

STARS

University of Central Florida
STARS

HIM 1990-2015

2015

Bystander Apathy: An Investigation of Intervening Versus Non-Intervening Bystanders in Witnessing to Bullying

Alexandria Smith
University of Central Florida



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Find similar works at: <https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015>

University of Central Florida Libraries <http://library.ucf.edu>

This Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by STARS. It has been accepted for inclusion in HIM 1990-2015 by an authorized administrator of STARS. For more information, please contact STARS@ucf.edu.

Recommended Citation

Smith, Alexandria, "Bystander Apathy: An Investigation of Intervening Versus Non-Intervening Bystanders in Witnessing to Bullying" (2015). *HIM 1990-2015*. 601.

<https://stars.library.ucf.edu/honorstheses1990-2015/601>



BYSTANDER APATHY:
AN INVESTIGATION OF PSYCHOLOGICAL SYMPTOM
PATTERNS OF INTERVENING VERSUS NON-INTERVENING
BYSTANDERS
IN RESPONSE TO BULLYING

by

ALEXANDRIA M. SMITH

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the Honors in the Major Program in Psychology
in the College of Sciences
and in the Burnett Honors College
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida.

Summer Term, 2015

Thesis Chair: H. Edward Fouty, Ph.D.

ABSTRACT

David Cash was a college student who found himself in the women's restroom of the Primadonna in Nevada. He witnessed his friend, Jeremy Strohmeyer raping and killing a 7-year-old girl. Cash did not take any action in trying to prevent this heinous crime. There are many elements to consider when bystanders neglect to take action. Research examining bystander apathy in critical situations is lacking, yet the number of violent crimes witnessed by others where intervention is not offered continues to escalate. Bullying often occurs in the presence of others. Bystander apathy is believed to play a passive role in most cases of bullying. This study investigated the psychological symptom patterns of intervening and non-intervening bystanders in bullying events. It was hypothesized that there would be a significant difference in the SCL-90-R profiles between intervening and non-intervening bystanders. It was further hypothesized that gender would significantly interact with the bystander response to witnessing bullying.

Data were collected from undergraduate participants at the University of Central Florida through The Psychology Department's Psychological Research Participant System (aka, SONA). Psychological Symptoms were evaluated using the Symptom-Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R). Data was obtained from 135 undergraduate participants. The sample consisted of 42 males and 93 females between 18 to 58 years of age. The participants were categorized by intervening and non-intervening bystanders. A two-way between subjects MANOVA was used to assess the influence of gender and intervening and non-intervening bystanders on the nine SCL-90-R symptom domains. No significant main effects or interaction was observed. However, a review of the univariate analyses revealed a significant gender x intervening interaction on the paranoid

ideation subscale, $F(1, 131) = 4.823, p = .03$. Implications and directions for future research are discussed

DEDICATION

This thesis is dedicated to God who is my strength and my refuge.

Through him, all things are possible.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A special feeling of gratitude toward my life's supporters. I would like to thank Dr. H. Edward Fouty for having faith in me to reach this point. Also, a special thank you to Dr. Margaret Kennerley and Dr. Leslee Damato-Kubiet for their encouragement and assistance during this process.

I would also like to thank my loving husband, Samuel Smith who constantly provides me words of encouragement. My grandmother who has always been there for me and has never left my side. My father, William Bartholomew for his support. My children, Noah and Natalie Smith who are my true source of motivation.

I would also like to thank my grandfather, Thomas Greeno and my mother, Cynthia Bartholomew who have been with me in spirit.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
Bullying.....	1
Victims	3
Bystanders	4
Statement of Significance.....	8
Statement of Hypothesis.....	9
METHOD	10
Participants	10
Materials and Procedures	10
RESULTS	12
Witness to Single Act of Bullying.....	12
Witness to Multiple Acts of Bullying	12
DISCUSSION.....	13
APPENDIX A: IRB OUTCOME LETTER	15
APPENDIX B: EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH.....	17
APPENDIX C: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE	19
APPENDIX D: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS	21
APPENDIX E: F TABLE	24
APPENDIX F: RAW DATA	28
REFERENCES	37

INTRODUCTION

Bullying

Bullying may be direct or indirect, physical, verbal, or sexual and can be by the use of technology or in person (Dogruer & Yaratan, 2014). Bullying may also be indirect or relational, such as spreading rumors or giving an unwelcoming look or stare (Rivers & Noret, 2010). Although the media usually focuses on bullying among adolescence, it is common among adults as well and should not be overlooked. It is recognized that bullying is becoming a problem in today's society (Goldsmid & Howie, 2013). While the media features numerous stories about bullies and victims, there seems to be a lack of awareness about the level of involvement in bystanders witnessing bullying incidents.

According to National Conference of State Legislation in the United States, 17 states passed school safety laws regarding bullying and student harassment in the years between 1994 and 2004. A 1996 survey consisting of 2,900 middle school and high school students by the Seoul Family Court in South Korea, approximately 90% of students were threatened with physical violence by other students. Bystanders may not be willing to report these illegal activities to authorities even though they may be prosecuted for not reporting (Shibata, Mori, Okamura, & Soyama, 2008).

Stereotypically, bullies are aggressive and care very little about the feelings of other people. With the help of technology, they have broadened their attacks. Victims of cyber- and face-to-face bullying have higher risks of being impacted emotionally and experience anxiety and depression. Social impacts such as low self-esteem are also a result of bullying. The effect of

cyber bullying can be so severe that victims commit suicide or become involved in something as tragic as school shootings (Shetgiri, Lin, Avila, & Flores, 2012).

Modern bullies attack their victims more directly and often use extreme measures. They are not simply taking someone's lunch money, like on famous sitcoms and in the movies, but are harassing their peers to the extent that the victim may feel death is the only way to end the attacks. Between 2007 and 2012, young people increasingly began committing suicide solely on the basis of being bullied by their classmates. Jessica Logan, a high school student, committed suicide because she was harassed by hundreds of girls when her ex-boyfriend sent nude pictures of her to other classmates. Phoebe Prince, another young adult, committed suicide because she was bullied by having trash cans thrown at her and was harassed online by peers. Jon Carmichael committed suicide after he was stripped naked and had his head repeatedly flushed in a toilet by his peers while other witnessed the incident (Garby, 2013).

Bullies often experience a wide range of aggressive issues and conduct problems. In many cases bullies abuse controlled substances and actively engage in recreational drug use. Bullies affect the victim and influence the behavior of society as a whole (Vessey, Strout, & DiFazio, 2014).

