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Abstract

Researchers and school administrators have recognized the importance of peer bystanders in bullying situations, but there are very few studies that examine this phenomenon within Latané and Darley’s (1970) bystander intervention model. The five sequential steps in this model include: notice the event, interpret the event as an emergency that requires assistance, accept responsibility for intervening, know how to intervene or provide help, and implement intervention. Nickerson, Aloe, Livingston, and Feeley (2014) created the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey based on Latané and Darley’s model. Nickerson and colleagues and Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) have found evidence of reliability and validity for the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey in high school and middle school samples. The current study was designed to examine evidence of reliability and validity of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey with an upper-elementary school sample, and the association between affective and cognitive empathy and engagement in each of the five bystander intervention steps. Results revealed that a five-factor structure is appropriate for the elementary-school version of this survey, but results showed lower than desired reliability estimates. The survey’s associations with an established defender measure revealed convergent validity evidence. Results also showed that both affective and cognitive empathy were associated with steps of the bystander intervention model. Future directions and practical implications are discussed.
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The Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey: An Examination in an Elementary School Sample

Overview

Bullying is a widespread, serious problem in schools at all age levels throughout the world (Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoe, 2008; Nickerson, Aloe, Livingston, & Feeley, 2014; Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Bjorkqvist, Osterman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). Bullying has negative effects on victims, bullies, and bystanders (Padget & Notar, 2013; Salmivalli, 2010; Werth, Nickerson, Aloe, & Swearer, 2015). Although bullying has received attention from a large number of researchers, most of this research focuses on the dyadic power struggle between the bully and the victim (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Caravita, Blasio & Salmivalli, 2009; Gini et al., 2008; Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011). In the past few decades, research has turned to the social-ecological model of bullying, which takes into account individual, classroom, school, peer, and family variables that promote or inhibit bullying (Swearer & Espelage, 2011).

Salmivalli and her colleagues (1996) found that only 20-30% of students participate in bullying as the bully or the victim, but a much larger percentage, 70-80%, participate in some other role. They identified four bullying participant roles other than victim and bully: defender of the victim, assistant to the bully, reinforcer of the bully, and outsiders (i.e., those who stay outside the bullying situation). Researchers have also separated these participants into active bystanders (e.g., defenders) and passive bystanders (e.g., outsiders; Gini et al., 2008). The presence of defenders can decrease the overall frequency of bullying in a classroom or school, while the presence of reinforcers or assistants can increase the frequency of bullying (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012;
Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011). In light of these findings, the goal of the current study is to further the research on active bystander or defender behavior by examining a five-step process of bystander intervention among elementary students.

Bystander behavior has been of interest to social psychologists for decades. Darley and Latané (1968) began studying bystander behavior following the murder of Kitty Genovese. The story of Kitty Genovese, which prompted Darley and Latané’s research, indicated that no less than 38 bystanders witnessed the act, only one of which called the police after she was dead (Manning, Levine, & Collins, 2007). However, it has recently come to light that Ms. Genovese was murdered in her apartment where few neighbors could see or hear her, and that multiple bystanders did call the police (Manning et al., 2007). Regardless, this event prompted research on the bystander effect, and, unfortunately, similar events still happen today. For example, Ficscher and colleagues (2011) recounted the 2009 murder of Dominik Brunner, who was killed at a German train station in front of several witnesses, none of whom physically intervened.

In their seminal research, Darley and Latané concluded that when multiple individuals observe an emergency, they take social cues from one another to determine if help is necessary. If others do not intervene, individuals may conclude that they do not need to intervene, or that someone else already has. Further, Darley and Latané suggested that the responsibility to intervene is diffused among the group, making it less likely that any one member will provide help, as opposed to when the responsibility lies with just one person. The tendency of people to not intervene in an emergency situation became known as the “bystander effect”.
The bystander effect has also been applied to bullying situations to help explain why many bystanders do not intervene (Salmivalli, 2010). Hawkins, Pepler, and Craig (2001) suggested that bystanders are present for more than 80% of bullying incidents, but intervene less than 20% of the time. Because multiple children often witness bullying, children may experience a diffusion of responsibility and believe that they do not need to try to stop the bullying because someone else will, or that someone else already has (Darley & Latané, 1968; Salmivalli, 2010); however, around 20% of adolescents (ages 9 to 13) can be classified as defenders (Salmivalli et al., 1996; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004), indicating that despite the bystander effect these individuals still intervene.

Research has shown that empathy, or empathetic responsiveness, is positively associated with defender behavior (Cappadocia et al., 2012; Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoe, 2007, 2008; Nickerson et al., 2008; Nickerson et al., 2014; Nickerson & Mele-Taylor, 2014), and may help children and adolescents overcome the bystander effect. Empathy can be described as a cognitive and affective response to another person’s needs (Gini et al., 2007; Nickerson & Mele-Taylor, 2014). Cognitive aspects of empathy refer to an individual’s ability to identify and understand another person’s perspective; while affective aspects of empathy refer to feelings of emotional concern or sympathy for another person (Gini et al., 2007). Generally, youth with greater empathy are more likely to be active bystanders. Likewise, youth with greater empathy more likely to participate in the five-step bystander intervention model (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press; Nickerson et al., 2014); however, some researchers have found that outsiders also have high levels of empathy (Gini et al., 2008). The relationship among defenders, outsiders, and empathy can be explained by the differences defenders and outsiders have in cognitive
empathy and affective empathy. Researchers have found that children who have high scores on defender measures have associations with affective empathy, and children who have high scores on outsider measures have associations with cognitive empathy (Pöyhönen, Juvonen, & Salmivalli, 2010). Therefore, it is likely that youth high in affective empathy will be more likely to engage in the five steps of the bystander intervention model. Most of the research on the relationship among affective and cognitive empathy and bystander intervention has been conducted in samples of adolescent participants; only two studies (Caravita et al., 2009; Pöyhönen et al., 2010) have examined this relationship in elementary school students.

The five steps in bystander intervention proposed by Latané & Darley (1970) are: notice the event, interpret the event as an emergency that needs assistance, assume responsibility for intervening, have knowledge of intervention strategies, and finally, provide help. These steps are sequential, meaning engagement in the early steps is required for engagement in the later steps, and that youth can drop out of the sequence at different steps (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press; Nickerson et al., 2014). Previously, researchers have also used the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey measure with middle school students (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press) and high school students (Nickerson et al., 2014) and found evidence of reliability and validity for Bystander Intervention in Bullying scores. In general, there is a paucity of research on bystander behavior among elementary-school students, and, more specifically, the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey has not been used with these students. The current study is designed to fill these gaps by adapting the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey for use with elementary-school students, examining evidence of reliability and validity.
scores, and examining the association among affective and cognitive empathy and bystander intervention.

**Literature Review**

**Definition of Bullying**

The definition of bullying has evolved throughout the course of bullying research (van Noorden, Haselager, Cillessen, & Bukowski, 2015). There is a general consensus that bullying can be broadly defined as a subtype of aggressive behavior that is purposeful, repetitive violence meant to cause harm or discomfort physically or psychologically to peers who are weaker or of a lower power status (Gladden et al., 2014). The power imbalance and repetition of the actions distinguish bullying from other forms of aggression (Correia & Dalbert, 2008; Gladden et al., 2014; van Noorden et al., 2015). By this definition, a one-time physical fight between peers of the same power status would not constitute bullying. Unfortunately, beyond this general description there is not a consensus on the definition of bullying (Gladden et al., 2014; Monks & Smith, 2006). Monks and Smith (2006) suggested that not all researchers can even agree on the importance of including intentionality of the offender and repetition of the acts in the definition. Some believe one particular act of aggression could be considered bullying if it is severe enough to cause fear of repetition. Likewise, some researchers believe that even if the perpetrators do not intend for their actions to be bullying, if the victim perceives them to be, they should be considered bullying (Monks & Smith, 2006). Defining bullying as a concept, is necessary to ensure that researchers and participants are in agreement, to ensure proper measurement, and to create congruency in the literature (Smith et al., 2002; van Noorden et al., 2015).
Several studies have examined how bullying is defined by children and adolescents and whether they can discriminate it from other terms. Smith and his colleagues (2002) conducted a cross-cultural study to examine the understanding 8-year-olds and 14-year-olds have of bullying terms and definitions. The sample included 1,245 students (604 8-year-olds and 641 14-year-olds) from 14 countries. The research design utilized 25 cartoons depicting accidental behaviors, joking, repetition, power imbalance, various types of aggression, and various forms of discrimination. Smith et al. selected a group of terms in each country based on focus groups and spontaneous usage of the terms. The students then paired each term with picture(s) that described it; for example, if the term was “picking-on”, the student would go through each picture and decide if it was an example of “picking-on”. This process was repeated for each term. Results of this study revealed no significant gender differences, even though boys and girls engage in and experience different forms of bullying (Smith et al., 2002). Smith et al. also found that 8-year-olds were able to differentiate between aggressive and nonaggressive scenarios, but were not able to clearly differentiate between different forms of aggression (e.g., physical bullying, verbal bullying, and social exclusion); while 14-year-olds were able to do both. Smith and his colleagues suggested including specific behaviors or situations (such as hitting, name-calling, or teasing) when using questionnaires with younger children.

Monks and Smith (2006) reported the results of two studies that similarly assessed the definition of bullying held by children at different ages. The first study used stick-figure pictures with captions that depicted different types of aggressive acts that varied in context (i.e., including or excluding power imbalance, repetition, intent, or
provocation). They used these pictures to assess the definitions held by young children (ages 4 and 6), children in middle childhood (age 8), adolescents (age 14), and adults (mean age 40). All participants had to decide if each picture fit the description of bullying or not. Results showed that children ages 4, 6, and 8 could discriminate between aggressive and non-aggressive behaviors, but adolescents and adults have a more differentiated conceptualization of bullying. The results are consistent with those of Smith et al. (2002).

