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ABSTRACT

Gender Differences of Absenteeism Related to Bullying in School-Aged Children and Adolescents

A thesis presented to the Department of Psychology
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Waltham, Massachusetts

By Kayley Gaukler

The proposed study aims to look at the relationship between bullying, school attendance, and gender. A variety of differences among males and females have been reported in regards to bullying types. For example, males are more likely to engage in physical bullying while females are more likely to engage in relational bullying. However, previous research has indicated no differences in rates of victimization. Impacts of bullying also have apparent gender differences specifically an increase in absenteeism compared to uninvolved children. A hypothetical study, which would explore the gender difference of absenteeism with regards to bullying status, is explained. It is expected that results from this study could indicate that females are more likely than males to be absent from school as an effect of victimization.
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Introduction

Aggression is a common emotion in children, which sometimes develops into the unhealthy pattern that has come to be referred to as bullying. Bullying has various subtypes and gender norms which may differentially impact on emotional, interpersonal and academic outcomes. A child’s main job is to go to school and learn. However, the experience of bullying might interfere with this job as research has shown that being bullied might lead to increased absence from school (Ladd, 1999). In exploring this concern, research has yielded various results on what impact gender plays in bullying and absenteeism. Additionally, a lack of clarity in the field exists regarding the directionality between bullying and school attendance. The study proposed herein seeks to explore both gender differences in absenteeism related to bullying and the directionality of the relationship between the two.

Aggression and Bullying

Two distinct forms of aggression have been identified. In proactive aggression, children initiate the behavior in an instrumental way to achieve a goal or express anger and or power. In reactive aggression, children respond defensively when provoked by an individual or to bypass a block to their goal. This type of aggression is performed in attempts to hurt another individual. Proactive aggression is more common in younger children who have not yet learned delayed gratification while reactive aggression begins to be more common in early childhood and continues through middle childhood. (Berk, 2012)
There are three variations or subtypes to each of these forms of aggression. Physical aggression involves physical control of and/or harm to a victim. Verbal aggression is when control of or harm to a victim is exercised through threat of physical aggression, hostility, or name calling. Relational aggression is when an individual tries to control or harm a victim through social relationships, such as social exclusion, gossip, or manipulation (Card, Stucky, Sawalani, & Little, 2008). Physical and verbal aggression are always done directly but relational aggression may be done directly or indirectly (Berk, 2012).

Bullying falls into these categories of aggression as well and may involve verbal, physical, or and relational aggression, or combinations thereof. Bullying is defined as unwanted, aggressive behavior among school aged children that involves a real or perceived power imbalance (Scheithauer, Hayer, Petermann, & Jugert, 2006). Olweus (1997) further specifies that for behavior to qualify as bullying it must be negative and repeated overtime.

Bullying may occur face-to-face which is the traditional method or through the use of various electronic devices, known as cyberbullying (Brighi, Guarini, Melotti, Galli, & Genta, 2012). There are two subtypes of bullying: direct and indirect. Direct bullying is categorized by overt acts of aggression while indirect bullying is categorized by covert, often manipulative, acts of aggression. Both direct and indirect bullying and be further divided into physical, verbal, or relational bullying (Mynard & Joseph, 2000). Very similar to the subtypes of aggression (Card et. al., 2008), physical bullying includes physical actions such as hitting or kicking, verbal bullying includes teasing or swearing, and relational bullying involves spreading rumors or excluding a peer. Physical and verbal bullying are direct while relational bullying is indirect (Mynard & Joseph, 2000). Cyberbullying involves a combination of verbal and relational bullying (Brighi et al., 2012).
There are four categories which classify bullying status: uninvolved, bullies, victims, or bully-victims (Camodeca, Goossens, Terwogt, & Schuengel, 2002; Burton, Florell, & Gore, 2013). Uninvolved students are neither bullies or victims, bullies are students who only engage in bullying behavior but never experience it, victims are students who experience bullying behavior but never engage in it (Burton et. al., 2013), and bully-victims are students who both engage in bullying behavior and are the victims of bullying behavior (Camodeca et. al., 2002).

