Defenders of Victims of Peer Aggression: Interdependence Theory and an Exploration of
Individual, Interpersonal, and Contextual Effects on the Defender Participant Role

Author Note

This material is based upon work supported by a grant (DGE-1143953) from the National Science Foundation to the first author. The authors thank Melissa Curran for her feedback during the early stages of this manuscript.

Abstract

The research on predictors and effects of defending victims of peer victimization and bullying continues to grow, but most research on this topic is lacking a strong theoretical framework. This review of defending research introduces interdependence theory as a theory with the capacity to organize many of the empirical findings from the existing defending literature into a meaningful whole. Other theories used to frame defending research are described, and limitations of these theories are discussed. Framing defending research within interdependence theory leads to new research questions. These include: 1) who defends whom and why?, 2) through what processes do individuals in the peer group internalize peer group norms in regard to peer victimization, and how do these internalized norms affect individual perceptions and beliefs that then guide behavior?, and 3) what are the individual and interpersonal factors that affect whether bystanders defend peers, and how does intervention in peer victimization situations affect defenders in addition to victims? Framing defending research within interdependence theory allows for the organization of previous findings and will guide new research.

Keywords: Defending, Participant Roles, Peer Victimization, Interdependence

Defenders of Victims of Peer Aggression: Interdependence Theory and an Exploration of Individual, Interpersonal, and Contextual Effects on the Defender Participant Role

Peer victimization, being targeted by peers' aggressive acts (Perry, Kusel, & Perry, 1988), is a problem among children and adolescents that receives worldwide attention (Jimerson, Swearer, & Espelage, 2010). Peer victimization occurs when a peer is the recipient of intentional aggression. Bullying differs from peer victimization in that in addition to there being an intent to harm, there is an observed or perceived power difference between aggressor and victim which makes it difficult for the victim to defend his or herself and the aggression perpetration toward the victim continues over time or is likely to repeat (CDC, 2014; Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, & Isava, 2008). Peer victimization and bullying among children and adolescents is problematic because of the many individual and interpersonal difficulties associated with involvement with peer victimization for victims (Card, Isaacs, & Hodges, 2007; Hawker & Boulton, 2000; Salmivalli, 2010). Aggressors, and those who witness peer victimization, often referred to as bystanders, are likely to be negatively affected by these experiences, as well (Menesini, Eslea, Smith, Genta, Giannetti, Fonzi, & Costabile, 1997; Musher-Eizenman, Boxer, Danner, Dubo, Goldstein, & Heretick, 2004; Rivers, Poteat, Noret, & Ashhurst, 2009). Although much research has been conducted to better understand aggressors, victims, and the group nature of peer victimization, there are other youth who actively stand up against victimization. These youth, for whom there is a limited but growing body of research, are the focus of this review.

This theoretical review will first discuss peer victimization as a group process, the theories of the bystander effect and goal-framing theory, and then introduce interdependence theory as a theory with the capacity to organize many of the empirical findings from the existing defending literature into a meaningful whole, while also framing questions and hypotheses for

future research. We based this review on studies and previous reviews identified through electronic literature searches and backward searches from other papers.

Peer Victimization as a Group Process

Historically, bullying and peer victimization researchers studied the aggressor-victim dyad, but evidence supports the need to investigate the group nature of peer victimization. The negative psychosocial correlates of being witness to peer victimization for individuals outside of the victim role give credence to the view that peer victimization is a group phenomenon (Musher-Eizenman et al., 2004; Rivers et al., 2009). Peers have been observed present in up to 85% of episodes of victimization; this figure depends upon the physical environment (Craig, Pepler, & Atlas, 2000). Unfortunately, involvement with peer victimization in some capacity is typical for children and adolescents in that most children in the school setting are involved with peer victimization through different roles (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukialnen, 1996). In this way, peer victimization can be considered a group process (Salmivalli, 2010). Different studies suggest that these roles are more or less differentiated from each other, but research that identifies these roles has consistently shown children and adolescents' tendency to either support aggressors (as assistants to or reinforcers of the aggressor), attempt to stay outside the problem of peer victimization, or behave in prosocial ways on behalf of peer victims (Casper, 2013; Fitzpatrick & Bussey, 2011; Goossens, Olthof, & Dekker, 2006; Sandstrom, Makover, & Bartini, 2013; Sutton & Smith, 1999).