In their second study, by Monks and Smith (2006) asked children ages 4 and 6, “What do you think bullying is?” followed by “Anything else?” until the child had no more responses. The researchers classified the children’s verbatim responses into categories such as verbal, physical, relational, indirect, mental, inequality of power, repetition, person, and reason. They then gave children another cartoon task and asked the children to explain, in their own words, what occurred in the cartoon (e.g., bullying or not bullying), as well as to nominate peers that fit the depiction in the cartoon. Over half of the children were able to verbally indicate what bullying is, and about 75% of the children were able to distinguish bullying from not bullying in the cartoon task. The researchers also found no significant gender differences, no differences due to involvement in different bullying roles, and no differences due to previous victimization. They suggested that when conducting research or implementing interventions with young children, differences between fighting and bullying should be explained. Monks and Smith (2006) also supported Smith et al.’s (2002) suggestion of using specific behaviors to characterize bullying when dealing with young children.
In summary, bullying is violent behavior that is meant to cause harm or discomfort, physically or psychologically, to peers who have less power. Because the current study pertains to elementary school children, the results and suggestions of Smith and colleagues (2002) and Monks and Smith (2006) related to age differences are particularly important. The results might indicate that younger children and adolescents may engage in the five steps of the bystander intervention model in different ways or interpret survey items differently because of their dissimilar conceptualization of bullying. For example, some items in the Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) version of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey use the term bullying as a global term, which elementary school students may not understand as well as the description of specific behaviors (Monks & Smith, 2006). Furthermore, elementary school students may be less likely to perceive the term “bullying” to mean one of the more discrete forms of bullying such as social or relational bullying (Smith et al., 2002). There are many different forms of bullying, which may add to the disagreement on the definition of bullying.

**Forms of bullying.** Bullying appears in many forms. The power imbalance involved in bullying does not indicate strictly physical power; this imbalance can be manifested in many different forms of bullying (van Noorden et al., 2015). Cappadocia and colleagues found that in a sample of children and adolescents (ages 8-16) the most common forms of bullying are social (sometimes referred to as relational), verbal, and physical bullying, respectively. Physical bullying is most prevalent in younger children, and verbal and social forms become predominant as children get older (Cappadocia et al., 2012). Also as children get older, they realize these forms of bullying are just as effective at harming others but are less easily detectable by adults (Cappadocia et al.,
Although physical bullying is not the most prevalent, children are most likely to intervene when witnessing physical bullying as opposed to other forms of bullying (Padget & Notar, 2013); possibly because physical bullying resembles a social emergency while other forms do not.

Bullying can take direct or indirect forms. Some direct forms of bullying include physical aggression and verbal aggression or forms in which the bully directly attacks the victim. Indirect forms of bullying might include relational aggression or forms in which the bully can remain relatively anonymous (Correia & Dalbert, 2008). Girls are more likely to engage in indirect forms of bullying, while boys are more likely to engage in direct forms of bullying (Cappadocia et al., 2012; Correia & Dalbert, 2008). The earlier research on bullying focused on direct forms of bullying such as physical or direct verbal aggression; indirect forms of bullying did not begin to receive research attention until around the time bullying was conceptualized as a group process (Smith et al., 2002).

Salmivalli and colleagues (1996) have received recognition for conceptualizing bullying as a group process and differentiating the different roles involved in bullying. These roles will be discussed in detail in the next section.

Bullying Roles

Christina Salmivalli and her colleagues (1996) aimed to determine the participant roles that accompany the bully and victim roles in bullying situations. Through the use of self- and peer-report questionnaires, they researchers identified four participant roles in bullying situations: reinforcer of the bully, assistant to the bully, defender of the victim, and outsider. In Salmivalli and colleagues’ original research, the bullying participant roles were considered mutually exclusive by definition. More recent research has
indicated that the roles are not static, but can change over time (Ryoo, Wang, & Swearer, 2015). Moreover, treating an individual as exclusively a member of one of these groups may not be as accurate because youth’s behavior can be consistent with one or more of these roles depending on the context of the bullying situation (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Gini et al., 2008; Jenkins & Nickerson, in press; Ryoo et al., 2015; Salmivalli, 2010). For example, about 40% of children can be classified as bully-victims (Salmivalli, 2010; van Noorden et al., 2015). Nevertheless, these roles tend to be relatively stable across time and predict children and adolescents’ behavior in future bullying roles, unless a method of bullying prevention or intervention is enacted (Gini et al., 2008).

**Bully.** Bullies are the perpetrators in bullying situations. Researchers have suggested that bullies primarily bully to achieve higher social status within a peer group (Salmivalli, 2010). Caravita and colleagues (2009) also found that some children who have high scores on bully measures have high associations with perceived popularity, indicating that bullies perceive themselves as popular and may bully to maintain their social status. According to Ryoo et al. (2015), 22-30% of youth occasionally bully, and 6-7% regularly bully. Boys are more likely to be bullies than girls (Salmivalli et al., 1996), and bullying tends to become more accepted as children get older (Padget & Notar, 2013; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). Bullying most typically takes place on the playground or during relatively unstructured times (Hawksins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001; Salmivalli et al., 2011).

Bullies have been traditionally stereotyped as having low academic achievement, being insecure, and prone to using violence as their only means of solving conflicts (Gini et al., 2007). More recently, some researchers have recognized that bullies may be
lacking in social-information processing or social problem solving skills (Gini et al., 2007). It is possible that because of social deficits, some bullies perceive their actions as only joking when their behavior is actually considered bullying by victims and bystanders (Padget & Notar, 2013). Other researchers have recognized that at least some bullies are socially knowledgeable and may skillfully use bullying to achieve some kind of personal benefit (Correia & Dalbert, 2008; Salmivalli, 2010). Bullies are sometimes thought to be low in empathy or completely lacking empathy; however, this belief disregards the distinction between cognitive empathy and affective empathy (van Noorden et al., 2015). For instance, Caravita and colleagues (2009) found that some bullies have higher levels of cognitive empathy, or perspective-taking skills, allowing them to understand and manipulate others’ emotions. Also, Gini (2006) found that bullies tend to engage in moral disengagement strategies and have lower levels of moral sensibility.

Unfortunately, those who bully during childhood are more likely to face long-term problems into adulthood. Copeland, Wolke, Angold, and Costello (2013) found that perpetrators of bullying were at higher risk to develop psychiatric disorders in young adulthood compared with those who never bullied. These psychiatric disorders included: depression, anxiety, substance use disorders, and suicidality. Being classified as a bully was also a risk factor for developing antisocial personality disorder in adulthood (Copeland et al., 2013).

**Assistant and reinforcer.** Reinforcers and assistants are commonly considered pro-bullying roles because individuals in both roles help the bully in one way or another. Assistants do not instigate the bullying, but they join in when someone else does, or directly helps the bully in other ways. Reinforcers less directly help the bully, but they
are likely to give the bully attention to that reinforces him or her to continue the violent behaviors. Assistants comprise about 7% of individuals, and reinforcers comprise about 20% of individuals (Salmivalli et al., 1996). About one-fifth of children and adolescents have reported that they would join in bullying if someone else started it, possibly due to a desire to fit in, peer pressure, or avoidance of being teased (Nickerson et al., 2008). These pro-bully roles contribute to the cycle of bullying and the degradation of victims (Padget & Notar, 2013).

**Victim.** Victims, or targets, of bullying are typically students who are less accepted by their peers. Ryoo et al. (2015) suggested that 18-29% of students in 5th to 9th grade are occasionally victims of bullying, and 9-12% are frequently victimized. As students get older, the rates of reported victimization tend to decrease (Ryoo et al., 2015). The decrease in reported rate of victimization could be due to a decrease in the actual experience of bullying, changes in what students think constitutes bullying, other cognitive developmental changes, or reluctances to report being bullied (Monks & Smith, 2006; Ryoo et al., 2015; Smith et al., 2002). Victims of bullying are typically chosen by bullies because of their lower social power, submissiveness, and physical weakness (Salmivalli, 2010; Salmivalli et al., 2011). Gini (2006) found that the average victims of bullying have lower social cognition skills. Interestingly, Salmivalli and colleagues (1996) found that when victims were not being victimized, they were most often defenders or outsiders. A small percentage of victims in Salmivalli and colleagues’ (1996) study were classified as bullies as their secondary role, making them bully-victims. Bully-victim was the first dual role to be recognized in the literature, and this role has arguably worse outcomes than individuals classified as either bullies or victims.
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(Copeland et al., 2013; Wolke, Copeland, Angold, & Costello, 2013). Wolke et al. reported that bully-victims are at a higher risk to have chronic health problems as adults, to develop psychological problems, and to display risky or illegal behaviors in adulthood.

Bullying victimization has multiple negative consequences. Copeland et al. (2013) found that victims of bullying have increased risk for developing internalizing disorders such as anxiety disorders and depressive disorders. Similarly, van Noorden et al. (2015) suggested that bullying threatens the physical, social, and mental wellbeing of victims. Wolke and colleagues (2013) conducted a study using a multi-stage accelerated cohort design with a sample of 1,420 students recruited at ages 9, 11, or 13. Wolke et al. assessed participants for bullying, victimization, childhood hardship (i.e., low socioeconomic status, exposure to abuse, neglect, unstable family structure), and childhood psychiatric disorders until age 16, and assessed wealth, risky/illegal behaviors, health, social, and psychological variables as adults. Results of weighted regression models showed that victims and bullies are more likely, than those who were neither bullies nor victims during childhood, to experience financial hardship, have difficulty keeping a job, and have long-term educational impairment. Victims are also at an increased risk of experiencing difficulty maintaining social relationships into adulthood when compared to those who were neither a bully nor a victim (Wolke et al., 2013).

Similarly, Copeland et al. (2013) found in a sample of 1,420 participants that those who were bully-victims as children (ages 9 to 16) had the highest levels of depressive disorders, anxiety disorders, and suicidality in adulthood when compared to those who were bullies, victims, or neither during childhood. Further, Padget and Notar (2013) reported that peer mistreatment can also harm students’ feelings of safety,
belonging, and connectedness to school, affecting these students’ ability to learn at school. It has been suggested that victims who have at least one defender have fewer negative outcomes associated with being bullied (Salmivalli, 2010), indicating that defending is likely to be important in addressing the negative impact of bullying.

**Outsider.** Outsiders in bullying situations remain uninvolved or otherwise stay outside the bullying situation. Bystanders have great potential to mitigate the negative effects of bullying, but few students act on this potential (Hawkins et al., 2001). Even though 80% of bystanders find bullying unpleasant to watch (Padget & Notar, 2013), the majority of bystanders fall into the outsider role (Salmivalli et al., 1996). About 24% of students can be classified as outsiders (Salmivalli et al., 1996).

Gianluca Gini and his colleagues (2008) and Padget and Notar (2013) reviewed common reasons bystanders give for not intervening in bullying, including: fear of becoming the next victim, fear of putting themselves in harm’s way, fear of making it worse for the victim, and merely not knowing what to do. Not knowing what to do presents more problems for younger children than older children, because older children are generally more capable of producing intervention strategies than younger children (Padget & Notar, 2013). Peer pressure is another reason children do not intervene (Pozzoli & Gini, 2012). They may believe their peers hold pro-bully attitudes and feel their intervention would not be socially acceptable.

