

DO I TRUST YOU? BULLYING VICTIMS' SOCIAL SUPPORT WITH THEIR TEACHERS AND FRIENDS

Rachel Dinkes, M.Sc. ^a

^a American Institutes for Research

Abstract

Bullying is thought to be one of the most prevalent forms of victimization in our nation's schools. Understanding bullying victimization is critical to the emotional and social health of students. Using the 2005 School Crime Supplement, this study is an examination of the social supports for bullying victims. The objectives of this study are to: (a) present detailed descriptive data on the types of bullying that students report experiencing; (b) investigate differences in the perceived social support of students who are bullying victims and non-victims; and (c) investigate the relationship between bullying victimization and social support, controlling for student and school background characteristics and type of bullying. Significant differences in social support were found between bullying victims and nonvictims as well as by type of bullying.

Introduction

Our nation's schools should be safe havens, free of crime and violence, where students can focus on learning (Dinkes, Cataldi, Kena, and Baum, 2006). Any instance of crime or violence at school affects those who are involved as well as bystanders and the surrounding school environment. Although weapon carrying, theft, and drug use may be more obvious acts of school crime, bullying is thought to affect the greatest number of students (Batsche, 2002) and leads to some of the most deleterious personal and school outcomes. Bullying victimization has been correlated with poor mental health, insecurity, depression, subsequent adult mental health problems, dropping out of school, and academic difficulties (Cohn & Canter, 2002; Swearer et al., 2004; Sharp, Thompson, & Auroa, 2000; Borg, 1998).

The presence of social support in students' lives is considered a positive factor which has many positive associations (Demaray & Malecki, 2003). Although there are many negative outcomes associated with bullying victimization (such as those listed above), social support mitigates these negative outcomes. A seminal study in this field by Demaray and Malecki (2003) was limited to a small, mostly Hispanic urban middle school, which limits their findings. This study expands on the work of Demaray and Malecki by using a nationally representative sample of students.

As used in this paper, social support is defined as support that contributes to a person's overall physical and mental well-being (Kilpatrick & Malecki, 2003). Social support can come from friends, adults, or teachers and can come in many different forms. For example, emotional support can come from listening, and informational support can come from books, magazine articles, and pamphlets. Respondents to social support questions are able to provide an evaluation of support they perceive to be available and/or actually use (such as "strongly agree," "agree," "disagree," and "strongly disagree") (Tardy, 1985). Similar to the effects of victimization, low levels of social support have been correlated with poor psychological, social, academic, and health outcomes (Levitt, 1994; Frey & Rothlisberger, 1996).

Although there is a large body of work showing that social support is strongly related to positive student outcomes, there is a limited body of research that investigates the relationship between social support and bullying victimization. Despite this lack of research, bullying prevention programs that encourage youth to speak out about their victimization – such as the “Stop Bullying Now!” campaign – have proliferated. However, without an understanding of whether or not bullying victims have the social support to speak out and inform an adult, teacher, or friend that the bullying is occurring, intervention programs based on student outspokenness are misguided. Although the “Stop Bullying Now!” campaign encourages teachers to recognize the signs of bullying and intervene, research has shown that teachers are less likely to intervene in victimization scenarios involving relational (i.e., emotional) bullying than in those involving overt (i.e., physical) bullying. This study is an examination of victimization by overt and relational bullying and perceived social support for victims in order to provide insight into how social support varies by specific types of victimization.

The objectives of this study are to: (a) present detailed descriptive data on the types of bullying behavior that students report experiencing, (b) investigate differences in the perceived social support of students who are bullying victims and students who are not victims, and © investigate the relationship between victimization and social support, controlling for student and school background characteristics and various types of bullying.

Specifically, using seven social support outcome measures (page 72), the research questions for this study include the following:

- What is the association between victimization and social support, controlling for student and school factors such as race, gender, grade, and school type?
- Does the relationship between bullying victimization and social support vary according to the type of bullying victimization and social support measure?

Theoretical Framework

Bullying is defined as a harmful behavior by a person or group that occurs repeatedly over time (Demary & Malecki, 2003). Research has shown that bullying victims are more likely to be socially marginalized than their peers (Nansel et al., 2001; Olweus, 1994) and less likely to have social support (Rigby, 2000). Understanding this relationship between bullying victims and social support is crucial to identifying successful intervention methods.