**Prevalence of Bullying**

Rates of bullying and victimization in children have been explored globally using a variety of techniques. The most common technique to measure bullying in children is self-reports, either definition- or behavior-based. Definition-based-self-report involves giving the student a brief definition or description of bullying and asking if he/she has ever experienced bullying or bullied others. Behavior-based-self-report involves breaking bullying down into basic actions and asking how frequently he/she perform the action or experience the action from others (Sawyer, Bradshaw, & O'Brennan, 2008). It has been found that students are more likely to report they have experienced or engaged in bullying behavior when a behavior-based self-report is used compared to a definition-based (Sawyer, Bradshaw, & O'Brennan, 2008; Thomas, Connor, & Scott, 2014).

One study which used a revised version of the Bully/Victim Questionnaire (BVQ) originally developed by Olweus in 1996 looked at bullying rates across schools in two German states. The German version of this questionnaire was used. This report takes into account the different forms of bullying that may occur such as physical, verbal, and relational. This questionnaire is made up of 50 items which are related to socio-demographic information, experiences of bullying (both as a bully and victim), attitude toward bullying, and response to
bullying by authority figures. Relational bullying, physical bullying, and verbal bullying were all addressed by the questionnaire. The questionnaire was given anonymously to 2,086 students in grades five through ten (males $n=1,040$ females $n=1,046$). The results indicated that overall 12.1% of students reported bullying others, 11.1% of students reported being victims of bullying, and 2.3% of students were classified as bully/victims (students who participate in both bullying behavior and are victims as well) (Scheithauer et. al., 2006).

A similar study was done using the same questionnaire in Norway. Researchers anonymously gave the questionnaire to 5,171 students in grades 5 through 9 (ages 11 through 15, males $n=2,544$ females $n=2,627$) in the spring of 1977. Researchers found through the results that rates of victimization vary by school level. They found that bullying behavior was more common at the secondary school level with a 6-16% of students participating in bullying compared to the primary level where they estimated 1-12% of students participate in bullying. Victimization appears to occur more at the primary level with 4-20% of students are estimated to be victims then at the secondary school level where 4-17% of students are estimated to be victims. (Solberg & Olweus, 2003)

More recent research has yielded similar results. However, rates of bullying in the United States have begun to decrease since the 1990s with current information (2009) classifying 28% of students as bullies (Finkelhor, 2013). These rates do vary across different studies but bullying remains to be a significant problem for children in the US. One study which used information from the National Survey for Children’s Health as well as a parent-report bullying measure found that in 2003 23% of participants (age 10-17) of children measured had experienced victimization and in 2007, 15% of children were believed to have experienced victimization (Shetgiri, Lin, & Flores, 2013).
One study looked at bullying, both traditional and cyber, across varying regions of the United States using 4,720 students age 11 to 19 and two definition-based self-reports adapted from the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire—one which looked at traditional bullying and one which looked at cyberbullying. Results indicated that in the two months prior to the reporting, 37.8% of participants reported being victims of traditional bullying and 31.8% reported having engaged in traditional bullying. It was also found that 17.3% reported being victims of cyberbullying, and 10.9% reported having performed cyberbullying (Kowalski, Morgan, & Limber, 2012).

Gender Differences Among Prevalence

In the study which focused on German students, a significantly higher number of boys than girls reported bullying others with no significant gender difference in rates of victimization. More boys than girls were also classified as bully/victims (Scheithauer et. al., 2006). The study which was also done in Norway found that boys were significantly more likely to report bullying peers than girls at rates of 9.7% and 3.2 percent across all age levels, respectfully (Solberg & Olweus, 2003).