Gini et al. (2008) reported that regardless of outsiders’ reason for remaining passive, victims typically perceive passive bystanders, or outsiders, as working with the bully. Likewise, passive bystanders’ behavior is perceived by the bullies as approval of their bullying behavior (Salmivalli et al., 1996). The most common intervention
strategies used by children are to confront the bully, seek the assistance of a trusted adult, and, when the bullying involves exclusion, comfort the victim (Padget & Notar, 2013).

Bystanders experience negative effects of bullying by merely witnessing it. Werth and her colleagues (2015) recently conducted a study on these negative effects. The effects of witnessing bullying as a bystander are most detrimental when the bystander has previously been bullied. Additionally, negative emotional responses such as feeling sick, sad, or bad and difficulty learning were associated with witnessing bullying regardless of previous victimization. Furthermore, physical forms of bullying were more likely to cause social and emotional maladjustment in bystanders (Werth et al., 2015). Bystanders are arguably the most important component to change the school climate around bullying (Salmivalli et al., 2011). If bullying is decreased, perhaps through increased defending, bystanders may be less likely to experience negative effects because there would be fewer opportunities to observe bullying.

**Defender.** Defenders choose to actively aid the victim of bullying. About 20% of elementary and middle-school students can be classified as defenders (Salmivalli et al., 1996). Defender behavior seems to become less common as children get older, and several studies have found that girls are more likely to be defenders than boys (Cappadocia et al., 2012; Pöyhonen et al., 2010; Salmivalli et al., 1996). Defenders are very important to putting a stop to bullying and mitigating the negative effects victims experience. Hawkins and her colleagues (2001) conducted a naturalistic observation study on peer interventions in bullying situations with a sample of 84 children in first through sixth grade. Hawkins et al. made observations on the playground, where bullying is most likely to occur. They found that peers intervened in only 19% of
bullying incidents, and had success in stopping the bullying within 10 seconds over two-thirds of the time (Hawkins et al., 2001). Furthermore, Salmivalli et al. (2011) found that the mere presence of defenders in a classroom can decrease the overall frequency of bullying.

Defender behavior can encompass a wide range of behaviors, including standing up to the bully and comforting the victim. In an observational study, Hawkins et al. (2001) found that the most common intervention was verbal assertion followed by physical aggression. Similarly, Suchy, Tomasino, and Jenkins (n.d.) conducted a study on the different types of interventions defenders used. In a sample of 1,574 third to eighth grade students, they found, with the use of self-report, that helping the victim was the most common intervention, followed by comforting the victim. Reporting the incident to a teacher or trusted adult was the least common type of intervention (Suchy et al., n.d.). Defender behavior does not always have to be a grand gesture, such as standing up to the bully. Instead, small gestures of support, such as calling the victimized peer at home, can also help mitigate the negative effects of bullying (Padget & Notar, 2013).

Besides victims and bullies, defenders have received the most research attention. Research on defenders indicates that active bystander behavior depends on individual characteristics and social forces. Some personal characteristics include high empathy (Nickerson et al., 2014), high general social self-efficacy and high efficacy for defending behavior (Barchia & Bussey, 2011), higher social status, and more affiliations with prosocial peers (Nickerson & Mele-Taylor, 2014; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). Active bystanders or defenders also have higher levels of social skills (Jenkins, Demaray, Fredrick, & Summers, 2016), and are more socially accepted by their peers (Pöyhönen et
Defenders are also more likely to hold strong anti-bullying attitudes (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004), and show higher levels of moral sensibility (e.g., understanding and experience of guilt and shame; Gini, 2006). Additionally, children who are classified as defenders are more likely than those in other bullying roles to have secure attachments to their parents. Attachment was measured as the parents’ responsiveness, availability, their openness to communication, and their ability to provide help and comfort (Nickerson et al., 2008). It is believed that some of these characteristics help children and adolescents overcome the psycho-social phenomenon known as the bystander effect.

**Bystander Effect**

The bystander effect refers to the tendency for onlookers to refrain from intervening in an emergency situation when other people are present; this phenomenon has been a topic of interest in social psychology for decades (Darley & Latané, 1968). In the first empirical study of the bystander effect, Darley and Latané (1968) placed college students in a laboratory under the guise that they would be discussing problems that face college students. The researchers told participants that they were to use an intercom system so that they could remain anonymous. During the conversation, one of the participants, who was actually a confederate, seemed to be having a seizure. Darley and Latané measured the latency of the participants’ responses to report the emergency and varied the number of people or “bystanders” who heard the emergency. Eighty-five percent of participants who thought they were the only one to hear the seizure reported the emergency, 62% of participants who thought there was one other person hearing the conversation reported, and 31% of participants who thought four other people heard the
emergency reported. The results suggested that the bystander effect and situational forces, such as a diffusion of responsibility, do exist. Darley and Latané asked participants why they did not report the emergency and the most common response was that they did not know what to do. According to Padget and Notar (2013), some children also give this reason for not intervening in bullying situations, along with fear of making the situation worse, fear of getting hurt, or fear of becoming the next victim.

In a follow-up study, Latané and Darley (1968) examined what would happen if participants were placed in a similar situation, but were able to communicate with each other and know how others reacted. It was predicted that this communication would allow participants to help each other intervene; however, the researchers hypothesized that the group would still inhibit interventions. In the study, participants completed questionnaires in a room. Then, halfway through the questionnaire, gas started to fill the room through a vent in the wall. Participants were in one of three conditions: alone, with two passive confederates, or with a group of three participants. When participants were in the “alone” condition, they noticed the gas but returned to the questionnaire before investigating the gas and eventually getting help. Seventy-five percent of the participants in the alone condition reported the gas. In contrast, only 10% of participants in the “passive confederate” condition reported the gas, and the other 90% remained in the room as it filled with gas. Thirty-eight percent of the participants in the “group of three” condition (only one group out of eight groups) reported the gas. In a post-study interview, participants stated that they did not report the gas because they did not think it was dangerous. This indicates that when participants saw others not responding to the situation, they did not perceive it to be an emergency. These results suggest that
individuals may not always be unwilling or afraid to help, but may read the social cues of others and believe help is not needed.

In a study of bullying, Cappadocia and her colleagues (2012) found results similar to those of Latané and Darley (1968) in a sample of 108 children and adolescents (ages 8 to 16) at a residential summer camp. Although they found an unusually large number of defenders in the sample (80%), those who were outsiders reported not intervening because they were not directly involved and/or it was not extremely severe. Outsiders also reported not knowing what to do, being afraid, and not wanting to get involved as other reasons for not intervening (Cappadocia et al., 2012).

In a later bystander effect study, Latané and Rodin (1969) suggested that an onlooker may be more willing to intervene in emergency situations when he or she knows the other observers. In this experiment, participants were placed in a waiting room for what they thought was a market research study, and heard someone fall and injure herself in the next room. Latané and Rodin used four experimental conditions: participant alone, with a confederate, with a stranger, and with a friend. The results showed that those in the alone group were the most likely to intervene, and participants in the friend condition were more likely to intervene than participants in the stranger or confederate condition. Latané and Rodin concluded that social inhibition forces are strong in group situations, and that when a bystander is in a group with friends these inhibitions are lessened. Similar results have been obtained in bullying research; researchers have found that children and adolescents are more likely to intervene when the victim is in their peer group (Padget & Notar, 2013).
Bystander Intervention in Elementary School

**Bullying and the Bystander Intervention Model**

Since the bystander effect research of the 1960s and 1970s, the bystander effect has been used to help explain why some children do not help victims during bullying episodes (Nickerson et al., 2014). Though the bystander effect was not originally used to explain behavior of people witnessing bullying, there are many similarities between bullying episodes and the “emergency situations” described by the original researchers. Pozzoli and Gini (2012) identified three ways that bullying is similar to an emergency: there is a victim, this individual needs help, and there are risks for those who intervene. Furthermore, bullying can be conceptualized as a social emergency (Padget & Notar, 2013). Many researchers believe bystanders can serve a vital role in intervening and preventing bulling (Salmivalli et al., 2011).

Latané and Darley (1970) posed a bystander intervention model with five sequential steps that bystanders must go through in order to intervene in an emergency. The first step of the model is to notice the event. Individuals must attend to the situation before they can possibly intervene. Events that are vivid or unusual are most likely to be noticed (Latané & Darley, 1970; Nickerson et al., 2014). Children are most likely to intervene when witnessing physical bullying opposed to other forms (Padget & Notar, 2013); this could be due to the lower prevalence of physical bullying versus the prevalence of verbal and social bullying (Cappadocia et al., 2012). Bullying often occurs on the playground or during unstructured times when many extraneous variables are also present (Hawkins et al., 2001; Salmivalli, 2010). These extraneous stimuli can also distract bystanders from noticing the event (Nickerson et al., 2014).
After the individual has noticed the event, the situation must be interpreted as an emergency that requires help (Latané & Darley, 1970). Latané and Darley (1968) found that bystanders look to others to determine if help is needed; if the other bystanders remain passive the situation will not be interpreted as an emergency. Further, when an emergency situation is ambiguous, it can prevent individuals from perceiving it as an emergency. Bullying can be ambiguous because youth, especially young children, often have their own definitions of what constitutes “bullying” (Monks & Smith, 2006; Smith et al., 2002).

The third step is to assume responsibility for intervening (Latané & Darley, 1970). When only one bystander is present in an emergency situation, the pressure to intervene lies only on that person. Thus, a lone individual is more likely to take action. However, when several people observe an emergency, the pressure to take action is shared among the group, which lessens the pressure for each person (Darley & Latané, 1968).

Next, the individual must have knowledge of how to provide help (Latané & Darley, 1970). Darley and Latané (1968) found that participants generally did not intervene in the seizure emergency because they did not know what to do. Not knowing what to do is also a common reason children give for not intervening in bullying (Gini et al., 2008; Padget & Notar, 2013). Finally, the fifth step is to implement the chosen intervention (Latané & Darley, 1970).