Bullying can be experienced once or multiple times, but in order for bullying to be an applied process, it has to occur on a regular basis (e.g., weekly) and over a long period of time (e.g., 12 months). The repetitive psychological oppression of bullying will often give the victim a feeling of helplessness and will appear to increase the esteem of the bully (Einarsen, Hoel, & Notelaers, 2009; Johnston, Johnston, Phanhtharath, & Jackson, 2010).

Victims

Victims of bullying can encounter major mental health problems due to the emotional trauma and stress caused by bullying behaviors from others (Vessey, Strout, & DiFazio , 2014). Depression and aggression are two of the most commonly known symptoms reported by victims of bullying. Victims often suffer from some degree of post-traumatic stress disorder (PTSD). Many victims experience PTSD by being isolated from a group or situation. Some researchers now believe that a large number of smaller incidents lead up to Complex PTSD. Individuals suffering from complex PTSD will experience mental health disorders (e.g., depression, anxiety), suffer from fatigue and insomnia, and become easily agitated when trying to work and interact with others in daily routines. The breakdowns of Complex PTSD vary depending on environmental triggers (e.g., high levels of stress) and the individual (e.g., genetics) that is suffering from Complex PTSD (Farrell, 2007).

Victims that are bullied in the workplace usually perform their tasks poorly and have little interest in getting involved in their organization. Victims of workplace bullying are usually deprived of basic psychological resources, such as autonomy, competence, and relatedness. They tend to engage less with others and have a harder time staying motivated at work (Trépanier, Fernet, & Austin, 2013).

There is growing evidence that the psychological symptoms of the victim and the psychological symptoms of the bully overlap. Some studies have shown that there is a great probability that the victim will become an offender later in life. Bullying victims are also at a higher risk for vandalism, assault, and theft (DeCamp & Newby, 2015).

Specific behaviors have been reported from cyberbullying among adolescents. The behavioral impacts include poor concentration, low school achievement, and absenteeism. There is currently very little research examining cyberbullying in the college population. Approximately 10% were cyberbully victims and 9% were cyberstalked (Kraft & Wang, 2010; Schenk & Fremouw, 2012).

Another modern form of bullying is known as social trolling. Social trolls are known to be anonymous and evoke negative or emotional reaction and/or harass others online. Many suggest that victims just ignore the attacks, but it is not always so simple. Social media has become the main source of communication for many adolescents and adults. Disengaging in social media can, sadly, mean social isolation (Nicol, 2012). Social trolls have been known to provoke the idea of horrific acts, such as rape and murder. Revenge pornography has been posted by hackers and/or trolls. This has been life ruining for many individuals, especially women. Prosecuting everyone involved has been nearly impossible, and some may even live outside of the United States. Bystanders that witness social trolling may not feel the need to intervene because of the ambiguity of social trolling (Sunday Times, 2014).

Bystanders

Latané and Darley (1968) reported that for public acts of bullying, there are at least three types of bystanders. There are those that assist the victim, those that assist the bully, and those that ignore the situation completely. The behavior of the last category is better known to social psychologists as bystander apathy. There is another form of bystander apathy, known as controlled bystander apathy (aka, the helpless bystander). Controlled bystander apathy takes place when one or multiple bystanders are present, but are unable to help the victim. An example

of this is if a bystander witnesses a loved one dying and they are unable to prevent them from death (“The bystander’s tale,” 1995), but bullying persists to be an uncontrolled phenomenon.

While it is a cultural norm to act when others are in trouble, it is also a norm in individualistic cultures to not get involved in the affairs of other people. Given an individual’s level of distress and the risks and uncertainties associated with getting involved, it is uncertain how bystanders might react, especially when other witnesses are present.

Bad Samaritan is a term for a stranger who refuses to help when someone is in immediate danger. In some countries and parts of the United States, penalties are paid when citizens are Bad Samaritans. Citizens appear to have more control over purposeful and/or reckless criminal activity, than negligence (Davis, 1996).

Previous studies have shown that people are less likely to intervene when others are able to help. When a group of people are present, the responsibility to act is diffused. People can easily persuade themselves that their help is needed in both emergency and nonemergency situations (Grissinger, 2012). A good example is the Kitty Genovese case, which is one of America’s most notorious examples bystander apathy (Gansberg, 1964). Kitty Genovese was stabbed to death in front of 38 neighbors, but only one of the 38 called the police. The story stunned American viewers when it was reported that 37 witnesses watched Genovese die and did nothing.

According to previous research, helping behavior is based more on the situation rather than the helper’s personality traits. Nevertheless, helpful bystanders tend to perceive themselves as being universally helpful individuals (Zoccola, Green, Karoutsos, Katona, & Sabini, 2011). It is not out of the realm of possibility to assume that bystanders who are usually apathetic have a

weak sense of belonging, and/or other unknown personality traits, that would reduce their likelihood of intervening in most situations.

According to Soo Hoo (2004), bystander apathy is the reaction from people who watch something that demands intervention, but decide to do nothing instead. Apathy may be socio-cultural. For example, socially, teachers are presumed to be “polite,” meaning that do not want to cause distress. Even if apathy is situational, bystanders need to take responsibility for their actions. Soo Hoo suggested that apathetic bystanders are not insensitive, but rather, they are just not sure how to react. To illustrate, consider that many individuals take minor actions to help someone being victimized (perhaps due to social norms), but do nothing to prevent the abuse from recurring. If bystanders were better educated about actions they could take, such as reporting abuse to the appropriate authorities, they might be more willing to intervene.

Social roles, such as friendship, may play a part in the intervention of bystanders. We often feel the need to help those that we have a close relationship with. For example, the case of Shanda Sharer, a 12-year-old girl who was beaten and burned alive by four high school girls: Melinda Loveless, Laurie Tackett, Hope Rippey, and Toni Lawrence. Sharer was accused of having a relationship with one of the four’s girlfriend. Another of the four claimed to not be involved in the actual murder, but knew the plan was to burn Sharer alive, yet did not inform the police until after she was murdered (Roylance, 1992).

Victims who are non-friends may be at risk from being excluded from this limited principle. In contrast, friends of bullies may not see the bullying as particularly distressful. If the bully is the bystander’s friend, than they may engage in co-bullying behavior and/or would be less likely to assist the victim (Forsberg, Thornberg, & Samuelsson, 2014).