Gender Differences Among Subtypes

Gender differences among the three varieties of aggression are clear and apparent as early as 17 months old. At this age, males are already more physically aggressive than females and this trend is consistent throughout childhood. Meanwhile, females are more likely to show relational aggression and verbal aggression (Card et. al., 2008). In the study which used the BVQ in Germany, it was found that boys reported higher rates of being physically bullied than girls (Scheithauer et. al., 2006). A study done which used a variety of teacher and self-reports to measure rates of bullying and victimization in 670 7th and 8th grade students in the Midwest
found that there were similar significant differences among types of bullying in boys and girls. It was found that girls were more likely to experience relational bullying and boys were significantly more likely to experience verbal and physical forms of bullying (Rueger & Jenkins, 2014).

Various subsequent research supports the idea that boys show more physical bullying patterns while girls are more likely to engage in relational bullying behavior (Crapanzano, Frick, Childs, & Terranova, 2011; Archer, 2004).

**Impacts of Bullying**

There have been many studies done which examine the implications of bullying on school age children. The results of these studies have indicated that there are vast and multiple negative implications which may arise if a child experiences bullying or engages in bullying behavior. One of the focuses of this research is to examine what extent school experience is affected. Ladd (1999) indicated that victimization may be a cause of absenteeism during grade school as well as have negative effects on grades of students. Bullying behavior, specifically victimization, may also be a predictor of adjustment difficulties during the middle school years.

This topic was further explored by Coie, Lochman, Terry, and Hyman (1992) who completed a longitudinal study which followed two cohorts of black third-grade children into early adolescents. The children in the cohorts were from low to middle income families and came from twelve schools within the Durham city school system. In attempts to find data for the hypothesis that victimization was a predictor of school adjustment problems, the researchers used a variety of techniques such as teacher rating, parent ratings, and adolescent self-report to gather data. They also looked at rates of aggression in the participants and examined what effect
that has on school adjustment as well. It was concluded through the study that both victimization and aggression (bullying) are significant predictors of adjustment difficulty in early adolescent.

Various other studies have also been conducted to examine the impact of bullying in relation to an academic setting. One such study found that being a victim of bullying was positively correlated to frequent absenteeism and getting into trouble excessively at school for students in the 10th grade (Gastic, 2008).

Bullying is also linked to internalizing and externalizing problems for victims. It has been found that girls are significantly more likely to experience internalizing problems when they are the victims of bullying. They also may experience higher anxiety and lower self-esteem than boys who are bullied. (Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002) Internalizing problems have been linked to withdraw symptoms. Such behavior may cause a person to voluntary remove themselves from their environment. For example, they may no longer spend time with friends or doing activities they have previously enjoyed. (Strauss, Forehand, Smith, & Frame, 1986)

**Gender Differences on Academic Impacts**

In addition to differences among internalizing and externalizing problems for boys and girls who are involved in bullying or victimization, there are significant gender differences among academics as well. A similar study to that of Gastic (2008) was conducted in Ghana and focused on absenteeism in senior high school students. It was found that bullying was linked with higher rates of absenteeism in girls than in boys and was specifically higher for girls who have experienced psychological (relational) bullying (Dunne, Sabates, Bosumtwi-Sam, & Owusu, 2013).

Other gender differences in relation to academic impacts have been found between boys and girls. One study explored these gender differences and concluded that while victimized
females had better attitudes toward school than males who were victimized, longitudinal effects for females is linked with academic maladjustment and higher levels of anxiety in school than males. When looking at absenteeism, however, this study did not yield results consistent with other finding. Researchers did not find any gender differences among absenteeism between males and females who were bullied (Rueger & Jenkins, 2014).

The issue of absenteeism in students is a concern because many studies have been done which support the idea that regular absence from school has negative effects on academic performance. It can also be concluded that “children who frequently miss or are late to school fail to benefit from teacher instruction and modeling, peer interactions, and other activities designed to scaffold learning” (Morrissey et. al., 2014).

**Bullying and Attendance**

In exploring the relationship between bullying and attendance, the direction of the relationship should be explored as well. Does bullying cause lack of attendance in school or does lack of attendance in school cause bullying? It could be argued that a lack of being in school does not allow children as many opportunities to make friends and thus they are a more frequent target of aggression by peers.