This latter group, who defend their victimized peers, may enact a variety of prosocial behaviors including comforting and supporting the victim, intervening, getting help, or encouraging the victim to get help (Salmivalli et al., 1996). A common feature of defenders and interveners is that in comparison to passive bystanders who do not intervene or support victims,

defenders take an active role in peer victimization by demonstrating anti-victimization behavior including supporting victims by taking their sides (Oh & Hazler, 2009).

Victims are often physically weaker than aggressors and may lack the social skills needed to protect themselves (Card et al., 2007); for these reasons they may have little success in defending themselves. Defenders, however, have been observed to successfully intervene on behalf of victimized peers during victimization episodes (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001). However, defenders are not the majority of peer bystanders. Hawkins and colleagues (2001) recorded children and early adolescents intervening in episodes of peer victimization. Their observations of the playground showed that peers failed to intervene in 81% of peer victimization episodes. In this study, instances of actual intervention were observed and therefore may not have captured many behaviors other studies have defined as defending such as comforting the victim or getting help from an adult, but it still speaks to the lack of active defending of victimized peers among youth. A general account of the literature on defending suggests that about 20% of children are recognized as defenders either by peers, observation, or self-reports of defending (Barhight, Hubbard, & Hyde, 2012), although this percentage may vary depending on how groups are differentiated (Sutton & Smith, 1999). Although defenders constitute a minority among the peer group, over 70% of victims report being defended by at least one peer (Sainio, Veenstra, Huitsing, & Salmivalli, 2011). These defended victims were found to be better adjusted than their undefended peers. It has been suggested that victims' subjective experiences, if nothing else, should be different if they perceive peer support (Salmivalli et al., 2011). Defended victims were found to have higher self-esteem, be more popular, more accepted, less rejected, and to experience a lower frequency of victimization than victims who did not report being defended (Sainio et al., 2011).

Methodological Variation Between Studies

In recent years, researchers have empirically investigated the impact bystander training has on defending (Polanin, Espelage, & Pigott, 2012), defending networks within classrooms (Huitsing, Snijders, Van Duijn, & Veenstra, 2014; Huitsing, & Veenstra, 2012) and factors that predict both defending (e.g. Gini et al., 2007) and the effects of defending on victims (Kärnä, Voeten, Poskiparta, & Salmivalli, 2010) and defenders (Meter & Card, 2015). The research literature on defending is growing and is strengthened by the inclusion of culturally-diverse and multi-age samples. Furthermore, consideration has been given to contextual or interpersonal factors that help explain defending versus passive bystanding (Kärnä et al., 2010; Levine, Cassidy, Brazier, & Reicher, 2002; Tisak, & Tisak, 1996).

Most research on defending has been conducted in the context of bullying (Barchia & Bussey, 2011)—a more specific subtype of peer victimization that occurs more than once between individuals of different power. There is an ongoing discussion among peer relations researchers about whether peer victimization and bullying can be considered the same construct (Bauman, Underwood, & Card, 2013). In the substantial literature on bullying and peer victimization, there is enough cumulative research to assess differences between bullying and victimization. The body of defending literature is considerably smaller, and researchers have attended to whether defending differs depending on whether peer victimization or bullying were occurring. To our knowledge, there have been no studies comparing defending of peer victimization with defending of bullying.

The methods used to collect data about defending as well as other participant roles vary in how they measure bullying or victimization, the forms of victimization they include, who the reporter is, and what language the questionnaire is written in or translated into. Defending is

sometimes measured as likelihood with which participants rate their hypothetical responses to peer victimization scenarios; results from these studies may need to be interpreted more cautiously than the information provided by self-reports or peer-reports which aim to measure *actual* defending. Some researchers consider participant roles to be typologies and use cut-off points to categorize individuals, while others measure frequencies or proportions of behavior characteristics of roles as continuous variables (Gini, Albiero, Benelli, & Altoè, 2007). Due to the inability to differentiate research on defending in peer victimization and bullying situations in the context of interdependence theory at this time, and because defending research differs in ways beyond whether bullying or peer victimization was assessed, in the following review, defending and intervening behaviors in regard to bullying *or* peer victimization were considered to be the same construct.

