First Born child is looking forward to going to school & No major life events

Naughty sometimes (e.g. refusing to do things, answering back cheekily) & Good most of the time (e.g. does as asked, being polite and being respectful)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. explain why its naughty and ask her not to do it again, threaten to withdraw a treat, pretend to ring her nursery teacher) & good behaviour (e.g. praise and sweets)

The primary caregiver is happy about her going to school & she looks forward to going

She really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend but hasn't said how she feels about them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since she started school

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been a few changes in her behaviour since she started school (e.g. more tired)

No major life events since she started school

She has settled at school and looks forward to going, she really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

No changes in her behaviour & No major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 20 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Difficult**

Primary Caregiver – Mum (not employed)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Personality - Very organised, efficient & neat; almost not self-conscious, he doesn't worry unnecessarily & is relaxed & calm

Postpartum depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

Only child is looking forward to going to school & Experienced 1 major life event – operation but not overnight stay

Naughty sometimes (e.g. tired/hungry/poorly and wants his own way) & Good most of the time (e.g. when behaving nicely)

Discipline – bad behaviour (e.g. deny him something, if really wild - pin him down for 10 minutes, he breaks & bursts into tears & apologises, time out & smacking don't work) & good (e.g. praise)

The primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he looks forward to going to school,

He hasn't said if he likes his teacher, but he talks about at least one friend and really likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since he started school

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. more tired and a lot hungrier. Will colour in quietly for half an hour, but wouldn't sit down for a long time before)

No major life events since he started school

He has settled at school and looks forward to going to school, he really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend, but hasn't said if he likes them or not

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g., cockier and confident) & No major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = OUTSIDER

Teacher = 0

Participant 21 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment and works 18 ½ hours a week)

Secure Attachment & Even Personality

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

No information for Attachment or Personality

No depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

Only child is looking forward to going to school & No major life events

Naughty sometimes (e.g. shouts and can hit mum, gets a bit hyper/silly) & Good most of the time (e.g. polite, joins in, generous, loving, social)

Discipline – bad behaviour (e.g. try to calm him down, time out at bottom of stairs if particularly naughty & when calm talk about it, try not to hit) & good behaviour (e.g. love, attention & praise)

The primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he looks forward to going to school

He hasn't said if he likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend, but hasn't said how he feels about them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since he started school

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g., he's happier & wiser. He seems all grown up. Can mess about and be a bit silly and less relaxed in an evening because he's tired)

No major life events since he started school

He has settled at school & looks forward to going to school, he really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend & likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

No changes in his behaviour & no major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 10 > Attachment Cluster – **Unclassified** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (in employment 9 hours a week)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; very kind, tender & charitable; almost organised, efficient & neat;

reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Personality - Very kind, tender & charitable; organised, efficient & neat; very tense, hypersensitive &

highly-strung; reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

No depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born child is excited about going to school & Experienced 1 major life event – great grandma died

Naughty sometimes (e.g. smacking brother) & Good most of the time (e.g. gets up and dressed on own, tidies up, brushes teeth)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. raise voice) & good (e.g. treats & prizes from toy shop)

Primary caregiver's happy about her going, she is excited about going, really likes teacher, talks about friends & likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy

She never displays naughty behaviour and always displays good behaviour

No changes in her behaviour

She has experienced a major life event – she fell when running & cut her chin open. A & E put steri-strips on, but it got infected

She has settled at school and is really excited about going, really likes teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy

She never displays naughty behaviour and is always good

There have been a few changes in her behaviour during this term (e.g. she's become cheeky and answers back)

No major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 23 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary - Mum (in full time employment + Nanny)

Secure Attachment & Even Personality

Secondary – Dad (only works 4 days)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised; not self-conscious, don't worry unnecessarily & more

relaxed & calm

No depression & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

First Born is excited about going to school & experienced major life events – 3 nannies in 2 ½ years, baby & mum returned to

work & A & E after falling off a wall

Naughty sometimes (e.g. ignores & tests limits) & Good most of the time (e.g. follows instructions, doesn't interrupt, shares)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. shouting, time out on stairs, sent to room) & good (e.g. praise)

The secondary caregiver is happy about her going to school & she is excited about going

She really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend but hasn't said how she feels about them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since the child started school