Previous research has shown that certain school and student characteristics are correlated with bullying victimization. Gender, for example, is positively correlated with certain types of bullying victimization. Research has shown that girls are more likely to be victims of relational bullying and boys are more likely to experience overt bullying. It has also been shown that girls, in general, are more likely than boys to report having social support. Rigby (2000) found that girls who reported having social support were less likely to report being a victim of bullying, in general, and less likely to report frequent bullying victimization. Furlong et al. (1995) also found that bullying victims had lower levels of social support.

There is a disconnect between the emphasis of the intervention literature for bullying victims to speak out and the limited research into whether or not the bullying victims have the social support structure that enables them to do so. This research fills that gap.

Data

The analysis for this study uses data from the 2005 School Crime Supplement (SCS), which is one of the leading national data sets on school crime and safety in the United States. The SCS is appended to the National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS), which is administered for the U.S. Bureau of Justice Statistics by the U.S. Bureau of the Census and is the nation's primary source of information on crime and the victims of crime.

The NCVS collects detailed information annually on the frequency and nature of the crimes of rape, sexual assault, robbery, aggravated and simple assault, theft, household burglary, and motor vehicle theft experienced by Americans and their households. The survey measures crimes reported to the police as well as non-reported victimizations.

Created as a supplement to the NCVS and co-designed by the National Center for Education Statistics, located within the U.S. Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences, and the Bureau of Justice Statistics, the SCS collects additional information on school-related victimization on a national level. The SCS is designed to provide policymakers, academic researchers, and practitioners at the federal, state, and local levels with the data they need to make informed decisions about crime in schools. The SCS asks students a number of key questions about their experiences with and perceptions of crime and violence that occur inside their school, on school grounds, or on the way to or from school (including on a school bus). Additional questions concern preventive measures used by the school, students' participation in after-school activities, students' perceptions of school rules, the presence of weapons and street gangs in school, the presence of hate-related words and graffiti in school, student reports of bullying and reports of rejection at school, and the availability of drugs and alcohol in school, as well as attitudinal questions relating to fear of victimization and avoidance behavior at school. In 2005, about 7,000 students ages 12 through 18 participated in the SCS.

In 2003, the questionnaire items on bullying presented students with descriptions of what constituted bullying, along with yes/no response options. In 2005, the SCS introduced detailed questions about bullying victimization. Students were asked the following:

Now I have some questions about what students do at school that makes you feel bad or is hurtful to you. We often refer to this as being bullied. You may include events you told me about already. During the last six months, has any other student bullied you? That is, has another student . . .

- made fun of you, called you names, or insulted you?
- spread rumors about you?
- threatened you with harm?
- pushed you, shoved you, tripped you, or spit on you?
- tried to make you do things you did not want to do, for example, give them money or other things?
- excluded you from activities on purpose?
- destroyed your property on purpose?

For this paper, the responses to these items were used to create a measure of overall bullying. For the purposes of this study, these items were also classified into either relational or overt bullying victimization. Using the questions asked in the survey, relational bullying includes being made fun of, being the subject of rumors, and being excluded from activities on purpose. Overt bullying includes being threatened with harm; being pushed, shoved, tripped, or spit on; being made to do things you did not want to do; and having your property destroyed on purpose.

In 2005, the SCS asked a series of social support questions (i.e., social support variables or social support outcome measures) for the first time. These questions were based on the Multidimensional Scale of Perceived Social Support (MSPSS). MPSS was developed on university students and was validated in multiple subsequent studies. MPSS assess sources of support and is ideal for populations which cannot tolerate long questionnaires, like students. MPSS is an easy to understand survey scale and suitable for adolescents (Cheng and Chan, 2004). In the SCS, Students were asked whether they would “strongly agree,” “agree,” or “disagree” with the following statements about teachers, adults, and friends at their school during the last 6 months (the same questions were asked about adults and friends):

- At school, there is an adult I can talk to, who cares about my feelings and what happens to me;
- At school, I have a friend I can talk to, who cares about my feelings and what happens to me;
- At school, there is an adult who helps me with practical problems, who gives me good suggestions and advice about my problems.
- At school, I have a friend who helps me with practical problems, who gives me good suggestions and advice about my problems.
- Teachers treat students with respect;
- Teachers care about students;
- Teachers do or say things that make students feel bad about themselves.