If it is found that bullying is the cause of absence, it could be explained by a variety of factors. One such factor is that the fear or experience of bullying is causing the student to avoid school and thus not attend. One study done by Hutzell and Payne (2012) explored rates of avoidance to school and certain locations in a school setting of students who have experienced bullying. Using data from the National Crime Victimization Survey: School Crime Supplement 2007, the researchers were able to examine data of 11,161 students between the ages of 12 and 18. Bullying victimization and school avoidance were both measured using a series of questions
complied by the researchers. It was found that students who experience bully victimization were more likely to exhibit avoidance behavior. It was also found that high rates of avoidance behavior were shown for students with low academic achievement and those who attend public school.

Another reason a student may be absent is because they are experiencing physical symptoms from the fear of bullying and thus are too ill to attend school. This may be especially true in younger children. A study done which used the Children’s Manifest Anxiety Scale compared 453 4th graders and 6th graders from a southern elementary school. The researchers found that 4th graders were significantly more likely than 6th graders to report more anxiety on items which express psychological or psychosomatic symptoms including feeling sick to the stomach and faster heartbeat (Bledsoe, 1973). Bullying might cause children to experience anxiety that produces similar symptoms.

A third factor might be the child’s incentive to go to school. For example, if a child does not really enjoy school academically and they are being bullied, they might feel less desire to risk experiencing bullying and just use it as an excuse to stay home. However, if a child enjoys school and its academic challenges then he/she might be more likely to risk a bullying encounter to go to school. One study which explored the relationship between school liking found that it could be predicted from peer acceptance along with perceived peer support. Gender was found as a moderator of this predictor. It was also found that changes in peer acceptance were a significant predictor of changes in school liking over time. (Boulton, Don, & Boulton, 2011). Role of self-esteem could also contribute to school liking.
Baseline Rates of Attendance

It is important to consider the gender differences in attendance before exploring them in relation to bullying. Multiple studies have been done in and outside of the United States with varying results on baseline gender differences of absenteeism.

One such study was done in an urban public school in Florida. The goal of this study was to explore the relationship between family income, academic performance, and school attendance. The researchers also looked at gender and age in relation to school attendance. The study was done using a longitudinal design with various cohorts with a total of 35,419 children. The study began in 2003 and look at grades kindergarten through fourth. Data was collected each academic year for each of the five cohorts. School attendance was measured from school records which reported the total number of days absent and tardy per student. Active attendance reports were submitted daily by each teacher to create these records (Morrissey et. al., 2014).

It was found by looking across the grades that absence significantly declined from kindergarten to fourth grade. It was suggested by the author that this could be because the importance of school increased as a student aged. It was also found that there was no significant difference between child gender and school absence as well as family income status and academic achievement. (Morrissey et. al., 2014).

Measure of Attendance

In the United States, schools are responsible for recording a student’s absence from school, the reason for absence, and if the absence is authorized or unauthorized. The reason for the absence is recorded from a note or contact with the parent of guardian of the child or a doctor. However, sometimes the reason given to the school may not accurately reflect the true
reason a student was absent from school. For example, a student might tell his/her parent he is
sick or not feeling well when in actuality he is avoiding school because of a bullying instance.
For the researcher to accurately measure if an absence has any relation to bullying, the use of a
student journal could be helpful.

In a study which took place at the University of Technology in Sydney, Australia,
graduate students were encouraged to keep a journal throughout the course of this semester
which would reflect on their development throughout the course. This journal was then used by a
course evaluator to obtain qualitative data regarding the course content, structure, and
assessment. Because data was not written specifically for a course assessment, more accurate
information was obtained regarding student’s feelings toward the course (Wagner, 1999). Such a
style could be used to accurately assess reasons for absences in students.