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in the child's behaviour (e.g. poise is different; more grown up, content & self-satisfied, a bit naughtier)

No major life events, but during the 1st week she was whacked on the head. She also gets stressed about lunchtime

She has settled at school and is really excited about going, really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been easy

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in her behaviour (e.g., battling for attention with her little sister, but she's good really)

No major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = 0

Teacher = BULLY

Participant 24 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (not in employment)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; organised, efficient & neat; not self-conscious, doesn't worry, more relaxed & calm; reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; unsympathetic, ruthless, cold & cruel; relaxed & calm and not at all self-conscious; conventional, unimaginative & not inquisitive/philosophical

Suffered from postpartum depression, but not suffered since & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born child is excited about going to school & Had 1 major life event – broke her arm & had to stay overnight for reset

Naughty sometimes (e.g. fighting with brother or getting him into trouble) & Good most of the time (e.g. helpful, good with brother if he's hurt, behaving)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. verbal, shout rarely) & good behaviour (e.g. praise and treats)

The primary caregiver is happy about her going to school & she is excited about going

She really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and really likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since the child started school

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in her behaviour since she started school (e.g. tiredness)

No major life events since she started school

She has settled at school and looks forward to going to school, really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

She never displays naughty behaviour and is good most of the time

No changes in her behaviour & No major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = BULLY

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 25 > Attachment Cluster – **Insecure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver- Mum (not in employment)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Not forceful, more timid & shy; not self-conscious, don't worry unnecessarily & more relaxed and calm

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Even Personality

No depression & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born child is looking forward to going to school & No major life events

Naughty sometimes (e.g. fighting with sister, total disregard for toys) & Good most of the time (e.g. does as asked, gets dressed)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. withdraw treats, smack) & good behaviour (e.g. praise)

The primary caregiver is apprehensive and reluctant about him going to school, but he looks forward to going to school

He quite likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend but hasn't said how he feels about them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been normal since he started school

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

No changes in his behaviour & no major life events since he started school

He has settled at school (not as well as mum had hoped though, not many invites to parties, got a couple of friends last term) and he looks forward to going to school, he really likes his teacher, talks about at least one friend and sometimes likes them & sometimes doesn't

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been difficult

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour half of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g., he's answers back far more, especially at the end of the day when he's tired)

No major life events this term

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 26 > Attachment Cluster – **Unclassified** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary - Mum (in employment and works 3 days a week)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Very tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung; very reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

Secondary

No information for Attachment or Personality

Still suffering from postpartum depression (on mild antidepressants) & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

Only child is excited about going to school & experienced major life events – moved house twice in 2 years. Mum & Dad separated 2 yrs ago. He started seeing his dad regularly 6 months ago and lives with Mum and her partner

Naughty half of the time (e.g. doesn't do as told, tantrums and sometimes tells mum "I hate you") & Good half of the time (e.g. wants to be helpful, tidies up)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. send to bedroom until he's finished and comes down and apologises, take favourite toy off him, smacks) & good behaviour (e.g. praise and treats)

The primary caregiver is happy about him going to school & he looks forward to going to school

He hasn't said if he likes his teacher, he talks about at least one friend but hasn't said how he feels about them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been difficult

He displays naughty behaviour half of the time & good behaviour half of the time

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. more defiant & cheeky, has to be asked a lot more before he will do it)

No major life events since he started school

settled at school, but isn't bothered either way abut going, really likes his teacher, he talks about at least one friend & likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

He displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour sometimes

There have been changes in his behaviour (e.g. he's become cheeky, naughty and giddy. He has no manners.)

He has experienced major life events– Mum went into hospital for 3 weeks & just after the teacher wanted to see her because he had not been being his normal self. Dad got married in June, he was a page boy

Bullying Responses

Parent = VICTIM

Observation = BULLY (X7)

Teacher = BULLY

Participant 27 > Attachment Cluster – **Insecure** & Temperament Cluster - **Easy**

Primary Caregiver - Mum (not in employment)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; conventional, unimaginative & not inquisitive or philosophical

Secondary Caregiver - Dad

Secure Attachment & Personality - Organised, efficient & neat; tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung; reflective, inquisitive & broadminded