To analyze the data for the purposes of this study, the responses to the seven social support measures (above) were condensed into a binary variable (“agree/disagree”).

Preliminary Results

Bullying

First, the author investigated descriptive statistics to examine the frequency with which students reported being bullied. These findings are presented in Table 1 (Appendix).

Consistent with previous research on bullying, about 28 percent of students surveyed reported experiencing at least one type of bullying victimization during the previous 6 months. The most frequently reported type of victimization was being made fun of, called names, or insulted (19 percent), followed by being the subject of rumors (15 percent) (both are forms of relational bullying). The third most common type of victimization was being pushed, shoved, tripped, or spit on (9 percent), which is a form of overt bullying.

Overall, there was not a significant difference ($\alpha = .05$) between the percentage of boys and girls who reported being bullied (27 vs. 29 percent). However, some differences were found by gender. Girls were more likely than boys to report being the subject of rumors (19 vs. 11 percent), but there was not a significant difference in the percentage of boys and girls who reported being made fun of. Boys were more likely than girls to report being pushed or shoved (11 vs. 7 percent). Other differences by gender and victimization were not significant.

Race was strongly correlated with bullying victimization. Although the percentages of White and Black students who reported being bullied were not significantly different (30 and 29 percent, respectively), both were more likely than Hispanic students (22 percent) to report bullying. School type, public or private, was also strongly correlated, with public school students more likely to report being bullied than their private school peers (29 vs. 23 percent).

A chi-square test among all student/school background measures and victimization showed that all correlations were significant at $\alpha = .05$. Race/ethnicity and urbanicity showed the strongest correlation, and grade showed the weakest correlation.

Social Support

Next, the study investigated descriptive statistics to examine the frequency with which students reported having social support. These findings are presented in Table 2 (Appendix).

Overall, students reported having high levels of social support from adults, friends, and teachers. Ninety-two percent of students reported having an adult with whom they can talk and who cares about their feelings and what happens to them; 96 percent reported the same about a friend; and 91 percent reported that teachers treat students with respect. Twenty percent of students, however, reported that teachers say or do things that make students feel bad about themselves.

The results varied by gender, race, and urbanicity. Overall, there was no difference in the percentage of boys and girls who reported having an adult with whom they can talk and who cares about their feelings (91 and 92 percent, respectively). However, girls were more likely than boys to report having a friend with whom they can talk and who cares about their feelings (98 vs. 95 percent).

Overall, White students (93 percent) were more likely than Black or Hispanic students (89 percent each) to report having an adult with whom they can talk and who cares about them. White students (98 percent) were also more likely than Black or Hispanic students (93 and 96 percent) to report having a friend with whom they can talk and who cares about them.

Social Support by Victimization

The author then investigated descriptive statistics to examine differences in social support between students who were victims of different types of bullying and students who were not victims. These findings are reported in Table 3 and 4 (Appendix).

The differences in social support measures between students who were victims of bullying and students who were not victims are presented in Table 4. Overall, the differences were significant for all measures. The largest differences were for students who reported that teachers treat them with respect (a 7-percentage-point difference between victims and nonvictims) and that teachers do or say things that make them feel bad (a 9-percentage-point difference). Other differences ranged from 2 to 5 percentage points.

Significant differences were also found by type of bullying and type of social support measure. For example, there was a nearly 7-percentage-point difference between students who were excluded from activities on purpose and those who were not in reporting help from an adult with practical problems (84 vs. 91 percent, respectively). A large difference was also found in the percentage of students who were the subject of rumors and those who were not in reporting that teachers treat them with respect (a 10-percentage-point difference). The largest differences were between victims and nonvictims reporting that teachers do/say things that make students feel bad about themselves.

Bullying, Social Support, and Student Background Characteristics

The final analysis conducted in this study investigated the differences in social support controlling for multiple independent variables. Using logistic regression models, the odds of having social support were modeled on whether or not the respondent was a bullying victim, controlling for several student and school

background characteristics: gender, race, urbanicity, and school type. The results are presented in tables 5 and 6 (Appendix).

Grade was not a significant variable in any of the seven logistic regression models, which is consistent with the results from the descriptive statistics, and was removed from the models. All models presented are significant ($\alpha = .05$) using a Pearson chi-square goodness of fit estimate and a Hosmer and Lemeshow goodness of fit. All beta coefficients that are significant at $\alpha = .05$ are identified.