Present Study

The purpose of the present study is to use a cross-sectional design to examine the gender
difference in the relationship between bullying status and the rates of absence in students from
kindergarten through eighth grade. Age differences will also be explored, though no significant
differences are expected. The relationship between gender and bullying and bullying and absence
will additionally be explored. Definition-based self-report will be used to measure bullying status
and school records will be used to measure absence. Self-report, as well as parent-report of
internalizing behavior, will be completed three times over the course of the school year which
will be the length of the study. Use of a weekly student journal to look at the directionality of any
relationship between absence and bullying will also be used. This will be a pilot study for a
potential longitudinal study which will more deeply explore the directionality of any relationship between bullying and absence.

Hypotheses

- **Hypothesis 1:** No significant gender differences between rates of victimization will be found but high rates of bullying others in males than females will be found as consistent with previous findings (Scheithauer et. al., 2006; Kochenderfer-Ladd & Skinner, 2002).

- **Hypothesis 2:** Higher rates of relational bullying in females and higher rates of physical bullying in males will be found with no significant gender difference in verbal bullying as consistent with previous findings (Rueger & Jenkins, 2014).

- **Hypothesis 3:** Students who are classified as victims and bully-victims will be absent significantly more than students who are classified as bullied or uninvolved (Ladd, 1999; Gastic et. al., 2008; Rueger & Jenkins, 2014).

- **Hypothesis 4:** No significant differences in absence are expected between students who are classified as uninvolved and those who are classified as bullies (Gastic et. al., 2008; Rueger & Jenkins, 2014).

- **Hypothesis 5:** Among those who are classified as victims, females will be more likely than males to be absent from school due to their increased behavior of internalizing problems as support by some research such as Dunne et. al. (2013).

- **Hypothesis 6:** Though Ladd (1999) found a relationship between victimization predicting absenteeism, he did not explore the possibility that absenteeism could predict victimization. Lack of existing research on this topic leads to the hypothesis that frequent absenteeism from school could predict victimization as well as victimization predicting frequent absenteeism. This will be more greatly explored in a later longitudinal study.
Methods

A pilot study will be done which looks at grades K through 8 in one year and examines any apparent differences across the grades. This pilot study will be used specifically for exploring the gender difference in bullying as explained in Hypothesis 1. The data from the study will also be used to examine the differences in specific bullying status and gender as explained in Hypothesis 2. Since the study will also look at absence, it will compare bullying status with frequency of absence in individual students in regards to bullying status as explained by Hypothesis 3 and Hypothesis 4. The combination of gender, absence, and bullying will be explored as well as explained by Hypothesis 5. The relationship between gender and internalizing behavior will be explored as well.

Participants

This cross-sectional study will used participants starting at the beginning of kindergarten with an equal divide of males and females and follow the students through the completion of grade 8. Participants will be recruited from local elementary schools from the Boston area. The sample will be ethnically diverse and representative of the school district. Consent will be obtained from the parents of the students to participate in the study. The sample size will be 1000 students with an equal divide in gender (female and male groups of n=500).

Measures

Definition-based self-reports will be used in this study to get a more accurate assessment of bullying behavior amongst students. Students will be given self-reports at three different times
during the school year—the beginning, to provide a baseline (first week of school), the middle (beginning of January), and end (last week of school). Students in kindergarten through second grade will receive assistance completing the questionnaire by an unbiased party.

The Bully/Victim Questionnaire by Olweus will be revised and will be used to assess basic socio-demographic information as well as the student’s experiences of bullying. Both experiences of traditional bullying and cyberbullying will be explored. For the purpose of the study, traditional and cyberbullying will be combined into one measure of bullying status.

Absence will be measured by mandatory daily report by teachers, which marks which days the student was absent and the reason given by the student for the absence as well as if the absence was authorized or unauthorized. The yearly total of days of absence will be used as the indicator of absence for the data.