A good example of bystander social roles is photojournalist Kevin Carter who took a photograph of a famished toddler in Sudan who was crawling, trying to get to food. Instead of helping the toddler, he took a picture of her next to a vulture and left her to die. Kim & Kelly (2014) asked participants how they felt when they looked at the photograph. Many of the participants said that it made them feel sad, but did not seem concerned with the fact that the photographer did not help the child.

Bystander effect is also another reason for bystander apathy. This takes place when a group of onlookers do not view a situation as threatening, when in fact it actually is (Latané & Darley, 1974). The probability of a person receiving help is greater when: (1) a situation is clearly represented as an emergency, (2) there are apparent consequences for another, and (3) the bystander feels that is safe for him or her to help (Clark & Word, 1974).

Clark and Word (1974) and Latané and Darley (1970) focused on when prosocial behavior fails. We all will be, or have been, bystanders at one time or another. One might assume that most of us can become an apathetic bystander by nature. Juneman and Pane (2013) hypothesized that individuals with a “selfish” attitude are more likely to be apathetic toward the environment. The authors reported that the more narcissistic an individual is, the more apathetic he or she is in regard to the environment. Individuals with narcissistic tendencies are also very competitive and tend to use up many resources in order to be more successful. They are more concerned with personal gain than the environment they are taking from. Reasonably, narcissistic individuals are more inclined to take care of their own needs over the needs of others. This could mean that apathetic bystanders are more narcissistic, that narcissistic individuals are more likely

to be apathetic bystanders, or that other variables need to be considered. Researchers on bullying is still fairly new (Schaefer, 2007).

Active bystanders have a strong sense of agreeableness, empathy, and responsibility toward others, while apathetic bystanders feel less connected to those around them (Zoccola et al., 2011). Along with a weakened sense of belonging, apathetic bystanders may also have psychological distress that has previously been overlooked. One reason that individuals do not intercede is because they have past experiences where helping a victim has hurt them. For example, bullies, other bystanders, or authority may have seen them as weak, or may have seen them as "guilty" for being "associated" with the situation. Others may not intercede because they were bullied before and do not want to relive the trauma.

Despite the cultural norm to intervene when someone is in trouble, there is a competing norm to “mind your own business” and not help, particularly in individualistic cultures. Darley and Latané (1968) proposed that in particular circumstances the standards supporting the intervention may be declining, leading bystanders to settle the conflict in the direction of nonintervention. Regardless, a bystander who feels a connection to the victim—whether it be friendship, shared values, or the mere attractiveness of the victim—is far more likely to come to the aid of the victim.

Statement of Significance

There are no known studies that have investigated the psychological symptom patterns of intervening and non-intervening bystanders. Therefore, the present study fills a significant gap in

our current knowledge of the psychological dynamics of witnesses to bullying and will likely add to the current data base of our understanding of bystander apathy.

Statement of Hypothesis

Two hypotheses are presented. First, it is hypothesized that non-intervening bystanders will show significantly more pre-existing psychological distress than intervening bystanders. Second, it is hypothesized that there will be a significant difference in pre-existing psychological distress of non-intervening bystanders as a function of gender.

METHOD

Participants

The sample consisted of 135 volunteers (42 males and 93 females) from undergraduate classes at the University of Central Florida. The age range of the participants was 18 to 57 years ($M = 21.79$, $SD = 6.83$); males 18 to 57 years ($M = 21.10$, $SD = 7.03$) and females 18 to 58 years ($M = 22.09$, $SD = 6.75$). Racial/ethnic demographics were: White ($n = 90$, 58.1%), Hispanic/Latino ($n = 22$, 14.2%), Black or African American ($n = 23$, 14.8%), Asian ($n = 11$, 7.1%), Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander ($n = 1$, 0.6%), and of two or more races ($n = 8$, 5.2%). Participants reported their education level (years of college completed) as: Freshman ($n = 3$, 1.9%), Sophomore ($n = 29$, 18.7%), Junior ($n = 64$, 41.3%), Senior ($n = 34$, 21.9%); 16.1% ($n = 25$) did not answer this question.

Materials and Procedures

Psychological distress was measured using the Symptom Checklist-90-Revised (SCL-90-R; Derogatis, 1994). The SCL-90-R is a widely-used self-report questionnaire designed to measure psychological distresses. This psychometric instrument consists of three comprehensive measures of psychological distress and nine fundamental symptom dimensions. The nine fundamental symptoms are: (1) somatization, (2) obsessive-compulsive, (3) interpersonal sensitivity, (4) depression, (5) anxiety, (6) hostility, (7) paranoid ideation, (8) phobic anxiety, and (9) psychoticism. The SCL-90-R consists of 90 questions and takes approximately 15 minutes to complete. Performance on each scale is represented by a *T*-score.

Participants provided informed consent before beginning the electronic version of the SCL-90-R. A demographic questionnaire including items specific to bullying was developed for

the present study and followed the SCL-90-R in the questionnaire. The bullying questions asked subjects whether they witnessed bullying in the past, and if applicable, whether they intervened.

RESULTS

Witness to Single Act of Bullying

A one-way between-subjects MANOVA was used to analyze symptom patterns as a function of whether they witnessed and intervened in a single act of bullying ($N= 3$) or not ($N= 132$). No significance difference in the nine psychological symptom dimensions was observed, $F(9, 125) = .461, p = .898$.

Witness to Multiple Acts of Bullying

A two-way between-subjects MANOVA was used to assess the relationship between gender and whether participants who witnessed multiple acts of bullying intervened. The main effect for witnessing multiple acts of bullying was not significant, $F(9, 123) = 1.444, p = .177, partial \eta^2 = .096$, The gender main effect was not significant, $F(9, 123) = .961, p = .476, partial \eta^2 = .096$. The gender x witnessing multiple acts of bullying was not significant, $F(9, 123) = 1.706, p = .094, partial \eta^2 = .111$. Given the trend toward statistical significance noted for the gender x witnessing multiple acts of bullying interaction, an examination of the univariate tests was conducted. Eight of the nine symptom dimensions were not significant. However, the paranoid ideation subscale gender x intervene interaction was significant, $F(1, 131) = 4.823, p = .03, partial \eta^2 = .097$.

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this study was to investigate the psychological symptom patterns of apathetic versus intervening bystanders. The first hypothesis was that non-intervening bystanders would show significantly more psychological distress than intervening bystanders. This hypothesis was not supported by the data. The second hypothesis was that a significant difference in psychological distress of non-intervening bystanders would emerge as a function of gender. The data did not support this hypothesis.