Amanda Nickerson and her colleagues (2014) developed a survey that assessed each of the five steps in Latané and Darley’s (1970) model, the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey, and used it with a sample of high school students. Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) have also used this survey with a middle school population. This
self-report questionnaire has 16 items that correspond to the five steps in the model, and respondents rate their level of agreement to each item on a Likert-type scale. Nickerson et al. used confirmatory factor analysis and found that a five-factor model, corresponding to the five steps, fit the data; while a more parsimonious one-factor model did not fit the data. They also found that 15 of the 16 factor loadings were above .60. Also, the internal consistency estimates for all but one of the five subscales were above .75. The researchers also found that the steps are sequential; the first step predicts the second step, the second step predicts the third step, and so on.

Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) adapted this survey for use with middle school students and found supporting evidence for its use. Confirmatory factor analysis indicated the expected five-factor structure was appropriate. Also, all path coefficients were significant and positive for boys and girls. In terms of convergent validity support, Jenkins and Nickerson found positive correlations with each step of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey and the Defender subscale of the Bullying Participant Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ; Summers & Demaray, 2008). Results of regression analyses showed that students who had been victimized or were defenders were more likely to notice the event. Defenders were also more likely to interpret the event as an emergency, assume responsibility for the event, know how to help, and actually intervene (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press).

Nickerson and colleagues’ (2014) measure has not been used with youth younger than middle-school age; however, Pozzoli and Gini (2012) examined three of the five steps in a study of elementary-school students: interpreting the event as an emergency, taking responsibility for providing help, and deciding how to help. The researchers used
attitude toward bullying as a proxy for interpreting the event as an emergency. They found that these three steps can distinguish active versus passive bystanders in bullying for both children and adolescents. They also found that this model explained 28% of the variance in passive bystanding and 40% of the variance in defending; meaning the model was a better predictor for defenders than for outsiders, and that variables outside the model accounted for more than half of variance in defending scores and almost three-fourths of variance in outsider scores (Pozzoli & Gini, 2012).

In summary, there are several explanations for the bystander effect. One explanation is that the potential blame for not intervening is shared among the group, instead of falling on one person. Another explanation is that the bystanders take social cues from other passive bystanders to arrive at the conclusion that help is not needed. Yet another possibility is that another observer already helped the victim, so additional help is not needed. The most likely explanation is diffusion of responsibility; when more than one person is present the responsibility to help is shared among the group (Darley & Latané, 1968; Nickerson et al., 2014). Fortunately, some individuals are able to overcome the bystander effect and defend victims in social emergencies.

**Measurement of Defender Behavior and Bystander Intervention**

Defender behavior has been measured in a variety of ways, but most commonly through self-report (Crothers & Levinson, 2004). While self-report methods may be subject to social desirability bias, children can provide unique insight into their lives and thought processes rather than through an observer, peer, or teacher report (Crothers & Levinson, 2004; Olweus, 2010). Other methods of assessing bullying also have downfalls. Crothers and Levinson (2004) reported that observational methods may not
reveal the true magnitude of bullying or defender behaviors because bullying is often covert or happens in places such as restrooms and locker rooms that cannot be observed. Additionally, qualitative methods such as interviews can compromise validity, and reliability of these methods may be difficult to obtain. Furthermore, peers and teachers observe participants in a limited number of settings, which may introduce bias into peer- or teacher-report estimates (Crothers & Levinson, 2004).

Salmivali et al. (1996) originally assessed defender behavior through the Participant Roles Questionnaire (PRQ), including self- and peer-nominations. The PRQ has since been revised and adapted to assess defender behavior in multiple other studies (e.g., Caravita, Blasio & Salmivalli, 2009; Gini, 2006; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). The PRQ assesses defender behavior as well as outsider, bully, assistant, reinforcer, and victimization (Salmivali et al., 1996). Summers and Demaray (2008) developed a similar questionnaire, the Bullying Participant Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ), that is designed to assess behavior in five bullying roles: defender, outsider, assisting (assistant and reinforcer), bullying, and victimization.

Fitzpatrick and Bussey (2011) developed the Social Bullying Involvement Scales (SBIS). The SBIS consists of four scales, one of which is designed to assess intervention in social bullying. The intervention scale of the SBIS describes intervention as “tried to help” a child who was bullied. Through the SBIS students are assigned a score for each of the four scales, rather than being classified into a role. This scale assesses intervention more broadly than scales that use a classification approach (Fitzpatrick & Bussey, 2011) because it allows students to be members of more than one role and does not focus on specific defender behaviors.
Latanè and Darley’s (1970) model incorporates five unique steps in bystander (or defender) intervention. Unlike the previous methods of assessing defender behavior, the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey developed by Nickerson et al. (2014) assesses all five steps of Latanè and Darley’s (1970) model in a single self-report measure. Pozzoli and Gini (2013) applied Latanè and Darley’s model to a bullying context prior to Nickerson and colleagues’ (2014) development of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey, but had to use multiple self-report methods to assess these steps. Thus, there is a need to adapt this measure for use with a broader age range of students, so that these steps can be assessed with one measure in elementary school students and middle school students.

Regardless of how bystander intervention is assessed, it is clear that certain personal characteristics and social factors allow some individuals to overcome the bystander effect and defend victims of bullying. Empathy may be one characteristic that allows individuals to overcome the bystander effect.

**Defenders and Empathy**

The study of characteristics of defenders has become more common in bullying literature because of the power defenders may have in mitigating the negative effects of bullying (Salmivali, 2010). Empathy is one such characteristic, and it can be considered two processes: cognitive and affective (Gini et al., 2007, 2008; Pöyhönen, et al., 2010). Cognitive empathy is described as perspective taking, and affective empathy is described as identifying with another person’s emotions (Gini et al., 2007). The cognitive aspects of empathy allow individuals to understand the perspectives of others, and affective aspects of empathy allow individuals to experience the emotional reactions of others such
as the victim’s pain or stress in response to being bullied (Caravita et al., 2009; Gini et al., 2007, 2008; Pöyhönen et al., 2010).

There are interesting demographic differences in empathy. For example, empathy is sometimes found to be more common in girls, but both boys and girls report that they feel more empathy when a girl is in distress than when a boy is in distress (Olweus & Endresen, 1998). As a result of developmental differences and increased cognitive abilities, girls score higher on cognitive and affective empathy during adolescence than during childhood (Nickerson & Mele-Taylor, 2014; Pöyhönen, et al., 2010). Boys, however, experience a decrease in cognitive and affective empathy during adolescence, and an increase after adolescence (Caravita et al., 2009).

Empathy is an important characteristic in bullying research, and cognitive and affective empathy in relation to bullying have been studied at multiple developmental levels, including preschool (Belacchi & Farina, 2012), middle childhood (Caravita et al., 2009; Pöyhönen et al., 2010), and adolescence (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Caravita et al., 2009; Espelage, Green, & Polanin, 2012; Gini et al., 2008; Nickerson et al., 2008; Pöyhönen et al., 2010). Some bullying prevention programs even aim to teach empathetic behaviors to improve the school climate regarding bullying (Nickerson et al., 2008; Padget & Notar, 2013). Of course empathy is not the only characteristic that predicts defender behavior. Many other personal characteristics and social factors also play a role in who is more likely to be an active bystander rather than a passive bystander. Nevertheless, empathy is an important characteristic. Results of many studies have indicated that empathy can predict defending behaviors in bullying situations; some of these studies are reviewed here.
Gianluca Gini and his colleagues (2007) examined the relationship between empathy and pro-bullying roles (including bullies, assistants, and reinforcers) and defenders in a sample of Italian middle-schoolers ages 12 to 14. Through peer nomination, results of structural equation modeling indicated that for boys, pro-bullying roles were significantly associated with low empathy, and defender behavior was associated with higher levels of empathy. Results for girls were inconclusive because the structural equation model did not fit the data for girls. Results of this study show that individuals in pro-bullying roles may lack empathy. They also support previous findings that empathy is important to defender behavior.

In a later study, Gini et al. (2008) examined the role empathy and perceived social self-efficacy play in predicting active helping behavior in bullying situations within a sample of Italian adolescents ages 12 to 14. Through the use of peer nominations, results of structural equation modeling showed that high defender scores and high outsider scores had high associations with empathy. It is likely that Gini and colleagues found this because they measured empathy as a single construct instead of measuring cognitive and affective empathy as two distinct constructs. More recent research has shown that children and adolescents who have high scores on defender measures have associations with affective empathy, and those who have high scores on outsider measures have associations with cognitive empathy (Pöyhönen et al., 2010). Furthermore, high defender scores were associated with perceived social self-efficacy in the social relationships domain, while high outsider scores had low associations with this characteristic. These results suggest that how empathy is measured is an important consideration, and that empathy may not be the only essential factor in predicting defender behavior.
Nickerson and her colleagues (2008) examined the predictive power of attachment to the mother, attachment to the father, and empathy through the use of self-report in a sample of middle school students. Attachment was measured using the Kerns' Attachment Security Scale, which includes the parents’ responsiveness, availability, their openness to communication, and their ability to provide help and comfort. Results of hierarchical logistic regression modeling indicated that attachment to the mother and empathetic concern (affective empathy) are significant predictors of adolescents nominating themselves as defenders as opposed to outsiders. They also found that empathy contributed significant variance after all other variables were accounted for. These results indicate that empathetic responsiveness may be one of the more powerful predictors of defender behavior.

Caravita et al. (2009) investigated the relationship among cognitive and affective empathy, perceived popularity, social preference, and being a bully or a defender. They used self-report and peer nominations with a sample of participants in middle childhood (third through fifth grade) and adolescence (sixth through eighth grade). They measured empathy using the How I Feel in Different Situations questionnaire (Bonino, Lo Coco, & Tani, 1998), which measures cognitive and affective dimensions of empathy. Results indicated that some individuals with high bully scores also have high cognitive empathy and some individuals with high defender scores have high affective empathy. Caravita and colleagues also found that there is a complex interaction among cognitive and affective empathy and social status; supporting previous findings that empathy is an important, but not a defining factor, in defender behavior. The results of their study also illustrate the importance of measuring empathy as two separate constructs.
Pöyhönen et al. (2010) examined whether cognitive empathy, affective empathy, self-efficacy, school level (elementary versus middle school) gender, and social status are associated with defending behavior. Through the use of peer nomination and self-report, results showed that in a sample of fourth- and eighth-grade students, defending behavior was positively associated with affective empathy, self-efficacy for defending behavior, and high social status among peers. They also found that social standing in one’s peer group was a moderator for the effects of affective empathy and self-efficacy for defending, indicating that high social standing may allow children and adolescents to act on their feelings of empathy and efficacy. Additionally, girls were more likely to be defenders than boys, had high levels of self-efficacy for defending victimized peers, and higher levels of cognitive and affective empathy. Furthermore, elementary school students were more likely to be defenders, but had lower levels of cognitive and affective empathy possibly due to their younger age. Pöyhönen et al. (2010) also used the How I Feel in Different Situations questionnaire (Bonino et al., 1998; Freshbach et al., 1991), providing more support for its use in discriminating affective and cognitive empathy and predicting defender behavior.