The Child Behavior Checklist (CBCL) will be used to examine other problem areas in the child’s life such as any emotional, behavioral, or social problems. The CBCL measures internalizing and externalizing behavior. For the purpose of this study, internalizing behavior will be examined. This is a parent-report questionnaire.

A journal will be used as a dependent measure which looks at children’s experiences related to bullying and their feelings toward school. The journal will be different to match the literacy levels of the children across grades (see Appendix, pages 19 and 22). Grades kindergarten through second will complete the journal by the use of an interactive game which will provide questions through the use of a well-known children’s character such as Elmo. Questions will be given to students in grades 3-5 in the form of yes or no questions with short answers for further explanation. A prompt style will be used for grades 5 and above. The journal will be completed as an end of the week activity each week by each student. In the follow-up
study, the journal will be used primarily as another measure of bullying/victimization. The researcher will analyze the journal and code for instances of bullying and victimization behavior as based on the answers provided by the students. For example, an answer of “yes” to the question of “Was anyone mean to you today?” will indicate victimization. Similar to the BVQ, students will be classified as uninvolved, victims, bullies, or bully/victims. This will be an additional variable added to the dataset in additional research. The journal will also look at a student’s feelings toward school for the variable of “schoollike”. If a child indicates that they enjoy coming to school consistently, the variable will reflect positive school liking. These variables will both be fitted in a regression model to predict overall rates of absence.

Procedure

After the participants are recruited, consent will be obtained from the parents in the form of passive consent. All parents/guardians will receive a letter which describes the research and the study’s purpose with the option to opt their children out of the study (see Appendix, page 18).

In the first week of school, students will take the Bully/Victim Questionnaire to obtain a baseline bullying status score. Parents will also complete the CBCL in the first week of school. The questionnaire will be available online for them to complete. These measures will be repeated midway throughout the school year and during the last week of school.

Throughout the school year, students will use journaling as a dependent measure of bullying and feelings toward school. They will complete the journal based on grade level. The journaling will take place at the end of every week in the classroom.

Analytical Plan
The first step in analysis of the data will be to identify the variables. The outcome variable will be total days absent from school and will be called “daysabsent”. This will come from the attendance reports required by the school. Bully status as defined by the Bully/Victim Questionnaire will be measured at three different time points—beginning of the school year, halfway through the school year at the start of the second semester, and the end of the school. These variables will be called “bullybase”, “bullymid”, and “bullyend”. All three of these variables will be representative of a bullying status. Status of uninvolved will be represented by “0”, victim will be represented by “1”, bully will be represented by “3”, and bully/victim will be represented by “3”. The subtypes of bullying will be included in the later 3 categories with the first number being followed by a second. The subtype of relational will be represented by “1”, physical by “2”, and verbal by “3”. For example, victims who experience relational victimization will be coded as “11”. Internalizing behavior, which was measured by the CBCL, will be measured at the same time points. These three variables will be called “internalizing1”, “internalizing2”, and “internalizing3”. “Gender” will also be a variable. This will be a dummy coded variable where “1” is representative of female and “0” is representative of male. Since the pilot study will look at each grade level K to 8, “age” will also be a variable in the dataset. For the use of the model and for analysis, the measures of bullying and internalizing behavior at the end point will be used. See Table 1 (see Appendix, page 21) for a summary of the variables.

Initial simple correlations will be computed among all the continuous variables (including dummy coding variables).

To test Hypothesis 1, which will look at the variables “gender” and “bullyend”, a 2 by 4 contingency table will be used along with a chi-square test of independence. This will be done to
compare victimization, represented by “1”, and bullying, represented by “2” between male and female. It is suspected that there will be no significant difference.

To test Hypothesis 2, the subtype of bully in “bullyend” will be used. A contingency table and chi-square test of independence will be used to compare gender across “bullyend” for “31”, “32”, and “33”. Further log-linear modeling will help test the hypothesis that there will significant difference with relational bullying (“31”) with females being higher, significant difference with physical bullying (“32”) with males having higher rates, and no significant difference in verbal bullying (“33”).