Controlling for student and school background characteristics, students who reported being bullying victims were less likely to report having social support on all social support outcome measures (Table 5). For example, students who were bullied were half as likely as nonvictims to report having an adult who cared about them. In addition, victimization was one of the strongest predictors of low social support in all seven models. Overall, victimization was most strongly correlated with having low social support from a friend, which is not surprising given that the definition of being bullied involves being ostracized by one's peers.

Overall, in every model, minority students, particularly Hispanic students, were less likely than their White peers to report having social support at school. Attending a public school also decreased the likelihood of having social support. Being female increased the odds of having social support. Students living in an urban or suburban area were less likely to report having social support than students who lived in rural areas.

Next, the study examined social support and a particular type of victimization – being excluded from activities on purpose. The results for this particular type of victimization were consistent with the results for overall victimization.

Educational and Scientific Importance of the Study

Because students who are victims of different types of bullying are unlikely to have a teacher or friend to trust, it is crucial that bullying prevention programs focus more on teacher intervention and less on student reports of victimization. Research on teachers' responses to bullying scenarios shows that teachers are less likely to intervene in observed relational bullying and perceive it to be less of a problem than overt bullying. However, this study shows that not only is relational bullying more pervasive than overt bullying, relational bullying also leads to similar levels of distrust.

References

- Batsche, G.M. (2002). Bullying. In G.G. Bear, K.M. Minke, & A. Thomas (Eds.), *children's needs: Development, problems, and alternatives* (pp. 171-180). Bethesda, MD: National Association of School Psychologists.
- Bauman, S., & Del Rio, A. (2006). Preservice teachers' responses to bullying scenarios: Comparing physical, verbal, and relational bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 98* (1): 219-231.
- Bonds, M., & Stoker, S. (2000). *Bully-proof your school*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Borg, M. (1998). The emotional reactions of school bullies and their victims. *Educational Psychology, 18*: 433-445.
- Cheng, S.T., Chan, A.C.M. (2004). Personality and individual differences. Hong Kong Department of Politics and Sociology. Retrieved August 29, 2007 from: http://mrvar.fdv.uni-lj.si/sola/info4/tina/clanki/vadnal_izabel.pdf
- Cohn, A., & Canter, A. (2002). What schools and parents can do. Retrieved July 24, 2006, from the National Mental Health & Education Center, http://naspcenter.org/factsheets/bullying_fs.html
- Crick, N.R. (1996). The role of overt aggression, relational aggression, and prosocial behavior in the prediction of children's future social adjustment. *Child Development, 67*: 2317-2327.
- Demaray, M., and Malecki, C. (2003). Perceptions of the frequency and importance of social support by students classified as victims, bullies, and bully/victims in an urban middle school. *School Psychology Review, 32*(3): 471-489.
- Dinkes, R., Cataldi, E.F., Kena, G., & Baum, K. (2006). *Indicators of school crime and safety: 2006* (NCES 2007-

- 003/NCJ 214262). U.S. Departments of Education and Justice. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Frey, C.U., and Rothlisberger, C. (1996). Social support and school placement on the self-concept of LD students. *Learning Disability Quarterly, 11*: 115-124.
- Furlong, M.J., Chung, A., Bates, M., and Morrison, R.L. (1995). Who are the victims of school violence? A comparison of student non-victims and multi-victims. *Education and Treatment of Children, 18*: 282-298.
- Garrity, C., Jens, K., Porter, W., Sager, N., & Short-Camilli, C. (1994). *Bully-proofing your school*. Longmont, CO: Sopris West.
- Kilpatrick, M.D., Malecki, C.K. (2003). Perceptions of the frequency and importance of social support by students classified as victims, bullies, and bully/victims in an urban middle school. *School Psychology Review, 32*(3): 471-489.
- Levitt, M.J., Guacci-Franco, N., & Levitt, J. L. (1994). Social support achievement in childhood and early adolescence: A multicultural study. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology, 15*: 207-222.
- Nansel, T.R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R.S., Ruan, W.J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, B. (2001) Bullying behaviors among U.S. youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of the American Medical Association, 285*: 2094-2100.
- Olweus, D. (1993). Victimization by peers: Antecedents and long-term consequences. In K.H. Rubin & J.B. Asendorf (Eds.), *Social Withdrawal, Inhibition & Shyness in Childhood*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Olweus, D. (1994). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford, UK: Blackwell Publishers.
- Rigby, K. (2000). Effects of Peer Victimization in Schools and Perceived Social Support on Adolescent Well-being. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*: 57-68.
- Sharp, S., Thompson D., and Arora, T. (2000). How long before it hurts? An investigation into long-term bullying. *School Psychology International, 21*: 37-46.
- Swearer, S.M., Grills, A.E., Haye, K.M., and Cary, T. (2004). Internalizing problems in students involved in bullying and victimization: Implications for intervention. In D. L. Espelage & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in American Schools: a Social-ecological Perspective on Prevention and Intervention* (pp. 63-83). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Tardy, C.H. (1985). Social support measurement. *American Journal of Community Psychology, 13*: 187-202.
- Weinhold, B., & Weinhold, J. (2000). *Conflict resolution: The partnership way*. Denver, CO: Love Publishing Co.