Of participants who reported witnessing only a single act of bullying, only 2.2% intervened. However, those who witnessed multiple acts of bullying intervened far more frequently - 26.7%, which is more than a tenfold increase. The present data indicated that repeated exposure to bullying seems to result in a higher incidence of intervention. Much research in social psychology has shown that generally helpful bystanders are neglectful to help when other bystanders are present (Plötner, Over, Carpenter, & Tomasello, 2015). Thus, the present data revealed that it could be they are also less likely to help if they do not regularly observe bullying. The mean age of the participants was 21.79 years. Responsibility as perceived by adults is often emergent in maturity (Harris, Clark, & Rose, 1954). It is, therefore, possible that a middle-aged sample might feel more responsible for the rights and safety of others and thus intervene more frequently. Finally, for witnessing multiple acts of bullying, a much higher percentage of males (44.4%) than females (20.2%,) intervened. While there was no differentiation by type of bullying, females are generally more at risk when intervening in a physical bullying situation, and in all cases, gender and cultural expectations encourage females to be agreeable. Further, females are more likely to *not* use counter-aggression or other direct

methods to address bullying, yet may not view indirect methods such as removing the victim from the situation as “intervening” for the purposes of our questionnaire (Ringrose & Renold, 2010).

No significant differences were observed in any SLC-90-R subscale scores between intervening and non-intervening participants, nor were their significant differences between male and female non-intervening participants. However, a statistically significant interaction term was noted on the paranoid ideation subscale between males and females who witnessed multiple acts of bullying *and* intervened. Intervening males ($n = 16$) scored an average of 58.63 on this subscale, indicating more paranoia as compared to the mean score of 50.35 for intervening females ($n = 20$). Prior research has reported that being bullied is a risk factor for developing paranoia in adolescence (Shakoor et al., 2015). One possibility is that males who are bullied are both more likely to intervene and to have paranoid inclinations (though they may also be more likely to become bullies themselves). More research is needed to further elucidate this finding.

A limitation of the present study was the use of a college student sample. Such a sample may not be representative of the population of same age individuals thus diminishing the generalizability of findings. This threat to external validity suggests the need to replicate this study using a sample more representative of the general population. Furthermore, future researchers may wish to focus on the differences for propensity to intervene between males and females, perceptions regarding direct versus indirect interventions and physical versus relational bullying, and the relationship between paranoid ideation and bullying intervention.

APPENDIX A: IRB OUTCOME LETTER



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Approval of Exempt Human Research

From: **UCF Institutional Review Board #1
FWA00000351, IRB00001138**

To: **Homer Edward Fouty and Co-PI: Alexandria Smith**

Date: **February 03, 2015**

Dear Researcher:

On 02/03/2015, the IRB approved the following activity as human participant research that is exempt from regulation:

Type of Review: Exempt Determination
Project Title: Characteristics related to witnessing bullying.
Investigator: Homer Edward Fouty, Ph.D.
IRB Number: SBE-15-10975
Funding Agency:
Grant Title:
Research ID: N/A

This determination applies only to the activities described in the IRB submission and does not apply should any changes be made. If changes are made and there are questions about whether these changes affect the exempt status of the human research, please contact the IRB. When you have completed your research, please submit a Study Closure request in iRIS so that IRB records will be accurate.

In the conduct of this research, you are responsible to follow the requirements of the [Investigator Manual](#).

On behalf of Sophia Dziegielewski, Ph.D., L.C.S.W., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "Joanne Muratori".

Signature applied by Joanne Muratori on 02/03/2015 08:14:10 AM EST

IRB Coordinator

APPENDIX B: EXPLANATION OF RESEARCH



Title of Project: Characteristics related to witnessing bullying

Principal Investigator: H. Edward Fouty, Ph.D.

Co-Investigator: Alexandria M. Smith

You are being invited to take part in a research study. Whether you take part is up to you.

- The purpose of this study is to assess the dynamics associated with people who have witnessed bullying;
- You will be asked to complete a brief online survey consisting of symptom patterns and demographic questions;
- The time needed to complete this study will be approximately 30 minutes;
- You do not have to answer any questions that make you feel uncomfortable;
- You will receive 0.25 credits for full participation (no credit will be awarded for partial or incomplete participation).

You must be 18 years of age or older to take part in this research study.

Study contact for questions about the study or to report a problem: If you have questions, concerns, or complaints, please contact H. Edward Fouty, Ph.D., Department of Psychology, University of Central Florida, Daytona Beach campus, 1200 W. International Speedway Blvd., Daytona Beach, FL 32120-2811; by telephone at 386-506-4060; or by e-mail at Ed.Fouty@ucf.edu.

IRB contact about your rights in the study or to report a complaint: Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (UCF IRB). This research has been reviewed and approved by the IRB. For information about the rights of people who take part in research, please contact: Institutional Review Board, University of Central Florida, Office of Research & Commercialization, 12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501, Orlando, FL 32826-3246 or by telephone at (407) 823-2901.

APPENDIX C: DEMOGRAPHIC QUESTIONNAIRE

Your gender

- Male
- Female

Your age

Your race/ethnicity

- White
- Hispanic/Latino
- Black or African American
- Asian
- Native American or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander
- Two or more races

Your current year in college

- Freshman
- Sophomore
- Junior
- Senior

APPENDIX D: DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS

Descriptive Statistics

Factor	Intervened?	Mean	Std. Dev.	<i>n</i>
SOM	Yes	51.6667	14.84363	3
	No	52.3409	9.83438	132
	TOTAL	52.3259	9.89183	135
OC	Yes	60.6667	13.31666	3
	No	57.5227	10.65021	132
	TOTAL	57.5926	10.66540	135
IS	Yes	57.6667	20.20726	3
	No	56.6591	12.36026	132
	TOTAL	56.6815	12.46886	135
DEP	Yes	59.6667	10.01665	3
	No	56.4697	11.71965	132
	TOTAL	56.5407	11.66175	135
ANX	Yes	54.6667	18.00926	3
	No	51.3333	11.35457	132
	TOTAL	51.4074	11.45093	135
HOS	Yes	53.6667	11.84624	3
	No	53.6970	10.92860	132
	TOTAL	53.6963	10.90206	135
PHOB	Yes	50.0000	10.39230	3
	No	52.2045	9.53078	132
	TOTAL	52.1556	9.51422	135
PAR	Yes	55.6667	16.80278	3
	No	53.3333	10.83370	132
	TOTAL	53.3852	10.91212	135
PSY	Yes	52.6667	15.0111	3
	No	56.8485	11.51732	132
	TOTAL	56.7556	11.55097	135