Hypothesis 3 will look at the variables “daysabsent” and “bullyend”. ANOVA will be done which will compare victims and bully/victims to bully and uninvolved in regards to days absent. It is suspected that there will be significant difference between the two groups with the first group of victims and bully/victims having more days absent from school.

To test Hypothesis 4, the method of a planned comparison ANOVA will be used. This time the groups being compared will be bully and uninvolved (“2” and “0” in “bullyend”). It is suspected that there will be no significant difference between these two groups in days absent.

Hypothesis 5 will use the methods of ANOVA and regression. ANOVA will first be used to test the difference between females who are victims and males who are victims on days absent to see if any significant difference exists. Then a regression model will be fitted with the outcome variable as “daysabsent”. The other variables will be “bullyend” and “internalizing3”. In addition, gender will be in the model as well. Significant interactions between variables will be tested and added to the model as needed. The variable “age” will also be tested for significance.
Appendix

Letter to Parents:

Dear Parent/Guardian,

A research study is currently being conducted in your child’s school which looks at the implications bullying has on attendance. Researchers are interested if there is a link between a child’s bullying status and the rates of school being missed. This study is a pilot study being done throughout grades Kindergarten through 8th grade. It involves the children completing a self-report questionnaire titles the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire three times over the course of the school year (beginning, middle, and end) as well as the parent’s completing the Child Behavior Checklist at the same time points. The students will complete the questionnaire in class time and parents will complete the questionnaire at home online. In addition to these two questionnaires, students will complete a weekly journaling activity in class. Journals will be done independently and created to fit a child’s literacy ability. The journal will be targeted to explore a child’s feelings toward school and experiences with peers. Only the researchers will have access to the journals. Attendance reports will be used and provided by the administration. Results from this study will remain confidential and a child’s personal information will never be revealed. If you do not wish for your child to participate in this study or have additional, please contact the researcher at XXXXXXXX.

Thank you.
Journal for grades 3-5:

Please circle a response and answer the question in one or two sentences:

Was anyone nice to you today? Yes  No

What did they do?

Was anyone mean to you today? Yes  No

What did they do?

Did you see anyone be nice to somebody today? Yes  No

What did they do?

Did you see anyone be mean to somebody today? Yes  No

What did they do?

Were you nice to anyone today? Yes  No

What did you do?

Were you mean to anyone today? Yes  No

What did you do?

Are you excited to come to school? Yes  No

What do you like about school?

What don’t you like about school?

Journal for grades 5-8:

Please write about your interactions with other students today. Did you see or experience anything positive or negative? Did you behave in a positive or negative way toward another student? Please briefly describe what happened. Also explain how you felt before coming to
school today. Were you excited and happy to come to school? What do you like and dislike about school.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Name</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Coding/Value Label</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Gender        | Describes if the student is male or female | “0”=male  
“1”=female |
| Age           | Age of student at beginning of school year | |
| daysabsent    | Total number of days absent in school year | |
| bullybase     | Bullying status at baseline of BVQ (first week of school) as first number with second number as subtype | “0”=uninvolved  
“1”=victim  
“2”=bully  
“3”=bully/victim  
“1”=relational  
“2”=physical  
“3”=verbal |
| bullymid      | Bullying status at midline of BVQ (January) as first number with second number as subtype | “0”=uninvolved  
“1”=victim  
“2”=bully  
“3”=bully/victim  
“1”=relational  
“2”=physical  
“3”=verbal |
| bullyend      | Bullying status at final BVQ (last week of school) as first number with second number as subtype | “0”=uninvolved  
“1”=victim  
“2”=bully  
“3”=bully/victim  
“1”=relational  
“2”=physical  
“3”=verbal |
| Internalizing1| Score of CBCL from time 1 (first week of school) | |
| Internalizing2| Score of CBCL from time 2 (January) | |
| Internalizing3| Score of CBCL from time 3 (last week of school) | |
Was anyone nice to you today?

Yes

No
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