Statistical Procedures

Significance tests. Comparisons made in the text were tested for statistical significance to ensure that the differences are larger than might be expected due to sampling variation. When comparisons are made, *t* statistics were calculated using the following formula:

$$t = \frac{(est_1 - est_2)}{\sqrt{(se_1)^2 + (se_2)^2}}$$

Logistic regression. The regression analysis is used in this study to investigate the relationship between a dependent variable (social support) and several independent variables. Regression coefficients were calculated in WesVar using the following model:

$$\text{Logit } Y_i = \beta_1 \chi_{i1} + \dots + \beta_p \chi_{ip} + \varepsilon_i$$

where Y_i is the observed value of Y for the i -th individual in the sample, χ_{ij} is the value of independent variable j for unit i , and ε_i is a random error with a mean of zero.

Appendix

Table 1. Students ages 12-18 who reported bullying problems at school during the previous six months, by selected student and school characteristics, 2005 (in percent of student population)

| Student or school characteristic | Bullying Problem | | | | | | | |
|----------------------------------|------------------|--|-------------------|----------------------|----------------------------------|--|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| | Total | Made fun of, called names, or insulted | Subject of rumors | Threatened with harm | Pushed, shoved, tripped, spit on | Tried to make do things did not want to do | Excluded from activities on purpose | Property destroyed on purpose |
| Total | 28.1 | 18.7 | 14.7 | 4.8 | 9 | 3.5 | 4.6 | 3.4 |
| Male | 27.1 | 18.5 | 11.0 | 5.2 | 10.9 | 3.9 | 4.1 | 3.5 |
| Female | 29.2 | 19.0 | 18.5 | 4.4 | 7.1 | 3.1 | 5.2 | 3.3 |
| White | 30.0 | 20.1 | 15.8 | 5.1 | 9.7 | 3.6 | 5.3 | 3.4 |
| Black | 28.5 | 18.5 | 14.2 | 4.9 | 8.9 | 4.7 | 4.5 | 4.6 |
| Hispanic | 22.3 | 14.7 | 12.4 | 4.6 | 7.6 | 2.6 | 3.0 | 2.7 |
| Other race/ethnicity | 24.6 | 16.3 | 11.6 | 2.1 | 6.8 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 2.5 |
| Grade 6 | 36.6 | 26.3 | 16.4 | 6.4 | 15.1 | 4.4 | 7.4 | 3.9 |
| Grade 7 | 35.0 | 25.2 | 18.9 | 6.3 | 15.4 | 4.7 | 7.1 | 4.6 |
| Grade 8 | 30.4 | 20.4 | 14.3 | 4.3 | 11.3 | 3.8 | 5.4 | 4.5 |
| Grade 9 | 28.1 | 18.9 | 13.8 | 5.3 | 8.2 | 3.2 | 3.8 | 2.7 |
| Grade 10 | 24.9 | 15.5 | 13.6 | 4.9 | 6.8 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 2.9 |
| Grade 11 | 23.0 | 14.7 | 13.4 | 3.2 | 4.2 | 2.8 | 3.3 | 2.6 |
| Grade 12 | 19.9 | 11.3 | 12.5 | 3.5 | 2.9 | 1.8 | 2.2 | 2.4 |
| Urban | 26.0 | 17.7 | 13.3 | 5.5 | 8.5 | 4.1 | 4.9 | 3.9 |
| Suburban | 28.9 | 18.9 | 14.6 | 4.4 | 9.0 | 3.1 | 4.5 | 3.0 |
| Rural | 29.0 | 19.8 | 17.2 | 5.0 | 9.9 | 3.7 | 4.5 | 3.8 |
| Public sector | 28.6 | 19.0 | 14.9 | 5.1 | 9.3 | 3.5 | 4.5 | 3.5 |
| Private sector | 22.7 | 15.3 | 12.4 | 0.9 | 5.5 | 3.0 | 6.2 | 2.0 |