Theories used to frame research on defending

Bystander Effect. Latané and Darley's (1968) bystander effect has been used as one explanation of individuals' defending versus passive bystanding within the peer group (Obermann, 2011; Pozzoli & Gini 2012; Pozzoli & Gini, 2013; Salmivalli, 2010). According to the theory, if bystanders are to intervene, they a) must notice the event of another in distress, b) interpret it as an emergency, and then c) decide that intervening is their own personal responsibility (Latané & Darley, 1968). This theory has been useful in explaining passive bystanding in experimental situations that reflect real-life occurrences between strangers in natural environments, but the circumstances around incidents of peer victimization are different than those in Latané and Darley's experiments. How the bystander effect does and does not map on to what is known about peer victimization and participant roles within the peer group is discussed next.

Although being witness to peer victimization may be common among children and adolescents in schools, most bystanders do not support it. Most children have positive and supportive attitudes toward *victims* and are against the victimization of their peers (Boulton, Trueman, & Flemington, 2002; Rigby & Johnson, 2006; Rigby & Slee, 1991). It cannot be assumed that bystanders to peer victimization necessarily interpret the event as an *emergency*, but it can be assumed that bystanders understand the event to be distressing for the victim. Pronk and colleagues found that awareness of victims' distress in hypothetical bullying situations was positively related to defending (Pronk et al., 2014). When presented with hypothetical situations, most students reported they would prevent a peer from being victimized (Rigby & Johnson, 2006).

In addition to recognizing victims' distress, witnessing peer victimization has been associated with distress for bystanders. Darley and Latané's (1968) sample of bystanders who did not intervene when they were made to think a confederate in the study was experiencing a seizure were reported to show signs of physical nervousness including trembling hands, sweating, and emotional arousal. In studies of peer victimization, a comparison group of individuals outside of aggressor, victim, or aggressor/victim groups reported being just as upset as victims when they witnessed peer victimization (Menesini et al., 1997). Negative mental health consequences associated with witnessing others' peer victimization include hurt feelings, feelings of inferiority, and elevated substance use (Rivers et al., 2009). Physiological and emotional reactions have been associated with peer-reported defending among elementary school children. Participants in one study were exposed to videos depicting bullying (Barhight et al., 2012). Physiological indication of emotional arousal recorded as heart rate via electrocardiogram was measured alongside self-reports of feeling angry, sad, and scared. Participants who reacted

emotionally both physiologically and in self-reports were more likely to be defenders. Barhight and colleagues greatly contributed to the literature by examining factors outside of personality characteristics and cognitions that may contribute to whether or not individuals defend; however, they did not examine how defending may be predicted by interpersonal factors.

Collectively, research on defenders clearly shows that children and adolescents are aware that peer victimization causes distress for victims. Still, the bystander theory requires that individuals, in addition to being aware of the distressing situation, additionally take personal responsibility for helping. An explanation of this phenomenon may require a deeper look into the theoretically-informed processes that occur between adolescents who witness victimization among their peers.

Goal-Framing Theory. The goal-framing approach has been used to frame research on defending as well. The theory states that individuals' social goals, or goal-frame, predicts self-regulation, such that in every moment goals are related to behaviors, choices, and cognitions (Lindenberg, 2008). It suggests that individuals interpret situations in ways that help them to pursue goals that are important to them. Thus, individuals attend to what and who they think will help them reach their goals through interacting with others (Dijkstra, Lindenberg, & Veenstra, 2007). Lindenberg (2008) states that individuals tend to strive to improve their conditions and automatically bias the allocation of resources toward reaching goals that will improve one's condition. Goal-framing theory suggests that individuals have evolved to balance both individual and group goals, and are striving to improve their own condition through each. An individual's goal may be to act to improve conditions immediately, to guard one's condition, or to behave appropriately in a given moment; this goal will influence her cognitions, perceptions of behavioral options, and actions (Lindenberg, 2008). It has been suggested that youth strive to

attain affection and status from their peers, and that they enact specific interpersonal behavior, such as defending particular others in the peer group, in order to reach their goals (Huitsing et al., 2014; Huitsing & Veenstra, 2012). Goal-frames are considered to be individual factors, but others' goals can strongly influence an individual's goals, and an individual may choose to have her goals reinforced by associating with those with similar goal-frames (Lindenberg, 2008). The goal-framing approach has been used to explain defending and other peer-directed behavior within peer networks, which are composed of both with individual and group goals that may be motivated intrinsically and by others.