No depression & Easy relationship between primary caregiver and child

First Born child is looking forward to going to school & No major life events

Naughty sometimes (e.g. cheeky) & Good most of the time (e.g. helpful, polite, helps with baby)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. tell her off, put her in her room, take things away from her, stop her from playing with her friends, odd tap, but avoid smacking) & good behaviour (e.g. praise and rewards)

The primary caregiver is happy about her going to school & she looks forward to going to school

She really likes both of her teachers, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since she started school

She displays naughty behaviour half of the time & good behaviour half of the time

No changes in her behaviour & no major life events since she started school

She has settled at school and is really excited about going, really likes her teacher, talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the caregiver & the child has been normal

She displays naughty behaviour sometimes and good behaviour most of the time

There have been changes in her behaviour (e.g., she's become more cheeky and self-confident with mum more than anyone else. She tries to use her mum as a servant more and tells Grandma that her Mum is lazy!)

No major life events

Bullying Responses

Parent = 0

Observation = 0

Teacher = 0

Participant 28 > Attachment Cluster – **Secure** & Temperament Cluster - **Difficult**

Primary Caregiver – Mum (in part time employment)

Secure Attachment & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung

Secondary Caregiver- Mum's partner

Secure Attachment & Personality - Bold, assertive & persistent; slightly forgetful, unsystematic & disorganised; tense, hypersensitive & highly-strung

Suffered from postpartum depression (took antidepressants from 4 - 7 months after the birth, no depression since) & Normal relationship between primary caregiver and child

Later-born with younger siblings child is excited about going to school & Experienced major life events – Birth of two siblings, parent's divorce, Dad tried to snatch her from nursery. He constantly breaks the court order to keep away, family had to move house to get away, always on edge and child will not call him dad & Lives with mum and her partner

Naughty half of the time (e.g. fighting with siblings, argumentative) & Good half of the time (e.g. tidies up & looks after the baby)

Discipline - bad behaviour (e.g. time out, sent to room, withdrawal of sweets) & good behaviour (e.g. rewards and days out)

The primary caregiver is happy about her going to school & she is very excited & happy about to going to school

She hasn't said if she likes her teacher, she talks about at least one friend and likes them

The relationship between the primary caregiver and the child has been easy since she started school

She never displays naughty behaviour and always displays good behaviour

There have been changes in her behaviour (e.g. she is a lot better in herself, her stutter has stopped & better behaved, she doesn't have to be told any more, she's really good and very helpful)

No major life events since she started school

This child left the school in the study around Easter 2002. Her mum and her siblings were forced to move after Mum was badly beaten up by her boyfriend

The Children's Attachment Category Scores

Child	Scores	Category
1	0.517	Secure
2	0.440	Secure
3	0.638	Secure
4	0.618	Secure
5	0.399	Secure
6	0.200	Unclassified
7	-0.560	Insecure
8	-0.596	Insecure
9	0.403	Secure
10	-0.299	Unclassified
11	0.440	Secure
12	0.437	Secure
13	-0.602	Insecure
14	0.597	Secure
15	0.348	Secure
16	-.583	Insecure
17	0.359	Secure
18	0.575	Secure
19	0.589	Secure
20	0.442	Secure
21	0.521	Secure
22	0.177	Unclassified
23	0.371	Secure
24	0.598	Secure
25	-0.357	Insecure
26	0.204	Unclassified
27	-0.510	Insecure
28	0.487	Secure