Table 2. Students ages 12-18 who reported certain measures of social support at school, by selected student and school characteristics, 2005 (in percent of student population)

| Student or school characteristic | Adult | | Friend | | Teachers | | |
|----------------------------------|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|
| | Who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | I can talk to, who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | Treat students with respect | Care about students | Do or say things that make students feel bad about themselves |
| Total | 91.8 | 90.7 | 96.3 | 95.3 | 90.8 | 93.6 | 20.4 |
| Male | 91.1 | 90.1 | 94.9 | 93.8 | 91.5 | 93.8 | 20.1 |
| Female | 92.5 | 91.3 | 97.7 | 96.7 | 90.1 | 93.3 | 20.8 |
| White | 93.5 | 91.8 | 97.6 | 96.8 | 92.9 | 95.5 | 16.9 |
| Black | 89.3 | 89.0 | 92.9 | 91.2 | 79.6 | 86.8 | 33.7 |
| Hispanic | 89.0 | 89.2 | 95.6 | 94.1 | 92.6 | 91.9 | 23.2 |
| Other race/ethnicity | 89.1 | 88.3 | 94.0 | 93.6 | 93.0 | 95.2 | 15.4 |
| Grade 6 | 93.8 | 91.4 | 94.8 | 92.6 | 92.9 | 94.2 | 20.6 |
| Grade 7 | 92.4 | 89.3 | 95.8 | 94.4 | 91.7 | 95.3 | 21.6 |
| Grade 8 | 91.3 | 91.2 | 95.6 | 95.5 | 92.6 | 94.7 | 21.3 |
| Grade 9 | 91.8 | 91.7 | 96.3 | 95.4 | 89.5 | 93.0 | 19.1 |
| Grade 10 | 90.7 | 90.7 | 97.2 | 96.2 | 89.9 | 92.3 | 21.6 |
| Grade 11 | 90.8 | 89.8 | 96.9 | 95.4 | 90.5 | 92.4 | 22.1 |
| Grade 12 | 92.9 | 90.9 | 97.3 | 96.4 | 89.2 | 93.2 | 16.1 |
| Urban | 89.3 | 88.3 | 94.2 | 92.6 | 87.5 | 91.0 | 23.7 |
| Suburban | 92.4 | 90.5 | 97.3 | 96.3 | 92.2 | 94.2 | 19.3 |
| Rural | 93.6 | 94.7 | 96.5 | 96.1 | 91.4 | 95.6 | 19.1 |
| Public sector | 91.5 | 90.5 | 96.2 | 95.1 | 90.3 | 93.1 | 21.3 |
| Private sector | 94.9 | 92.3 | 97.4 | 96.6 | 97.4 | 99.5 | 10.2 |

Table 3. Students ages 12-18 who reported certain measures of trust at school, by type of victimization, 2005 (in percent of student population)