Between-Subjects Effects

Dep. Var.	Type III Sum of Squares	<i>df</i>	Mean Square	<i>F</i>	Sig.	<i>Partial</i> η^2	Noncent. Parameter	Observed Power
SOM	1.334	1	1.334	.014	.908	.000	.014	.052
OC	28.994	1	28.994	.253	.615	.002	.253	.079
IS	2.978	1	2.978	.019	.891	.000	.019	.052
DEP	29.980	1	29.980	.219	.640	.002	.219	.075
ANX	32.593	1	32.593	.247	.620	.002	.247	.078
HOS	.003	1	.003	.000	.996	.000	.000	.050
PHOB	14.256	1	14.256	.156	.693	.001	.156	.068
PAR	15.970	1	15.970	.133	.716	.001	.133	.065
PSY	51.297	1	51.297	.383	.537	.003	.383	.094

APPENDIX E: F TABLE

MANOVA Summary Table

MULTIINTERVEN	<i>F</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	1.444	9	.177	.096
Gender	.961	9	.476	.066
Intervene * Gender	1.706	9	.094	.111
Error		12300		

POST HOC ANOVA Summary Tables

SOM	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	9.031	1	9.031	.091	.763	.001
Gender	24.204	1	24.204	.244	.622	.002
Intervene * Gender	39.377	1	39.377	.398	.529	.003
Error	12,976.303	131	99.056			

OC	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	.197	1	.197	.002	.967	.000
Gender	.426	1	.426	.004	.952	.000
Intervene * Gender	52.318	1	52.318	.451	.503	.003
Error	15,183.034	131	115.901			

IS	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	141.274	1	141.274	.895	.346	.007
Gender	10.385	1	10.385	.066	.798	.001
Intervene * Gender	6.477	1	6.477	.041	.840	.000
Error	20,685.822	131	157.907			

DEP	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	160.909	1	160.909	1.180	.279	.009
Gender	.364	1	.364	.003	.959	.000
Intervene * Gender	250.308	1	250.308	1.836	.178	.014
Error	17,857.358	131	136.316			

ANX	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	36.004	1	36.004	.271	.604	.002
Gender	16.995	1	16.995	.128	.721	.001
Intervene * Gender	74.487	1	74.487	.560	.456	.004
Error	17,429.280	131	133.048			

HOS	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	158.471	1	158.471	1.324	.252	.010
Gender	6.173	1	6.173	.052	.821	.000
Intervene * Gender	15.707	1	15.707	.131	.718	.001
Error	15,673.765	131	119.647			

PHOB	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	17.949	1	17.949	.194	.660	.001
Gender	4.154	1	4.154	.045	.832	.000
Intervene * Gender	3.398	1	3.398	.037	.848	.000
Error	12,103.094	131	92.390			

PAR	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	66.711	1	66.711	.571	.451	.004
Gender	290.987	1	290.987	2.493	.117	.019
Intervene * Gender	562.968	1	562.968	4.823	.030	.036
Error	15,291.931	131	116.732			

PSY	<i>SS</i>	<i>df</i>	<i>MS</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>Sig.</i>	<i>Partial η²</i>
Intervene	.116	1	.116	.001	.977	.000
Gender	1.295	1	1.295	.009	.923	.000
Intervene * Gender	.341	1	.341	.002	.960	.000
Error	17,876.480	131	136.462			

APPENDIX F: RAW DATA

SUB	AGE	GENDER	RACE	EDUC	WITBULL	SINGLEACT	MULTACT	SOM
19.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	48.00
20.00	20.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	53.00
21.00	22.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	48.00
22.00	18.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	68.00
23.00	18.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	54.00
24.00	22.00	1.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	54.00
25.00	22.00	1.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	67.00
26.00	19.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	37.00
27.00	18.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	52.00
28.00	19.00	1.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	37.00
29.00	19.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	60.00
30.00	19.00	1.00	4.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	41.00
31.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	44.00
32.00	20.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	81.00
33.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	39.00
34.00	21.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	44.00
35.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	54.00
36.00	22.00	1.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	54.00
37.00	19.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	41.00
38.00	20.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	39.00
39.00	21.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	54.00
40.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	53.00
41.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	47.00
42.00	22.00	1.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
43.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	41.00
44.00	25.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	67.00
46.00	24.00	2.00	4.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	48.00
47.00	23.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	48.00
48.00	21.00	2.00	7.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	57.00
49.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	67.00
50.00	21.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	52.00
51.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	50.00
52.00	20.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	71.00
53.00	22.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
54.00	24.00	2.00	7.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	54.00
55.00	18.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	54.00
56.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	35.00
57.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	37.00
58.00	19.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	65.00

59.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	53.00
60.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
61.00	26.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	37.00
62.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	55.00
63.00	20.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	35.00
64.00	28.00	2.00	2.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	39.00
65.00	37.00	2.00	7.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	67.00
66.00	19.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	57.00
67.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	70.00
69.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	44.00
70.00	26.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	55.00
71.00	37.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	48.00
72.00	22.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	61.00
73.00	34.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	57.00
74.00	21.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	48.00
75.00	18.00	2.00	7.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	81.00
77.00	21.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	44.00
80.00	19.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	53.00
81.00	24.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	57.00
82.00	29.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	52.00
83.00	20.00	2.00	7.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
84.00	18.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	64.00
86.00	24.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	55.00
87.00	19.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	53.00
89.00	19.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	54.00
90.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	55.00
92.00	18.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
94.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	69.00
95.00	43.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	37.00
96.00	21.00	1.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	64.00
97.00	24.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	44.00
98.00	19.00	1.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	62.00
99.00	20.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	48.00
100.00	20.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	62.00
101.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	70.00
102.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	53.00
103.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	64.00
104.00	20.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	55.00
105.00	50.00	2.00	3.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	64.00
106.00	21.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	57.00
107.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
108.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	35.00