Barchia and Bussey (2011) conducted a longitudinal study to determine if affective empathy and other social cognitive characteristics could predict defending behaviors 8 months in the future. In a sample of seventh- through tenth-graders, with the use of self-report, results of linear regression indicated that empathy and self-efficacy predict defending. Results showed that higher self-efficacy scores predicted defender behavior 8 months later. Furthermore, for girls, a higher affective empathy score was a significant predictor of defending 8 months later. These results indicate that, for some
individuals, affective empathy can predict defender behavior at least 8 months in the future.

In a recent study, van Noorden and colleagues (2014) completed a comprehensive literature review of research on cognitive and affective empathy, and examined general trends in the empathy-bullying research. They concluded that an overall trend is that both cognitive empathy and affective empathy are positively correlated with defender behavior, but affective empathy is more commonly correlated with defender behavior. They also found that outsider behavior is associated with cognitive empathy but not affective empathy (van Noorden et al., 2014).

Taken together, the results of the aforementioned studies indicate that sharing and experiencing other’s emotional reactions may be a key to overcoming the bystander effect. While many other personal and interpersonal characteristics were also found to be significant predictors or have significant associations with defender behavior, cognitive and affective empathy are important characteristics in defender behavior. Cognitive and affective empathy allow defender to take the perspective of victimized students, and share in their emotional response to being bullied. It is also expected that cognitive and affective empathy may be important factors in engagement in the five-step bystander intervention model.

**Current Study**

The goals of the current study included adapting the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey created by Nickerson and colleagues (2014) for use with elementary-school students. Specifically, the survey was adapted from the middle school version (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press) to be more appropriate for elementary-school children.
This included changing the wording of items so that younger children would be able to read and understand them.

A second goal of the study was to provide reliability and validity evidence for the survey in a sample of upper elementary school children. Nickerson and colleagues’ (2014) model has been applied and validated in high school (Nickerson et al., 2014) and middle school samples (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press), but not yet in an elementary-school sample. Bullying is a pervasive problem at all age levels (Pozzoli & Gini, 2012). Bullying roles are also stable across time and predict future behavior in bullying episodes (Gini et al., 2008). Thus, it is appropriate that reliability and validity evidence for this measure be established for an upper-elementary school sample.

A third goal of the study is to determine the role cognitive and affective empathy play in predicting engagement in the five steps. Research has generally shown a correlation between empathy and defender behavior (Cappadocia et al., 2012; Gini et al., 2007, 2008; Nickerson et al., 2008). Many studies have also found a relationship between cognitive and affective empathy and defender behavior. Typically, affective empathy is more highly associated with defender behavior than is cognitive empathy (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Caravita et al., 2009; Pöyhönen et al., 2010; van Noorden et al., 2014). Researchers have not yet examined whether cognitive or affective empathy can predict engagement in the five-step bystander intervention model in elementary school students; only two studies (Caravita et al., 2009; Pöyhönen et al., 2010) have examined cognitive and affective empathy and defender behavior in elementary school students.
In order to accomplish the goals of the study, the following hypotheses were formulated:

I. Examination of the factor structure and internal consistency of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey will reveal a five-factor structure that corresponds to the five steps in the model. Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) and Nickerson et al. (2014) found that the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey had a five-factor structure in middle school and high school samples. To address this hypothesis, the survey was adapted from the middle school version (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press). Adapting the survey included wording changes of particular items so that they better fit elementary-school students’ cognitive developmental level and conceptualization of bullying.

II. Defender behavior will predict engagement in the five steps presented by the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey. Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) found that higher scores on the defender subscale was associated with engagement in all five steps. To address this hypothesis, the researcher examined the survey’s associations with the defender subscale of the Bullying Participant Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ; Summers & Demaray, 2008).

III. Those with high affective empathy will be more likely to engage in the five steps of the bystander intervention model. Empathy is a strong predictor of defender behavior, and defender behavior is associated with engagement in the five steps (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press). Nickerson and colleagues (2014) also found that empathy was the strongest predictor of engagement in the five-steps in a high school sample. Additionally, Barchia and Bussey (2011), Caravita et al. (2009), and
Pöyhönen et al. (2010) have found that defenders have associations with affective empathy, while outsiders have associations with cognitive empathy.

**Method**

**Participants**

The participants included 325 fourth- and fifth-grade students from an elementary school in the rural Midwest. There were 189 boys (58.15%) and 136 girls (41.85%), including 158 fourth-graders (48.62%) and 167 fifth-graders (51.38%). Eleven students (3.27%) were removed from the initial sample of 336 students because of incomplete data. The data were collected through a school-wide evaluation of social-emotional issues requested by the school. It was determined that this sample size would be sufficient to conduct the proposed statistical tests according to the suggestions of Comrey and Lee (1992; as cited in Watkins, 2004), who suggested that 300 participants is a “good” sample size for factor analysis.

**Procedure**

Each class completed surveys in one of the school’s computer labs using Qualtrics, an online survey software, with teachers and support persons present, during the students’ regularly scheduled computer lab time. Prior to beginning the evaluation, letters were sent home to parents informing them of the evaluation, how results would be used, steps that were taken to ensure confidentiality of student information, and contact information of the primary researchers. Because data were collected through whole-school screening, a passive consent method was used in which parents returned letters if they denied their child’s participation. Out of all the students, 22 (6.14%) returned letters denying consent. The primary researcher, a research assistant, the school psychologist, a
special education teacher, or a teacher’s aide read the survey aloud to students who received tier II or III reading interventions or students who received special education services for a specific learning disability in reading. No identifying information was included in the dataset, and Institutional Review Board approval was obtained to use this data set for research purposes.

**Measures**

The study included three self-report measures. Self-report methods are the most common form of assessing bullying and bystander behavior (Crothers & Levinson, 2004). The Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey (Nickerson et al., 2014) was used to assess engagement in the five-steps of the bystander intervention model. The Bully Participant Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ; Summers & Demaray, 2008) was used to assess evidence of convergent validity for the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey. The How I Feel in Different Situations Scale (Bonino et al., 1998; Feshbach et al., 1991) was used to assess cognitive and affective empathy.

**Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey.** Engagement in the five-step bystander intervention model was measured with the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey (see Appendix A; Nickerson et al., 2014). This is a 16-item survey intended to assess engagement in five-intervention steps: notice the event, interpret the event as an emergency that requires assistance, assume responsibility for helping, know of intervention strategies, and provide help. For each item, participants indicate their agreement on a Likert-type scale (1 = really disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = agree, 4 = really agree). This survey is scored by summing the student’s endorsements for each item; thus, higher scores indicate agreement with more items.
Items were modified from the middle school version (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press) to suit elementary-school students. Modifications included shortening the number of words per sentence, changing some words that might have been difficult for elementary students to read or understand, altering the directions, and changing the Likert-scale anchor descriptions. For example, item five originally stated, “Inappropriate comments can hurt someone’s feelings, even if the person making the comments says they are joking”, and was revised to state “Mean comments can hurt someone’s feelings, even if it is a joke”.

The researcher also took additional steps to ensure that the items and format were appropriate for use with upper-elementary school students. First, the researchers added a definition of bullying to the beginning of the survey, including an example and a non-example of bullying. This was done per the suggestions of Smith and colleagues (2002) and Monks and Smith (2006), who suggested using a definition and specific behaviors to help children understand bullying when it is used as a global term. Next, the researcher administered the survey to a second-grade student with average reading skills to ensure upper-elementary school students with reading difficulties would be able to read and understand the items. Additionally, upper-elementary school teachers reviewed the survey and made comments about the survey’s appropriateness. Finally, the creator of the original Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey reviewed the revisions to confirm that the item content did not change.

Readability indices were calculated to ensure that the items were an appropriate reading level for late-elementary school students using an online readability calculator from readability-score.com. This calculator was used because it assesses several
readability indices (Felsch-Kincaid Grade Level, Gunning-Fog Score, SMOG Index, Automated Readability Index, Spache Score, & Dale-Chall Score). The directions section of the survey has an average readability score of 4.37 grade level. The description of bullying has an average readability score of 4.13 grade level. The average readability scores for each subscale range from 2.73 to 4.72 grade level, indicating that the items have acceptable readability indices for use with upper-elementary school students.

Nickerson et al. (2014) conducted reliability and validity analyses on the original survey using a sample of 562 ninth through twelfth graders. Through confirmatory factor analysis, they found that a single factor did not fit the data, but a five-factor model fit the data adequately (RMSEA = 0.05, 90% CI [0.04, 0.06], CFI = 0.96, GFI = 0.95, NFI = 0.94). Additionally, the results of a chi-square difference test indicated that the five-factor model fit the data significantly better than did the one-factor model ($\chi^2_D = 890.55$, $df = 10$, $p < 0.001$). All but one of the 16 items had a factor loading higher than 0.6. The item with a lower factor loading was a reverse-coded item. All five subscales had internal consistency estimates above .75, and the subscales were positively correlated with each other. All direct paths from one step to another were statistically significant, indicating a sequential nature to the steps, which is consistent with the theoretical grounding. Finally, Nickerson and colleagues (2014) demonstrated construct validity by investigating relationships with attitudes toward bullying, knowledge about bullying, and empathy.

Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) adapted the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey for use with middle-school students. They modified items to include only
bullying, not sexual harassment, which was included in the original high school survey. One reverse-coded item was also reworded to eliminate the need for reverse-coding. With a sample of 299 middle-school students, Jenkins and Nickerson used confirmatory factor analysis and replicated the five-factor structure found by Nickerson et al. (2014) ($\chi^2 = 173.56, p < .001$, relative $\chi^2 = 1.846$, $CFI = .969$, $RMSEA = .053$, ($CI .41, .066$), and Parsimonious Normed Fit Index (PNFI; .647)). Like Nickerson et al., they also found that all path coefficients were significant and positive. Internal consistency coefficients ranged from .77 to .87. Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) also demonstrated convergent validity evidence through positive, significant correlations with the defending subscale of the Bully Participant Behavior Questionnaire.