Appendix 25

The Children's Temperament Category Scores

Child	Activity	Rhythm	App/With	Adapt	Intense	Mood	Persist	Distract	Thresh	CATEGORY
1	2.44	1.80	3.55	2.86	4.17	3.13	2.75	3.70	3.00	EASY
2	3.33	3.00	3.27	3.00	5.08	3.75	2.13	3.90	3.75	EASY
3	3.00	2.60	2.91	2.29	4.58	2.50	2.25	3.60	4.75	EASY
4	3.00	3.20	3.18	2.43	4.50	3.00	2.63	3.80	5.00	EASY
5	3.44	1.00	5.18	4.57	4.75	3.75	3.13	4.60	6.00	DIFFICULT
6	3.33	3.60	3.73	2.00	4.58	4.38	3.38	3.20	2.50	DIFFICULT
7	2.44	2.40	3.09	3.00	3.25	3.25	2.50	3.40	4.00	EASY
8	3.22	2.40	2.55	2.43	4.50	2.50	2.75	4.90	4.75	EASY
9	2.67	2.40	4.64	3.29	2.92	3.00	3.38	3.78	4.25	SLOW TO WARM UP
10	2.89	2.60	2.64	1.57	4.33	1.88	2.38	3.70	5.00	EASY
11	3.22	3.60	1.45	2.43	4.58	2.50	1.75	4.60	4.25	EASY
12	2.67	2.20	3.27	2.86	4.17	3.50	2.63	2.90	3.25	SLOW TO WARM UP
13	3.56	1.40	2.45	1.43	4.67	2.63	2.13	4.40	4.75	EASY
14	4.33	3.00	2.91	3.00	4.58	3.38	4.13	4.70	4.50	DIFFICULT
15	3.00	1.40	2.18	2.29	3.75	3.13	3.00	3.90	4.00	EASY
16	4.33	2.20	2.36	2.57	3.67	3.13	3.25	3.40	2.50	EASY
17	4.56	2.75	3.09	1.67	4.42	2.50	5.13	4.10	5.50	EASY
18	3.56	1.20	2.73	2.57	5.25	2.88	2.88	4.10	4.75	EASY
19	1.78	1.40	3.36	1.71	3.75	2.00	2.25	4.10	4.25	EASY
20	4.22	2.80	3.09	1.86	4.75	4.13	3.13	5.00	4.25	DIFFICULT
21	3.22	3.00	2.91	3.14	3.83	3.25	3.13	3.40	3.75	EASY
22	4.33	2.80	2.09	3.00	4.92	3.63	3.13	3.80	5.25	EASY
23	3.33	1.60	2.18	2.57	5.00	2.75	3.00	5.40	3.50	EASY
24	2.56	3.20	3.00	2.43	3.75	2.13	2.50	3.30	2.00	EASY
25	4.44	2.00	2.82	3.14	4.25	3.50	3.88	4.40	4.00	EASY
26	3.11	2.20	2.18	2.29	4.08	3.75	3.38	5.20	4.00	EASY
27	3.33	1.20	2.91	2.00	5.33	2.88	2.50	4.30	4.25	EASY
28	4.78	1.20	2.00	3.29	5.08	4.13	4.00	3.70	4.50	DIFFICULT

Guide to Interpreting the Personality Dimension Scores of the

Primary Caregivers and the Secondary Caregivers Shown Overleaf

Higher scores in the **SURGENCY/EXTRAVERSION** dimension (i.e. scores of 5 – 8) indicated that the caregiver was bold, assertive and persistent and lower scores (i.e. scores of 1 – 4) indicated that the caregiver was not forceful, but was more timid and shy.

Higher scores in the **AGREEABLENESS** dimension (i.e. scores of 5 – 8) indicated that the caregiver was kind, tender and charitable and lower scores (i.e. scores of 1 – 4) indicated that the caregiver was unsympathetic, ruthless, cold and even cruel.

Higher scores in the **CONSCIENTIOUS** dimension (i.e. scores of 5 – 8) indicated that the caregiver was organised, efficient and neat and lower scores (i.e. scores of 1 – 4) indicated that the caregiver was forgetful, unsystematic and disorganised.

Higher scores in the **NEUROTICISM** dimension (i.e. scores of 5 – 8) indicated that the caregiver was tense, hypersensitive and highly-strung and lower scores (i.e. scores of 1 – 4) indicated that the caregiver was not self-conscious, they didn't worry unnecessarily and was more relaxed and calm.

Higher scores in the **OPENNESS TO EXPERIENCE** dimension (i.e. scores of 5 – 8) indicated that the caregiver was reflective, inquisitive and broadminded and lower scores (i.e. scores of 1 – 4) indicated that the caregiver was conventional, unimaginative and was not inquisitive or philosophical.