110.00	25.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	60.00
111.00	19.00	2.00	4.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	57.00
112.00	21.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	37.00
113.00	21.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	48.00
114.00	18.00	1.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	39.00
116.00	23.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	65.00
117.00	21.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	54.00
119.00	19.00	1.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	55.00
120.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	47.00
121.00	19.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	57.00
122.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	48.00
123.00	58.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	35.00
124.00	19.00	2.00	2.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
125.00	33.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	44.00
128.00	34.00	2.00	3.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	35.00
130.00	18.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	58.00
131.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	52.00
132.00	57.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	48.00
133.00	18.00	2.00	4.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	55.00
134.00	24.00	2.00	4.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	35.00
136.00	21.00	2.00	2.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
137.00	22.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	60.00
138.00	20.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	39.00
140.00	22.00	1.00	3.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	66.00
141.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	57.00
142.00	20.00	2.00	2.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	67.00
143.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	39.00
144.00	22.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	60.00
146.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00
147.00	23.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	58.00
148.00	21.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	54.00
149.00	22.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	50.00
150.00	19.00	2.00	6.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	48.00
151.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	66.00
152.00	23.00	2.00	2.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	60.00
153.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	61.00
154.00	19.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	48.00
155.00	18.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	57.00
156.00	23.00	2.00	3.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	52.00
157.00	18.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	39.00
158.00	18.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	41.00
159.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	50.00

160.00	20.00	2.00	1.00	8.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	57.00
161.00	20.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	52.00
162.00	18.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	47.00
163.00	33.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	44.00
164.00	22.00	2.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	58.00
166.00	19.00	2.00	3.00	3.00	1.00	1.00	2.00	39.00
168.00	18.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	1.00	57.00
169.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	61.00
170.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	4.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	37.00
171.00	19.00	1.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	44.00
172.00	20.00	2.00	7.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	58.00
173.00	21.00	2.00	1.00	3.00	1.00	2.00	2.00	66.00

OC	IS	DEP	ANX	HOS	PHOB	PAR	PSY
52.00	55.00	50.00	44.00	45.00	54.00	47.00	53.00
66.00	60.00	64.00	54.00	60.00	44.00	47.00	57.00
37.00	46.00	50.00	37.00	52.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
76.00	81.00	71.00	73.00	61.00	62.00	74.00	70.00
60.00	61.00	60.00	48.00	41.00	47.00	64.00	62.00
46.00	62.00	69.00	62.00	61.00	66.00	76.00	75.00
74.00	73.00	71.00	65.00	81.00	56.00	74.00	73.00
60.00	68.00	64.00	52.00	47.00	47.00	47.00	57.00
64.00	53.00	54.00	62.00	63.00	66.00	59.00	68.00
50.00	62.00	59.00	52.00	53.00	59.00	67.00	53.00
52.00	46.00	48.00	52.00	40.00	44.00	47.00	44.00
58.00	61.00	62.00	40.00	47.00	47.00	47.00	57.00
44.00	55.00	34.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
79.00	81.00	74.00	79.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	81.00
54.00	46.00	52.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	47.00	44.00
62.00	50.00	48.00	37.00	60.00	44.00	57.00	53.00
62.00	62.00	62.00	59.00	61.00	59.00	47.00	68.00
61.00	6.00	67.00	52.00	47.00	59.00	67.00	64.00
56.00	57.00	49.00	40.00	47.00	59.00	47.00	57.00
44.00	46.00	48.00	37.00	52.00	44.00	47.00	44.00
39.00	41.00	38.00	52.00	41.00	47.00	41.00	44.00
54.00	60.00	58.00	54.00	45.00	62.00	52.00	57.00
52.00	53.00	38.00	40.00	47.00	47.00	41.00	44.00
48.00	39.00	34.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
62.00	57.00	52.00	52.00	59.00	47.00	41.00	57.00
70.00	73.00	68.00	72.00	71.00	70.00	72.00	81.00
58.00	55.00	56.00	58.00	52.00	44.00	52.00	57.00
62.00	60.00	57.00	54.00	45.00	44.00	52.00	44.00
64.00	55.00	56.00	49.00	57.00	44.00	52.00	44.00
64.00	68.00	69.00	69.00	65.00	74.00	64.00	74.00
70.00	69.00	74.00	66.00	61.00	59.00	47.00	53.00
66.00	64.00	64.00	57.00	47.00	44.00	62.00	44.00
71.00	72.00	71.00	73.00	73.00	76.00	72.00	81.00
56.00	39.00	52.00	44.00	57.00	44.00	41.00	53.00
58.00	66.00	67.00	48.00	76.00	47.00	62.00	62.00
52.00	49.00	52.00	40.00	41.00	47.00	41.00	44.00
54.00	70.00	59.00	44.00	45.00	54.00	63.00	65.00
61.00	49.00	52.00	48.00	65.00	47.00	41.00	74.00
67.00	69.00	66.00	65.00	68.00	44.00	57.00	53.00

64.00	50.00	57.00	49.00	57.00	54.00	41.00	64.00
50.00	39.00	57.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	57.00
39.00	49.00	54.00	52.00	41.00	47.00	47.00	53.00
50.00	46.00	48.00	58.00	68.00	56.00	60.00	53.00
37.00	39.00	34.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
58.00	62.00	54.00	52.00	45.00	44.00	47.00	64.00
70.00	81.00	70.00	72.00	65.00	68.00	74.00	81.00
60.00	52.00	58.00	37.00	57.00	44.00	47.00	44.00
72.00	64.00	70.00	67.00	52.00	56.00	62.00	79.00
37.00	50.00	45.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	57.00	44.00
62.00	62.00	59.00	54.00	63.00	54.00	60.00	60.00
50.00	39.00	57.00	61.00	57.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
66.00	64.00	62.00	61.00	68.00	61.00	62.00	57.00
39.00	61.00	45.00	52.00	47.00	62.00	56.00	53.00
48.00	39.00	45.00	44.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	53.00
81.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	81.00	80.00	81.00
58.00	46.00	59.00	49.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
44.00	39.00	48.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	52.00	44.00
56.00	72.00	75.00	61.00	76.00	44.00	71.00	68.00
50.00	41.00	49.00	40.00	41.00	47.00	41.00	57.00
44.00	39.00	45.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	41.00	53.00
72.00	57.00	60.00	56.00	59.00	47.00	59.00	70.00
72.00	66.00	62.00	57.00	70.00	54.00	71.00	73.00
48.00	46.00	58.00	52.00	45.00	44.00	47.00	60.00
81.00	77.00	74.00	52.00	79.00	47.00	67.00	69.00
44.00	50.00	5.00	49.00	45.00	56.00	41.00	44.00
44.00	46.00	41.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
75.00	55.00	63.00	67.00	40.00	67.00	60.00	62.00
68.00	81.00	81.00	64.00	76.00	47.00	51.00	69.00
61.00	55.00	49.00	49.00	57.00	44.00	62.00	65.00
71.00	66.00	65.00	62.00	65.00	56.00	70.00	62.00
70.00	76.00	69.00	67.00	63.00	65.00	71.00	79.00
52.00	66.00	52.00	37.00	40.00	56.00	47.00	60.00
68.00	66.00	65.00	59.00	68.00	54.00	47.00	64.00
71.00	71.00	69.00	72.00	73.00	72.00	72.00	81.00
63.00	69.00	56.00	57.00	52.00	54.00	60.00	62.00
61.00	52.00	54.00	49.00	57.00	54.00	57.00	60.00
63.00	52.00	54.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	57.00
65.00	71.00	72.00	67.00	68.00	61.00	57.00	62.00
71.00	46.00	61.00	59.00	52.00	44.00	60.00	44.00
50.00	58.00	60.00	52.00	57.00	62.00	62.00	60.00
66.00	71.00	64.00	37.00	52.00	44.00	57.00	60.00