**The Bullying Participant Behavior Questionnaire (BPBQ).** The BPBQ was used to assess convergent validity (see Appendix B; Summers & Demaray, 2008). The BPBQ is a 50-item questionnaire designed to assess involvement in five different bullying roles: defending, bullying, assisting, victimization, and outsider. The BPBQ has 5 subscales (10 items each), corresponding to the five roles. The defender subscale assesses the frequency students engage in defender behavior (e.g., “I tried to become friends with someone after they were picked on”). For each item, participants rate how often they engage in the behavior on a Likert-type scale ($0 = \text{Never}, 1 = \text{1 to 2 times}, 2 = 3 \text{ to 4 times}, 3 = 5 \text{ to 6 times}, 4 = 7 \text{ or more times}$).

Jenkins, Nesbitt, and Canivez (under review) obtained reliability and validity evidence for the BPBQ in a sample of 386 elementary-school students. For these analyses, Jenkins et al. removed the outsider and assistant subscales due to high readability estimates (i.e., estimates ranged from 6.0 grade level to 9.5 grade level). After
removing the outsider and assistant subscales, the results of an exploratory factor analysis indicated that a three factor structure was appropriate and accounted for 60% of the variance (KMO = .92; Bartlett’s test of sphericity $p < .001$). Factor loadings were as follows: .66 to .87 for the Defender scale, .46 to .82 for the Bullying scale, and .68 to .80 for the Victimization scale. Results of higher-order factor analysis indicated that the bully, victim, and defender scale contribute sufficient amounts of reliable variance. The omega subscale coefficients ranged from moderate to high (.40 to .80) for all three subscales. Results indicated that it is appropriate to interpret scores on these three subscales separately. Jenkins and colleagues found that the internal consistency alpha coefficients were .95 (Defender subscale), .88 (Bully subscale), and .93 (Victim subscale).

Demaray et al. (2014) also obtained reliability and validity evidence for the BPBQ in a sample of 800 middle-school students. Results from exploratory factor analysis showed a five-factor structure that accounted for 60% of the variance, and the confirmatory factor analysis indicated acceptable fit. Demaray et al. found that the internal consistency alpha coefficients for each subscale were as follows: .94 (Defender subscale), .94 (Outsider subscale), .88 (Bully subscale), .92 (Assistant subscale), and .93 (Victim subscale). To examine validity evidence of the BPBQ, Demaray et al. examined the correlations among the BPBQ subscales and the subscales of the Behavior Assessment System for Children, Second edition, Self-Report of Personality (BASC-2 SRP; Reynolds & Kamphaus, 2004), which assesses internalizing and externalizing problems in children. The BPBQ Bully Score and the BASC-2 Attitude to School and Attitude to Teachers subscales showed positive correlations (from $r = .12$ to $r = .38$).
Demaray et al. also found significant negative correlations between the BPBQ Bully Score and BASC-2 Interpersonal Relations, Self-Esteem, and Relations with Parents subscales ($r = -0.10$, $r = -0.14$, and $r = -0.29$, respectively).

**How I Feel in Different Situations Scale (HIFDS).** The HIFDS is a 12-item scale that was used to assess cognitive and affective empathy (see Appendix C; Bonino et al., 1998; Feshbach et al., 1991). This scale has a cognitive empathy subscale that assesses perspective taking or understanding how others feel (e.g., “I can tell when my parents are worried about me even if they don’t say so”), and an affective empathy subscale that assesses ability to share others’ feelings (e.g., “When somebody I care about is sad, I feel sad too”). The participant rates how true each item is on a 4-point Likert-type scale (1 = Never True, 2 = Sometimes True, 3 = Often True, 4 = Always True).

Caravita et al. (2009) completed confirmatory factor analysis and structural equation modeling (using the Mplus software (Mplus 3.0; Muthén & Muthén 1998–2004)) on the HIFDS with a sample of 266 elementary-school participants and 195 middle-school participants. They found a two-factor structure after removing an item (Item 7) that was labeled affective but had high loadings with the cognitive factor ($c2(42) = 57.33, p = .06; \text{CFI} = .97, \text{TLI} = .97, \text{RMSEA} = .03; \text{SRMR} = .03$). The two-factor model provided better fit than a more parsimonious one-factor model. Affective item factors ranged from .40 to .71, and cognitive item factors ranged from .37 to .55. Furthermore, results of a multiple group analysis indicated that the factor loadings were equal across the age groups (Caravita et al., 2009). Pöyhönen et al. (2010) found that internal consistency alpha coefficients were .80 for affective empathy and .71 for cognitive empathy. Baldner and McGinley (2014) reported evidence of concurrent
validity in that the affective subscales of the HIFDS, Basic Empathy Scale (BES; Jolliffe & Farrington, 2006), and Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI; Davis, 1980) were all intercorrelated ($rs = .51$ to $.64$), as were the cognitive subscales ($rs = .31$ to $.49$).

**Data Analysis**

To address hypotheses about reliability evidence of using the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey developed by Nickerson et al. (2014) with an upper-elementary school sample, an exploratory factor analysis was conducted. All the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey items were included as variables in the factor analysis, with the intention of examining the underlying factor structure of the survey. It was predicted that the factors would be correlated, so a promax rotation was used. This rotation was chosen opposed to an orthogonal rotation because it would not force the factors to be uncorrelated (Watkins, 2004). The alpha values for each subscale were examined to explore internal consistency reliability.

To address hypotheses made about convergent validity evidence for the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey, a set of five bivariate correlations were conducted. Correlations between each scale of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey and scores on the defender scale of the BPBQ were examined.

To address hypotheses made about the ability of cognitive or affective empathy to predict engagement in the five steps, a series of five standard/simultaneous multiple-regression analyses were conducted. In each multiple-regression analysis cognitive and affective empathy were entered as the predictor variable and the outcome variable was each step of the bystander intervention model. The predictor variables were entered
simultaneously to examine whether cognitive or affective empathy was a better predictor at each of the five steps of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey.

**Results**

**Factor Analysis**

To test the first hypothesis, an exploratory factor analysis (EFA) was conducted with an oblique (promax) rotation. Five factors were forced because the theoretical model of the bystander intervention model included five steps. An examination of the scree plot indicated that there were four factors above an eigenvalue of 1, and one factor just below an eigenvalue of 1. The factor structure accounted for 63.59% of the variance. The KMO measure (.83) indicated a high sampling adequacy for the factor analysis, and Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($p < .001$) indicating the factor model is appropriate. Upon inspection of the factor loadings, four items cross-loaded on factors in which they were not intended to load (items 5, 6, 14, and 16). Items 16 had a low loading with the intended and unintended factor. Item 16 was worded differently than the other items on the subscale (e.g., item 16 discusses a student who is not a friend). Thus, item 16 was deleted and the analysis was conducted again. In this analysis, the factors accounted for 64.33% of the variance. Four items loaded on factors in which they were not intended to load (e.g., items 5, 6, 9, and 14), but their loadings with the unintended factors were smaller than their loadings with the intended factors (.25, .25, .23, and .36, respectively). The KMO measure of .81 indicated a high sampling adequacy for the factor analysis. Bartlett’s test of sphericity was significant ($p < .001$) indicating the factor model is appropriate. Examination of the pattern matrix indicated that the strongest factor consisted of the Notice items followed by the Accept Responsibility, Act,
Knowledge of Interventions, and Interpret as an Emergency items. Table 1 provides a summary of the items that load onto each factor. Alpha coefficients for each subscale are presented in Table 1, they range from .61 to .77.

**Bivariate Correlations**

To address the second hypothesis, a series of bivariate correlations between the Defender scale of the BPBQ and each scale of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey were conducted. Results indicated that each subscale is significantly correlated in a positive direction with the Defender scale of the BPBQ. A summary of these results can be found in Table 2.

At an alpha level of .05, the Notice scale was significantly correlated with the BPBQ Defender scale, \( r(328) = .25, p < .001 \) (one-tailed), the Interpret as an Emergency scale was significantly correlated with the BPBQ Defender scale, \( r(328) = .11, p = .02 \) (one-tailed), and the Accept Responsibility scale was significantly correlated with the BPBQ Defender scale, \( r(328) = .29, p < .001 \) (one-tailed). Likewise, the Knowledge of Interventions scale was significantly correlated with the BPBQ Defender scale, \( r(328) = .25, p < .001 \) (one-tailed), and the Act scale was significantly correlated with the BPBQ Defender scale, \( r(328) = .27, p < .001 \) (one-tailed).

**Simultaneous Multiple-Regression Analyses**

A series of five simultaneous multiple-regression analyses were conducted to address the final hypothesis. A summary of the results of the multiple regression analyses can be found in Table 3. In each multiple-regression analysis, Cognitive and Affective Empathy were entered as the predictor variables and the outcome variable was
each step of the bystander intervention model (e.g., Notice, Interpret as an Emergency, Accept Responsibility, Knowledge of Interventions, and Act).

At an alpha level of .05, results show that Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 3% of the variance in scores on the Notice scale of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey, $F(2, 321) = 4.48, p = .01$. Cognitive Empathy accounted for most of the variance (3%), $p = .01$. The higher Cognitive Empathy scores the more likely students were to endorse items on the Notice scale.

Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 6% of the variance in scores on the Interpret as an Emergency scale, $F(2, 321) = 9.73, p < .001$. Affective Empathy accounted for most of the variance (5%), $p = .001$. The higher Affective Empathy scores the more likely the students were to endorse items on the Interpret as an Emergency scale.

Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 11% of the variance in scores on the Accept Responsibility scale, $F(2, 321) = 19.78, p < .001$. Cognitive Empathy accounted for most of the variance (6%), $p < .001$. The higher Cognitive Empathy scores the more likely the students were to endorse items on the Accept Responsibility scale.

Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 6% of the variance in scores on the Knowledge of Interventions scale, $F(2, 321) = 10.21, p < .001$. Cognitive Empathy accounted for most of the variance (3%), $p < .001$. The higher Cognitive Empathy scores the more likely the students were to endorse items on the Knowledge of Interventions scale.

Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 11% of the variance in scores on the Act scale, $F(2, 321) = 20.57, p < .001$. Affective Empathy accounted for most of the
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variance (6%), \( p < .001 \). The higher Affective Empathy scores the more likely the students were to endorse items on the Act scale.