Personality Dimension Scores of the Primary Caregivers with Mean Personality

Dimension Scores and Standard Deviations

	Surgency/ Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience
1	5.69	7.06	6.90	4.20	4.85
2	4.38	5.50	5.55	4.25	4.30
3	3.88	6.63	6.15	5.75	5.75
4	5.19	6.75	7.15	3.65	5.45
5	3.06	7.75	7.40	4.45	4.50
6	5.94	7.69	7.50	4.85	5.10
7	6.00	5.69	5.80	4.10	4.50
8	4.94	6.19	5.85	3.45	4.60
9	4.69	5.69	5.30	4.95	4.95
10	6.31	7.75	7.15	5.30	5.85
11	4.63	7.25	5.40	4.70	5.60
12	3.88	6.19	5.70	5.40	5.65
13	4.56	7.00	7.55	5.90	5.30
14	4.25	6.25	6.20	5.25	4.75
15	5.88	6.31	4.70	3.80	5.60
16	5.44	6.63	5.00	3.00	5.30
17	2.44	4.88	4.75	1.55	2.45
18	5.44	6.13	5.90	3.55	5.60
19	4.00	6.00	7.30	3.20	4.15
20	6.63	6.63	5.35	3.45	5.75
21	6.13	6.81	6.70	3.85	5.00
22	5.06	5.31	6.70	4.55	4.00
23	4.94	6.75	6.55	4.20	4.75
24	6.44	6.69	7.80	3.05	6.05
25	3.31	6.56	6.20	2.80	4.50
26	6.19	5.94	6.90	6.65	6.50
27	6.31	6.88	5.75	4.65	4.10
28	7.19	6.75	7.05	6.55	5.50
Mean Score	5.10	6.49	6.29	4.32	5.01
Standard Deviation	1.17	0.71	0.90	1.17	0.81

Personality Dimension Scores of the Secondary Caregivers with Mean Personality Dimension Scores and Standard Deviations

	Surgency/ Extraversion	Agreeableness	Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	Openness to Experience
1	5.50	6.44	6.65	3.90	5.15
2	7.00	4.56	7.15	3.75	5.45
3	5.88	6.88	5.35	4.00	5.75
4	5.31	6.88	6.10	4.00	5.10
5	5.75	5.75	5.85	4.80	4.85
6	4.50	5.19	4.65	5.60	4.70
7	5.50	6.25	5.50	4.30	6.60
8	.	.	.	.	.
9	.	.	.	.	.
10	4.88	7.81	7.25	6.15	6.90
11	.	.	.	.	.
12	.	.	.	.	.
13	7.50	4.44	6.00	1.45	6.25
14	4.94	6.88	6.15	3.80	5.75
15	.	.	.	.	.
16	5.13	4.75	5.95	3.40	6.05
17	4.31	3.88	4.90	1.85	2.70
18	4.38	6.44	4.95	5.45	4.95
19	4.38	5.56	4.75	4.40	4.95
20	5.63	5.63	7.50	2.70	4.80
21	.	.	.	.	.
22	6.88	7.19	4.95	2.20	5.80
23	5.44	6.31	4.45	2.30	5.45
24	6.88	3.38	6.35	1.70	4.25
25	5.69	6.63	6.10	4.75	5.25
26	.	.	.	.	.
27	6.56	5.63	6.85	5.45	6.45
28	6.81	5.88	4.95	5.70	4.80
Mean Score	5.66	5.82	5.83	3.89	5.33
Standard Deviation	0.96	1.14	0.92	1.42	0.92

PLAYGROUND OBSERVATIONS

Peer Interaction Scale – Coding Sheet

Participant No: **Name of Rater:**

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	Total
. Bully																								
. Assistant																									
. Reinforcer																									
. Defender																									
. Outsider																									
. Victim																									

Operational Variables for Coding Observations

finition of Bullying:

It is bullying when one child is repeatedly exposed to harassment and attacks from one or several other children; harassment and attacks may be, for example, shoving or hitting the other one, calling him/her names or making jokes about him/her, leaving him/her outside the group, taking his/her things, or any other behaviour meant to hurt the other one.

1. The Bully: Starts bullying; Makes the others join in the bullying; Always finds new ways of harassing the victim.

2. The Assistant: Joins in the bullying, when someone has started it; Assists the bully; Helps the bully, maybe by catching the victim.

3. The Reinforcer: Comes around to see the situation; Laughs; Incites the bully by shouting or saying "Show him/her!"

4. The Defender: Comforts the victim or encourages him/her to tell the teacher about the bullying; Tells the others to stop bullying; Tries to make the others stop bullying.

5. The Outsider: Is not usually present in bullying situations; Stays outside the situation; Doesn't take sides with anyone.

6. The Victim: Is (repeatedly) harassed and attacked by one or several other children.