| Type of victimization | Adult | | Friend | | Teachers | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|
| | Who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | I can talk to, who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | Treat students with respect | Care about students | Do or say things that make students feel bad about themselves |
| Total | 91.8 | 90.7 | 96.3 | 95.3 | 90.8 | 93.6 | 20.4 |
| Not bullied | 92.8 | 91.3 | 97.4 | 96.3 | 92.8 | 94.9 | 17.9 |
| Bullied | 89.2 | 89.0 | 93.6 | 92.7 | 85.8 | 90.3 | 26.9 |
| Relational bullying – Made fun of, called names, or insulted: | | | | | | | |
| Not bullied | 92.4 | 91.1 | 97.1 | 96.0 | 91.8 | 94.3 | 18.8 |
| Bullied | 89.1 | 88.9 | 93.0 | 92.3 | 86.5 | 90.3 | 27.2 |
| Relational bullying – Subject of rumors: | | | | | | | |
| Not bullied | 92.2 | 90.8 | 96.7 | 95.6 | 92.3 | 94.7 | 18.7 |
| Bullied | 89.0 | 89.6 | 94.4 | 93.3 | 82.1 | 87.1 | 30.3 |
| Relational bullying – Excluded from activities on purpose: | | | | | | | |
| Not bullied | 92.0 | 91.0 | 96.5 | 95.5 | 91.1 | 93.8 | 19.8 |
| Bullied | 86.7 | 84.3 | 92.4 | 90.7 | 84.6 | 88.2 | 34.5 |
| Overt bullying – Threatened with harm: | | | | | | | |
| Not bullied | 92.0 | 90.9 | 96.6 | 95.4 | 91.3 | 94.0 | 19.6 |
| Bullied | 86.8 | 85.2 | 92.2 | 91.5 | 81.3 | 85.8 | 36.2 |
| Overt bullying – Pushed, shoved, tripped, spit on: | | | | | | | |
| Not bullied | 92.0 | 91.0 | 96.7 | 95.5 | 91.5 | 94.0 | 19.5 |
| Bullied | 89.7 | 87.4 | 92.6 | 92.5 | 83.9 | 89.4 | 29.8 |
| Overt bullying – Tried to make to do things did not want to do: | | | | | | | |
| Not bullied | 92.0 | 90.8 | 96.5 | 95.4 | 91.1 | 93.7 | 20.1 |
| Bullied | 86.1 | 87.6 | 92.2 | 91.3 | 83.5 | 90.5 | 30.8 |
| Overt bullying – Property destroyed on purpose: | | | | | | | |
| Not bullied | 91.9 | 90.8 | 96.4 | 95.4 | 91.2 | 93.8 | 20.0 |
| Bullied | 88.9 | 86.8 | 94.4 | 92.1 | 79.8 | 87.7 | 33.4 |

Table 4. Differences between victims and non-victims reporting social support, 2005 (in percent of difference)

| Type of victimization | Adult | | Friend | | Teachers | | |
|---|--|---|---|---|-----------------------------|---------------------|---|
| | Who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | I can talk to, who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | Treat students with respect | Care about students | Do or say things that make students feel bad about themselves |
| Total | 3.6* | 2.3* | 3.8* | 3.6* | 7.0* | 4.6* | 9.0* |
| Relational bullying – | | | | | | | |
| Made fun of, called names, or insulted | 3.3* | 2.1* | 4.1* | 3.7* | 5.3* | 4.0* | 8.4* |
| Subject of rumors | 3.2* | 1.2 | 2.3* | 2.2* | 10.3* | 7.6* | 11.6* |
| Excluded from activities on purpose | 5.3* | 6.7* | 4.1* | 4.8* | 6.5* | 5.6* | 14.7* |
| Overt bullying – | | | | | | | |
| Threatened with harm | 5.2* | 5.8* | 4.3* | 3.9* | 10.0* | 8.2* | 16.5* |
| Pushed, shoved, trip, spit on | 2.3 | 3.6* | 4.2* | 3.1* | 7.6* | 4.6* | 10.3* |
| Tried to make to do things did not want to do | 5.9* | 3.1 | 4.3* | 4.1* | 7.6* | 3.2 | 10.7* |
| Property destroyed on purpose | 2.9 | 4.0 | 2.0 | 3.3 | 11.4* | 6.1* | 13.4* |

Table 5. Logistic regression results of reported social support of students ages 12-18 by victimization, 2005