**Exploratory Gender Analyses**

In previous studies, there are gender differences in how empathy is associated with bystander intervention (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press; Nickerson et al., 2008). Thus, exploratory analyses were conducted to determine if there were gender differences in Cognitive and Affective Empathy. A t-test for independent means was conducted on the Affective Empathy scores of boys and girls. At an alpha level of .05, results show that girls have statistically significant higher Affective Empathy scores \( (M = 15.45, SD = 4.24) \) than boys \( (M = 12.83, SD = 4.04) \), \( t(322) = 5.64, p > .001 \) (two-tailed), \( d = .63 \). Likewise, a t-test for independent means was conducted on the Cognitive Empathy scores of boys and girls. At an alpha level of .05, results show that girls have statistically significant higher Cognitive Empathy scores \( (M = 12.76, SD = 3.47) \) than boys \( (M = 11.95, SD = 3.63) \), \( t(322) = 2.02, p = .04 \) (two-tailed), \( d = .23 \). A summary of results of these analyses can be found in Table 4.

Because there were significant gender differences in Cognitive and Affective Empathy, additional exploratory analyses were conducted to determine how gender differences in Cognitive and Affective Empathy predict engagement in each step of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey using a series of five standard/simultaneous multiple multiple regression analyses. A summary of these results can be found in Table 5.

At an alpha level of .05, results show that for girls, Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 9% of the variance in scores on the Notice scale of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey, \( F(2, 133) = 6.81, p = .002 \). Cognitive Empathy
accounted for all of the variance (9%), \( p = .002 \). Girls with higher Cognitive Empathy scores were more likely to endorse items on the Notice scale. The analysis for boys was not significant.

For girls, Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 13% of the variance in scores on the Interpret as an Emergency scale, \( F(2, 133) = 10.18, p < .001 \). Affective Empathy accounted for most of the variance (12%), \( p = .001 \). Girls with higher Affective Empathy scores were more likely to endorse items on the Interpret as an Emergency scale. The analysis for boys yielded no significant findings.

For girls, Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 18% of the variance in scores on the Accept Responsibility scale, \( F(2, 133) = 14.65, p < .001 \). Affective empathy accounted for most of the variance (7%), \( p = .01 \), and Cognitive Empathy accounted for 4% of the variance, \( p = .04 \). Girls with higher Cognitive and Affective Empathy scores are more likely to endorse items on the Accept Responsibility scale. For boys, Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 8% of the variance in scores on the Accept Responsibility scale, \( F(2, 185) = 7.60, p = .001 \). Cognitive Empathy accounted for most of the variance (7%), \( p = .003 \). Boys with higher Cognitive Empathy scores are more likely to endorse items on the Accept Responsibility scale.

For girls, Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 10% of the variance in scores on the Knowledge of Interventions scale, \( F(2, 133) = 7.21, p = .001 \). Cognitive Empathy accounted for most of the variance (7%), \( p = .01 \). Girls with higher Cognitive Empathy scores were more likely to endorse items on the Knowledge of Interventions scale. The analysis for boys was not significant.
For girls, Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 24% of the variance in scores on the Act scale, $F(2, 133) = 20.81, p < .001$. Affective Empathy accounted for most of the variance (15%), $p < .001$. Girls with higher Affective Empathy scores were more likely to endorse items on the Act scale. For boys, Cognitive and Affective Empathy account for 4% of the variance in scores on the Act scale, $F(2, 185) = 3.90, p = .02$; however, neither Cognitive nor Affective Empathy accounted for a significant amount of variance on their own.

Additional exploratory analyses were conducted to determine if there were gender differences in the five steps of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey. A one-way analysis of variance was conducted on gender differences in engagement scores on each of the five scales of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey. At an alpha level of .05, results show that there is a significant gender difference in engagement in the Interpret as an Emergency scale, $F(1, 327) = .31, p = .01$. Girls had significantly higher scores on the Interpret as an Emergency scale ($M = 11.01, SD = 1.25$) than boys ($M = 10.55, SD = 1.67$). Likewise, results show that there is a significant gender difference in engagement in the Knowledge of Interventions scale, $F(1, 327) = 9.08, p = .003$. Girls had significantly higher scores on the Knowledge of Interventions scale ($M = 9.35, SD = 1.68$) than boys ($M = 8.73, SD = 1.93$). Results also show that there is a significant gender difference in engagement in the Act scale, $F(1, 327) = 8.79, p = .003$. Girls had statistically significant higher scores on the Act scale ($M = 13.97, SD = 2.04$) than boys ($M = 13.25, SD = 2.26$). A summary of results of this analysis can be found in Table 6.
Discussion

The overarching goal of this study was to examine the validity and reliability of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey with an upper-elementary school sample, and the associations between affective and cognitive empathy and engagement in each of the five bystander intervention steps. Correlations with the defender subscale of the BPBQ revealed convergent validity support for the elementary-school version of the survey. A five-factor model was found to be appropriate for the factor structure, which is consistent with Latané & Darley’s (1970) model; however, the alpha coefficients were lower than desired and did not reflect adequate internal consistency reliability. Furthermore, results show that cognitive and affective empathy are necessary to engage in each of the five steps. Exploratory analyses also revealed interesting gender differences in cognitive and affective empathy, engagement in the five steps, and how cognitive and affective empathy predict engagement in each of the five steps.

Hypothesis I

Hypotheses regarding the factor structure were supported. The exploratory factor analysis showed that a five-factor structure was appropriate as expected after removing Item 16 (If I saw a kid I did not know very well being bullied, I would help them); however, four items had unintended cross loadings (Items 5, 6, 9, and 14). These items loadings with the unintended factors were smaller than their loadings with the intended factors. Nickerson et al. (2014) and Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) also found that a five-factor structure was appropriate for the high school and middle school versions of the survey, which is consistent with Latané & Darley’s five-step model.
Neither Nickerson et al. (2014) nor Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) had to remove Item 16 due to a low loading with the intended factor. However, Padget and Notar (2013) explained that children and adolescents are more likely to intervene when the victim is their friend or is in their peer group. Latané and Rodin (1969) also found that friendship can affect participants’ ability to overcome the bystander effect. Latané and Rodin found that when participants were in a group with a friend, they were more likely to intervene in a mock emergency situation. Thus, it is reasonable to assume that because Item 16 stated that the victim is not a friend, students would be less likely to endorse this item.

The internal consistency reliability estimates were lower for this sample than those obtained in the middle-school sample (Jenkins & Nickerson, in press) and the high-school sample (Nickerson et al., 2014). According to Schmitt (1996), .70 is considered a desirable alpha level. The Act subscale (.69) and the Knowledge of Interventions subscale (.65) approach .70, but the Interpret as an Emergency subscale (.61) falls below this threshold. Schmitt also suggested that alpha levels can be affected by the length of the assessment, and longer assessments tend to have higher alpha levels. The Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey consists of only 16 items, and is a relatively short assessment. A longer assessment may be necessary for elementary-school students to assess the five steps with adequate internal consistency reliability estimates.

**Hypothesis II**

Hypotheses regarding convergent validity of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey and the BPBQ were also confirmed. The results of five bivariate correlations indicate that each subscale of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey...
was significantly positively correlated with the Defender subscale of the BPBQ. This provides preliminary evidence of convergent validity. These results are also consistent with those found by Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) and with the survey’s theoretical backing (i.e., Latané & Darley’s five-step model). Students who defend others are more likely to notice the event, interpret the event as an emergency, accept responsibility to intervene, have knowledge of interventions, and take action to implement the intervention.

**Hypothesis III**

Hypotheses regarding cognitive and affective empathy were not supported; results of a series of multiple regression analyses revealed unexpected results. Based on previous studies, it was hypothesized that those with high affective empathy would be more likely to engage in each of the five steps of the bystander intervention model (Barchia and Bussey, 2011; Caravita et al., 2009; Pöyhönen et al., 2010). Results showed that those high in cognitive empathy were more likely to notice bullying, accept responsibility for intervening, and have knowledge of interventions. Results also showed that those high in affective empathy were more likely to interpret bullying as an emergency, and take action to intervene in bullying. Although this result was not hypothesized, it is consistent with the findings of Barchia and Bussey (2011), Caravita et al., (2009), and Pöyhönen et al. (2010) because these studies assessed overall defender behavior as opposed to the five underlying steps, and affective empathy is a better predictor of the final step (actually taking action to intervene in bullying) than cognitive empathy. Additionally, Pöyhönen et al. (2010) found that in a sample of fourth and eighth grade students that fourth grade students have lower affective empathy scores than
eighth graders (a difference of a full point in mean scores of affective and cognitive empathy), but cognitive empathy scores between the two grades are more similar (a difference of 0.20 points in mean scores of affective and cognitive empathy).

Additionally, it may be developmentally appropriate for elementary-school students to have lower affective empathy scores than middle school students. Caravita et al. (2009) explained that as children get older they develop more complex forms of empathy, and that children continue to develop empathy throughout preschool and elementary school. Therefore, it is reasonable that in an elementary school sample, cognitive empathy would be a better predictor of more defender behaviors than affective empathy. Furthermore, the results show that cognitive and affective empathy are necessary to engage in each of the five steps of Latané & Darley’s (1970) model. This finding is also consistent with the results of van Noorden and colleagues (2014) who concluded that the trend in empathy-bullying research is that cognitive and affective empathy are associated with defender behavior.

**Exploratory Analyses**

Although no hypotheses were formed, exploratory analyses were conducted to determine if there were gender differences in cognitive and affective empathy. Two independent t-tests on gender differences showed that girls had higher cognitive and affective empathy scores than boys. This finding is consistent with the findings of Olweus and Endresen (1998), who conducted a study on sex differences in empathetic responsiveness and also found that girls have significantly higher levels of empathy than boys. This finding is also consistent with the results of Pöyhönén et al. (2010) who found that girls have higher associations with cognitive and affective empathy than boys.
Additionally, a series of multiple regression analyses showed that girls with higher cognitive empathy scores were more likely to notice instances of bullying, have knowledge of interventions, and take action to intervene in bullying. Girls with higher affective empathy scores were more likely to interpret bullying as an emergency, and girls with higher cognitive and affective empathy scores are more likely to accept responsibility for intervening in bullying. While previous research has shown that affective empathy has a stronger relationship with defending behavior (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Caravita et al., 2009), Pöyhönen et al. (2010) found that elementary-school girls report lower levels of affective empathy than middle-school girls. Thus, for elementary-school girls, cognitive empathy may play a bigger role in defender behavior than affective empathy. Also, results showed that boys with higher cognitive empathy scores are more likely to accept responsibility to intervene in bullying; all other multiple regression analyses for boys were not significant. This result is inconsistent with the results of Caravita et al. (2009), who found that for boys, affective empathy had higher associations with defender behavior than cognitive empathy.