61.00	55.00	60.00	49.00	68.00	68.00	62.00	44.00
60.00	57.00	52.00	62.00	47.00	62.00	41.00	57.00
60.00	66.00	59.00	59.00	47.00	66.00	56.00	44.00
52.00	46.00	52.00	44.00	45.00	44.00	52.00	44.00
44.00	46.00	35.00	65.00	45.00	44.00	47.00	53.00
50.00	53.00	45.00	40.00	53.00	47.00	41.00	44.00
46.00	49.00	49.00	40.00	47.00	47.00	41.00	44.00
56.00	52.00	54.00	49.00	45.00	61.00	47.00	53.00
52.00	62.00	57.00	44.00	47.00	47.00	41.00	57.00
63.00	64.00	57.00	49.00	60.00	44.00	63.00	62.00
50.00	46.00	48.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	57.00	44.00
63.00	60.00	59.00	49.00	60.00	44.00	57.00	60.00
68.00	71.00	69.00	67.00	60.00	56.00	65.00	71.00
48.00	46.00	50.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
44.00	39.00	41.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
56.00	60.00	62.00	57.00	45.00	67.00	57.00	60.00
58.00	54.00	69.00	48.00	61.00	47.00	47.00	66.00
52.00	60.00	60.00	54.00	52.00	44.00	47.00	53.00
62.00	39.00	50.00	52.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
37.00	39.00	34.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
48.00	50.00	34.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
70.00	60.00	52.00	62.00	60.00	56.00	57.00	66.00
52.00	39.00	52.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	47.00	53.00
66.00	71.00	65.00	68.00	72.00	70.00	65.00	77.00
70.00	76.00	67.00	68.00	60.00	56.00	72.00	79.00
66.00	66.00	69.00	65.00	73.00	61.00	63.00	62.00
37.00	39.00	34.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
62.00	66.00	68.00	57.00	45.00	56.00	66.00	64.00
54.00	50.00	57.00	44.00	52.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
56.00	64.00	64.00	58.00	45.00	54.00	57.00	53.00
39.00	41.00	49.00	40.00	59.00	47.00	41.00	44.00
37.00	39.00	48.00	44.00	52.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
37.00	52.00	50.00	44.00	52.00	44.00	52.00	44.00
80.00	81.00	70.00	70.00	60.00	76.00	71.00	73.00
68.00	62.00	54.00	59.00	45.00	62.00	57.00	66.00
54.00	39.00	54.00	37.00	40.00	62.00	52.00	57.00
52.00	46.00	52.00	54.00	60.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
71.00	66.00	70.00	61.00	68.00	67.00	52.00	57.00
52.00	49.00	52.00	40.00	53.00	47.00	56.00	44.00
44.00	46.00	57.00	37.00	45.00	54.00	41.00	44.00
52.00	49.00	45.00	40.00	47.00	47.00	41.00	44.00
54.00	52.00	58.00	44.00	52.00	44.00	47.00	60.00

60.00	64.00	63.00	61.00	57.00	62.00	60.00	68.00
70.00	62.00	81.00	65.00	63.00	47.00	62.00	75.00
68.00	81.00	76.00	62.00	61.00	59.00	70.00	69.00
48.00	52.00	48.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	41.00	40.00
56.00	58.00	56.00	52.00	45.00	44.00	47.00	53.00
54.00	46.00	56.00	37.00	40.00	44.00	52.00	44.00
56.00	69.00	63.00	48.00	47.00	59.00	56.00	53.00
61.00	64.00	59.00	44.00	63.00	56.00	57.00	57.00
64.00	64.00	38.00	40.00	47.00	47.00	51.00	44.00
48.00	46.00	34.00	37.00	45.00	44.00	41.00	44.00
64.00	66.00	64.00	57.00	52.00	65.00	60.00	57.00
67.00	62.00	67.00	67.00	57.00	54.00	62.00	72.00

REFERENCES

- Bar-On, D. (2001). The bystander in relation to the victim and the perpetrator: Today and during the Holocaust. *Social Justice Research, 14*(2), 125-148.
- The bystander's tale: Sandy Hardcastle felt helpless as a friend lay dying (1995, September 26). *The Guardian* (London, England).
- Clark, P. M. (2014). Reversing the ethical perspective: What the allegorical interpretation of the Good Samaritan parable can still teach us. *Theology Today, 71*(3), 300-309.
- Clark, R. D., & Word, L. E. (1974). Where is the apathetic bystander? Situational characteristics of the emergency. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29*(3), 279-287.
doi:10.1037/h0036000
- Davis, M. (1996). How much punishment does a bad Samaritan deserve? *Law and Philosophy, 15*(2), 93-116.
- DeCamp, W., & Newby, B. (2015). From bullied to deviant: The victim–offender overlap among bullying victims. *Youth Violence & Juvenile Justice, 13*(1), 3-17.
doi:10.1177/1541204014521250
- Derogatis, L. R. (1994). Symptom Checklist 90, Revised. *Administration, Scoring, and Procedures Manual*. San Antonio, TX: Pearson.
- Dogruer, N., & Yaratana, H. (2014). Developing a bullying scale for use with university students. *Society for Personality Research: An International Journal, 42*(Suppl.). 81-92.