| Reported any type of bully victimization | Adult | | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | | Friend | | I can talk to, who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | | Teachers | | Treat students with respect | | Care about students | | Do or say things that make students feel bad about themselves | |
|--|--------|---------|---|---------|--------|---------|---|---------|---|---------|----------|---------|-----------------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---|--|
| | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | | |
| Bullied | -0.69* | 0.5 | -0.49* | 0.6 | -1.20* | 0.3 | -0.91* | 0.4 | -0.81* | 0.4 | -0.84* | 0.4 | 0.61* | 1.8 | | | | |
| Black | -0.55* | 0.6 | -0.41* | 0.7 | -0.95* | 0.4 | -0.90* | 0.4 | -1.19* | 0.3 | -1.22* | 0.3 | 0.92* | 2.5 | | | | |
| Hispanic | -0.81* | 0.4 | -0.59* | 0.6 | -1.06* | 0.3 | -0.88* | 0.4 | 0.07* | 1.1 | -0.26* | 0.8 | -0.04* | 1.0 | | | | |
| Other | -0.67* | 0.5 | -0.31* | 0.7 | -0.94* | 0.4 | -0.73* | 0.5 | -0.08* | 0.9 | -0.56* | 0.6 | 0.48* | 1.6 | | | | |
| Public School | -0.46* | 0.6 | -0.21* | 0.8 | -0.22* | 0.8 | -0.25* | 0.8 | -1.22* | 0.3 | -2.50* | 0.1 | 0.73* | 2.1 | | | | |
| Urban | -0.40* | 0.7 | -0.82* | 0.4 | -0.20* | 0.8 | -0.40* | 0.7 | -0.20* | 0.8 | -0.50* | 0.6 | 0.09* | 1.1 | | | | |
| Suburban | -0.15* | 0.9 | -0.65* | 0.5 | 0.40* | 1.5 | 0.13* | 1.1 | 0.10* | 1.1 | -0.31* | 0.7 | 0.04* | 1.0 | | | | |
| Female | 0.20* | 1.2 | 0.15* | 1.2 | 0.90* | 2.5 | 0.72* | 2.1 | -0.11* | 0.9 | -0.04* | 1.0 | 0.01* | 1.0 | | | | |
| Constant | 3.41* | 30.2 | 3.28* | 26.5 | 3.89* | 48.8 | 3.70* | 40.3 | 4.07* | 58.5 | 6.10* | 445.9 | -2.53* | 0.1 | | | | |

Table 6. Logistic regression results of reported social support of students ages 12-18 by being excluded from activities on purpose, 2005

| Reported being excluded from activities on purpose | Adult | | | | Friend | | | | Teachers | | | | | |
|--|--|---------|---|---------|---|---------|---|---------|-----------------------------|---------|---------------------|---------|---|---------|
| | Who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | | I can talk to, who cares about my feelings and what happens to me | | Who helps me with practical problems, who gives good suggestions and advice about my problems | | Treat students with respect | | Care about students | | Do or say things that make students feel bad about themselves | |
| | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) | B | Exp (B) |
| Bullied | -0.70* | 0.5 | -0.78* | 0.5 | -1.28* | 0.3 | -1.17* | 0.3 | -0.95* | 0.4 | -0.95* | 0.4 | 1.11* | 3.0 |
| Black | -0.20* | 0.8 | -0.16* | 0.9 | -1.53* | 0.2 | -1.55* | 0.2 | -2.40* | 0.1 | -1.58* | 0.2 | 2.15* | 8.5 |
| Hispanic | -0.91* | 0.4 | -20.48 | n/a | -2.28* | 0.1 | -1.02* | 0.4 | -1.13* | 0.3 | -19.28 | n/a | 0.54* | 1.7 |
| Other | -1.26* | 0.3 | -0.71* | 0.5 | -1.77* | 0.2 | -1.57* | 0.2 | 0.06* | 1.1 | -0.61* | 0.5 | 0.95* | 2.6 |
| Public School | -0.51* | 0.6 | -0.25* | 0.8 | -0.31* | 0.7 | -0.33* | 0.7 | -1.29* | 0.3 | -2.55* | 0.1 | 0.80* | 2.2 |
| Urban | -0.39* | 0.7 | -0.81* | 0.4 | -0.18* | 0.8 | -0.39* | 0.7 | -0.19* | 0.8 | -0.49* | 0.6 | 0.07* | 1.1 |
| Suburban | -0.15* | 0.9 | -0.64* | 0.5 | 0.37* | 1.4 | 0.11* | 1.1 | 0.09* | 1.1 | -0.31* | 0.7 | 0.04* | 1.0 |
| Female | 0.20* | 1.2 | 0.15* | 1.2 | 0.88* | 2.4 | 0.71* | 2.0 | -0.12* | 0.9 | -0.05* | 0.9 | 0.01* | 1.0 |
| Constant | 3.95* | 51.7 | 3.97* | 52.9 | 4.87* | 130.5 | 4.69* | 108.6 | 4.86* | 129.0 | 6.86* | 955.4 | -3.57* | 0.0 |