There were also gender differences in engagement in three of the five steps of bystander intervention. Girls were more likely than boys to interpret bullying as an emergency, have knowledge of interventions, and take action to intervene in bullying. Likewise, Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) found that girls have higher scores than boys on the Interpret as an Emergency scale. These results are also consistent with previous findings that girls have higher associations with defender behavior than boys (Cappadocia, 2012; Pöyhönen et al., 2010; Salmivalli et al., 1996). It is likely, that for upper elementary school boys, characteristics besides empathy affect an individual’s
likeliness to defend the victim of bullying. Other important characteristics include: perceived popularity (Caravita et al., 2009), social preferences (Caravita et al., 2009), group norms (Salmivalli, 2010), and anti-bullying affiliations (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004).

Limitations

This study is the first investigation of the elementary-school version of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey; however, the participating elementary school is primarily Caucasian and is located in a rural area of the Midwest. The ability to generalize the findings to broader or more diverse populations is limited by these restrictions.

As other studies have discussed (e.g., Caravita et al., 2009; Crothers & Levinson, 2004), relying on self-report measures can inflate results due to social desirability bias, which is the tendency for respondents to present themselves in a favorable light. Thus, reports of empathy and defending behavior could be inflated. For example, Caravita et al. (2009) suggested that girls may be more likely to report higher levels of empathy than boys on self-report measures, but this gender difference is not seen in peer-report methods. Caravita and colleagues suggested that girls may be more likely to perceive themselves as more empathetic because of social stereotypes. As Caravita et al. also suggested, the results of the current study could be further clarified by the use of multi-method measurement of empathy such as peer report, teacher report, or observational methods. In addition, Cappadocia et al. (2012) discussed that results based exclusively on self-report methods must be taken with caution because of shared method variance in using multiple self-report measures.
Future Directions

Future studies should examine the internal consistency reliability estimates of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey to determine if these results will generalize to other studies. Also, because alpha levels were lower than desired, elementary-school students may require a longer measure with more items to achieve adequate reliability estimates to assess the five steps of bystander intervention. Future studies should include a more comprehensive measure or add additional items to the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey to more adequately assess the five steps in elementary-school students. Future studies should also examine convergent validity estimates with other measures of defender behavior, such as the Participant Roles Questionnaire (PRQ; Salmivalli et al., 1996), to provide more evidence of convergent validity.

Furthermore, additional studies should be conducted to determine how other characteristics relate to the five steps of bystander intervention in elementary-school students. Empathy is an important characteristic in predicting defender behavior, but it is not the defining characteristic in determining those who are likely to intervene in bullying. Other characteristics such as perceived popularity (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Pöyhönen et al., 2010) and group norms (Salmivalli, 2010) are also associated with defender behavior, and their associations with the five steps should be examined in elementary-school students.
Practical Implications

Results of this study are applicable to practitioners. If further research shows adequate reliability estimates, elementary schools could administer the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey to all students to determine which steps students are engaging in, and then focus on intervention tools to increase non-engaged steps. Some steps, such as knowledge of interventions, would be easier to increase than others, such as taking action to intervene in bullying.

The results related to empathy can also help schools design bullying prevention and intervention models. Both cognitive and affective empathy were predictors of engagement in the five steps of bystander intervention; thus, programs that focus on increasing empathetic behaviors may be helpful in increasing defender behavior. For example, Manger, Eikeland, & Asbjørnsen (2001) found that the “Reasoning and Reacting” social-cognitive small-group training program was effective in increasing empathy scores of an adolescent sample in Norway compared to a control group. More broadly, increasing the presence of defenders can also improve school climate (Salmivalli et al., 2011).

Conclusion

This study showed preliminary validity evidence for the elementary school version of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey; however, the internal consistency reliability estimates were lower than desired. In addition, results also supported previous findings of Nickerson et al. (2014) and Jenkins and Nickerson (in press) that a five-factor structure is appropriate for this measure. Results also supported the conclusions of van Noorden et al. (2014) who suggested that both cognitive and
affective empathy are associated with defender behavior. Furthermore, this study supported the gender-difference results of Cappadocia (2012), Olweus and Endresen (1998), Pöyhönen et al. (2010), and Salmivalli et al. (1996), who also found that girls have higher empathy scores than boys, and that girls are more likely to defenders than boys.
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Table 1

*Summary of final exploratory factor analysis for the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Items</th>
<th>Loading</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice (alpha = .77)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Bullying is a problem at my school.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kids at my school are bullied.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have seen other kids being bullied at my school this year.</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret as an Emergency (alpha = .61)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When a kid is being bullied they need help.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mean comments can hurt someone’s feelings, even if it is a joke.</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I think bullying is hurtful.</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Responsibility (alpha = .74)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I think it’s up to me to stop bullying.</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Even if I don’t bully others, it’s still up to me to try to stop it.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe my actions can help stop bullying</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Interventions (alpha = .65)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have the skills to help a student who is being bullied.</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I know what to say to get someone to stop bullying someone else.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I can help get someone out of a situation where they are being bullied.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act (alpha = .69)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would tell my friends to stop saying or doing mean things if I see or hear them.</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would say something to a kid who is being mean to another kid.</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would tell my friends to stop saying mean things about someone else.</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2

Summary of series of bivariate correlations between BPBQ Defender scale and each scale of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying survey.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BPBQ Defender</th>
<th>Notice</th>
<th>Interpret as an Emergency</th>
<th>Accept Responsibility</th>
<th>Knowledge of Interventions</th>
<th>Act</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.114*</td>
<td>.294**</td>
<td>.249**</td>
<td>.271**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. ** $p < .001$, * $p < .05$
Table 3

*Summary of results of series of multiple regression analyses of Cognitive and Affective Empathy and each step of the Bystander Intervention in Bullying Survey.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice (R² = .11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret as an Emergency (R² = .06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Responsibility (R² = .11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Interventions (R² = .06)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.16*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act (R² = .11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.24***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *** p < .001, ** p < .01, * p < .05
Table 4

*Summary of exploratory analyses of variance of gender differences in cognitive and affective empathy.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Sources of Variance</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>5.64**</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>12.83</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>Girls</td>
<td>12.76</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.02*</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Boys</td>
<td>11.95</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: **p < .001, *p < .05*
Table 5

*Summary of exploratory series of multiple regression analyses of Cognitive and Affective Empathy separated by gender.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>β</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Notice</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys (R² = .005)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (R² = .09)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.33**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Interpret as an Emergency</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys (R² = .02)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (R² = .13)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.35**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Accept Responsibility</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys (R² = .08)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.007</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (R² = .18)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.26*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Knowledge of Interventions</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys (R² = .03)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (R² = 1.00)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Act</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boys (R² = .04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Girls (R² = .24)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affective Empathy</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.39***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognitive Empathy</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05
Table 6

Summary of exploratory gender difference analyses of variance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Sources of Variance</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Notice</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1481.38</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>4.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interpret as an Emergency</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.95</td>
<td>7.40*</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>748.57</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accept Responsibility</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1195.76</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledge of Interventions</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>30.34</td>
<td>9.08**</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1092.64</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41.54</td>
<td>8.79**</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>1545.88</td>
<td>327</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.** *p < .01, *p < .05*
Appendix A

Bystander Intervention Model in Bullying
(Notice event, Interpret event as emergency, Accept responsibility, Knowledge of how to help, Implement intervention)

Directions: Circle how much you agree or disagree with each sentence. Circle one number for each sentence. Think about all the kids in your grade, and be honest when circling your answer. Your parents, teachers, and friends will not be able to see your answers.

Bullying is when a person says or does mean things to someone else more than one time. It is not when someone says or does mean things by mistake. If my friend trips a student, by mistake, says sorry after, and does not do it again, it is not bullying. But, if my friend trips the same person two times, it is bullying. Also, if my friend calls a student a mean name more than one time, it is bullying.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circle how much you agree or disagree with each sentence. Circle one number for each sentence.</th>
<th>Really Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Really Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Bullying is a problem at my school.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Kids at my school are bullied.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I have seen other kids being bullied at my school this year.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. When a kid is being bullied they need help.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Mean comments can hurt someone’s feelings, even if it is a joke.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I think bullying is hurtful.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I think it is up to me to help stop bullying.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Even if I don’t bully others, it is still up to me to try to stop it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I believe that my actions can help stop bullying.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I have the skills to help a student who is being bullied.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I know what to say to get someone to stop bullying someone else.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I can help get someone out of a situation where they are being bullied.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would tell my friends to stop saying or doing mean things if I see or hear them.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>14. I would say something to a kid who is being mean to another kid.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>15. I would tell my friend to stop saying mean things about someone else.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16. If I saw a kid I did not know very well being bullied, I would help them.</strong></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix B

Bullying Participant Behavior Questionnaire Defender Scale

For each of the statements below, indicate how often this has happened to you in the past 30 days (or one month): Never, 1-2 times, 3-4 times, 5-6 times, or 7 or more times in the past month.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you done any of the following in the past 30 days?</th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>1-2 Times</th>
<th>3-4 Times</th>
<th>5-6 Times</th>
<th>7 or More Times</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I tried to become friends with someone after they were picked on.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I encouraged someone to tell an adult after they were picked on.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I defended someone who was being pushed, punched, or slapped.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I defended someone who had things purposely taken from them.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I defended someone who was being called mean names.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I tried to include someone if they were being purposely left out.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I helped someone who had their books knocked out of their hands on purpose.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I helped someone who was purposely tripped.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. When I saw someone being physically harmed, I told an adult.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I defended someone who I thought was being tricked on purpose.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix C

#### How I feel in Different Situations

Decide how true each statement is to you. 

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Never True</th>
<th>Sometimes True</th>
<th>Often True</th>
<th>Always True</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. When somebody tells me a nice story, I feel as if the story is happening to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Seeing a friend crying makes me feel as if I am crying too.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. When somebody I care about is sad, I feel sad too.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Seeing a child being spanked upsets me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel sad when something bad happens to a character in a story.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. When my friend is disappointed, I feel disappointed too.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I can imagine how my parents feel, even if they don’t show it.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I am able to recognize, before many other children, that other people’s feelings have changed.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I can tell when my parents are worried about me even if they don’t say so.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I am able to understand how other people react to things that I do.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I can sense when somebody I am with is getting irritated, even if he/she doesn’t say so.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I can sense how my friends feel from the way they behave.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>