- Einarsen, S., Hoel, H., & Notelaers, G. (2009). Measuring exposure to bullying and harassment at work: Validity, factor structure and psychometric properties of the negative acts questionnaire revised. *Work & Stress: An International Journal of Work, Health & Organizations*, 23(1), 24-44.
- Farrell, M. V. (2007). The target of the bully and the effects of PTSD. *Midwifery Today*, 82, 14-65.
- Finkel, N. J., & Moghaddam, F. M. (2005). Human rights and duties: An introduction. *The psychology of rights and duties: Empirical contributions and normative commentaries* (pp. 3-17). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/10872-001
- Forsberg, C., Thornberg, R., & Samuelsson, M. (2014). Bystanders to bullying: Fourth to seventh grade students' perspectives on their reactions. *Research Papers in Education*, 29(5), 557-576.
- Gansberg, M. (1964, March 27). 37 who saw murder didn't call the police. *The New York Times*. Retrieved October 6, 2014, from http://www.37themovie.com/images/about/NYTimes_KittyGenoveseArticle.pdf
- Garby, L. (2013). Direct bullying: Criminal act or mimicking what has been learned. *Education*, 133(4), 448-450.
- Goldsmid, S., & Howie, P. (2014). Bullying by definition: An examination of definitional components of bullying. *Emotional & Behavioural Difficulties*, 19(2), 210-225. doi:10.1080/13632752.2013.844414

- Grissinger, M. (2012). Actively caring for the safety of patients: Overcoming bystander apathy. *P&T: A Peer-Reviewed Journal for Formulary Management*, 37(6), 317-319.
- Harris, D. B., Clark, K. E., & Rose, A. M. (1954). The measurement of responsibility in children. *Child Development*, 25(1), 21-28.
- Hundt, N. E., & Holohan, D. R. (2012). The role of shame in distinguishing perpetrators of intimate partner violence in U.S. veterans. *Journal of Traumatic Stress*, 25(2), 191-197. doi:10.1002/jts.21688
- Johnston, M., Phanhtharath, P. & Jackson, B. (2010). The bullying aspect of workplace violence in nursing. *JONA'S Healthcare Law, Ethics, and Regulation*, 12(2), 36-42.
- Pane, M. M., & Juneman, A. (2013). Apathy towards environmental issues, narcissism, and competitive view of the world. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 101(1), 44-52.
- Kim, Y., & Kelly, J. D. (2013). Photojournalist on the edge: Reactions to Kevin Carter's Sudan famine photo. *Visual Communication Quarterly*, 20(4), 205-219. doi:10.1080/15551393.2013.849980
- Kraft, E., & Wang, J. (2010). An exploratory study of the cyberbullying and cyberstalking experiences and factors related to victimization of students at a public liberal arts college. *International Journal of Technologies*, 1(74-91). doi:10.4018/jte.2010100106
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10(3), 215-221.
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1970). *The unresponsive bystander: Why doesn't he help?* New York, NY: Appelpson-Century-Crofts.
- Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1974). Bystander "apathy." *New York Affairs*, 2(4), 28-49.

- Lewis, H. (2014, October 19). Trolls, hackers and revenge porn — this is the casual destruction of women, bit by megabit: Rape threats to Chloe Madeley, naked pictures of Jennifer Lawrence posted ... Why does the internet hate us so much, asks Helen Lewis. *Sunday Times* (London, England). Retrieved March 11, 2015, from <http://www.thesundaytimes.co.uk/sto/newsreview/article1472395.ece>
- Mammana-Lupo, V., Todd, N. R., & Houston, J. D. (2014). The role of sense of community and conflict in predicting congregational belonging. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 42(1), 99-118. doi:10.1002.
- Manning, R., Levine, M., & Collins, A. (2007). The Kitty Genovese murder and the social psychology of helping: The parable of the 38 witnesses. *American Psychologist*, 62(6), 555-562.
- Nicol, S. (2012). Special feature: Cyber-bullying and trolling. *Youth Studies Australia*, 31(4), 3-4.
- Plötner, M., Over, H., Carpenter, M., & Tomasello, M. (2015). Young children show the bystander effect in helping situations. *Psychological Science*, 26(4), 499-506.
- Ringrose, J., & Renold, E. (2010). Normative cruelties and gender deviants: The performative effects of bully discourses for girls and boys in school. *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(4), 573-596.
- Rivers, I., & Noret, N. (2010). Participant roles in bullying behavior and their association with thoughts of ending one's life. *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, 31(3), 143-148. doi:10.1027/0227-5910/a000020

- Roylance, F. D. (1992, June 21). Indiana community is shaken by torture murder of young girl. *The Baltimore Sun* (Baltimore, MD). Retrieved June 18, 2015, from http://articles.baltimoresun.com/1992-06-21/news/1992173004_1_madison-girls-shanda-north-of-madison
- Schaefer, M. (2007). Stopping the bullies. *Scientific American Special Edition*, 17(2), 48-53.
- Schenk, A., & Fremouw, W. (2012). Prevalence, psychological impact, and coping of victims among college students. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(1), 21-37.
doi:10.1080/15388220.2011.630310.
- Shakoor, S., McGuire, P., Cardno, A. G., Freeman, D., Plomin, R., & Ronald, A. (2015). A shared genetic propensity underlies experiences of bullying victimization in late childhood and self-rated paranoid thinking in adolescence. *Schizophrenia Bulletin*, 41(3), 754-763. doi:10.1093/schbul/sbu142
- Shetgiri, R., Lin, H., Avila, R. M., & Flores, G. (2012). Parental characteristics associated with a bullying perpetration in U.S. children aged 10 to 17 years. *American Journal of Public Health*, 102(12), 2280-2286.
- Shibata, A., Mori, T., Okamura, M., & Soyama, N. (2008). An economic analysis of apathetic behavior: Theory and experiment. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 37(1), 90-107.
doi:10.1016/j.socec.2006.12.026
- Soo Hoo, S. (2004). We change the world by doing nothing. *Teacher Education Quarterly*, 31(1), 199-211.

Trépanier, S., Fernet, C., & Austin, S. (2013). Workplace bullying and psychological health at work: The mediating role of satisfaction of needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness. *Work & Stress*, 27(2), 123-140. doi:10.1080/02678373.2013.782158

Vessey, J., Strout, T. D., DiFazio, R. L., & Walker, A. (2014). Measuring the youth bullying experience: A systematic review of the psychometric properties of available instruments. *Journal of School Health*, 84(12), 819-843.

Zoccola, P. M., Green, M. C., Karoutsos, E., Katona, S. M., & Sabini, J. (2011). The embarrassed bystander: Embarrassability and the inhibition of helping. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 51(8), 925-929. doi:10.1016.