Interdependence Theory. From their early experiments on bystander intervention, Darley and Latané (1968) concluded that intervening may have less to do with personality and more to do with whether others are present, which removes some of the responsibility from the individual bystander. It is important to understand the effect of the presence of other bystanders on intervention, but it may also be important to study who bystanders are in relation to each other (Levine et al., 2002), or their interdependent relationships. Bystanders to peer victimization, unlike bystanders in early experiments on bystander intervention, are likely to know one another, and also likely know the aggressors and victims. Harold Kelley states in a description of the theory of interdependence, that it is the relationship that helps us understand how concern for others relates to concern for the self, and how that impacts motivation to assist others (1982). In regard to participant roles among the peer group, peer relationships contribute to peer behavior during episodes of peer victimization in that bystanders may be more supportive of either victims (as defenders) or aggressors (as assistants or reinforcers) due to their affiliation with these peers and other bystanders. By fulfilling these roles, individuals are attending to certain individuals

and aligning their behavior in ways that help them to reach their goals of affection and status by either taking sides with aggressors or standing up to aggressors as defenders of peer victims.

Harold Kelley's descriptions of interdependence theory most commonly exemplify situations between partners in romantic relationships, but may refer to any interpersonal relationships including parent/child, boss/employee, or peer relationships. These relationships and activity within these relationships are influenced by the nature of the relationship, as well as situational conditions and the availability of information actors and partners have, time of occurrence of situation or behavior, and actor and partner characteristics (Kelley, Holmes, Kerr, Reis, Rusbult, et al., 2003a). What characterizes peer relationships as interdependent is that actor and partner's actions, comments, feelings, thoughts, consequences, etc. depend upon both actor and partner (Kelley et al., 2003a). For example, aggressors' status as powerful peer group members, capable of victimizing others, is dependent on their relationship with victims, who are less powerful and therefore easier to victimize. This relationship of inequality is what allows aggressors to maximize their own outcomes through use of aggression. The aggressor's status may also depend on the history of his or her interactions with the victim and with others in the peer group. Victims are interdependently linked to aggressors (Card, 2011) in that their status, feelings, and actions are restricted by their relationship with aggressors, as well as other peer group members with whom they are interpersonally linked.

Individuals are expected to maximize their own positive outcomes through their interactions with those with whom they have interdependent relationships, and to strive to minimize negative outcomes or consequences for themselves. In his discussion of interdependence theory in regard to victim-aggressor relationships, Card (2011) discusses the sorts of outcomes individuals may seek for themselves or aim to avoid within interdependent

relationships by enacting particular behaviors within the peer group. The outcomes include gaining social or materials rewards or avoiding aversive interactions. The next section will describe characteristics of interdependent relationships that may contribute to defending.

The Relationship's Effect on Defending

A close relationship with a peer has been suggested to motivate whether or not an individual will defend that peer if she is victimized (Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005; Pronk, Goossens, Olthof, De Mey, & Willemsen, 2013). Given hypothetical bullying situations, defenders as well as outsiders, those who were not recognized by their peers as defenders of others, reported being more likely to intervene when the hypothetical victim was a friend (Pronk et al., 2013). In another study, participants were presented with hypothetical situations that involved either a) a friend or b) an acquaintance of the participant enacting aggression toward a victim who is either a c) friend or d) acquaintance of the bystander. The authors did not report whether the results were statistically significant, but when either the aggressor or victim was a good friend, participants reported they would defend at a higher percentage. The percentage was lowest when both aggressor and victim were hypothetical acquaintances (Tisak & Tisak, 1996). It is possible that a relationship with an aggressor has the potential to facilitate defending, but most research on this topic has shown that a relationship with the victim predicts defending, while a relationship with the aggressor does not; evidence of an association between being close to the *aggressor* and defending has not, to our knowledge, been found in any other studies of peer victimization. Oh and Hazler (2009) analyzed retrospective reports about a remembered peer victimization incident. Participants were asked to report closeness to either the victim or bully. This closeness differentially predicted scores on the ordinal defender to assistant scale, which assigned highest scores to defenders, and lower scores to outsiders, assistants, and

reinforcers, in that order. The results suggested that bystanders evaluate their interdependent relationships with both victims and aggressors when deciding how to respond to an episode of peer victimization. Individuals have reported this behavior in qualitative interviews, as well. When participants' relationship was close with the victim, youth reported defending, but when the participants reported being close with the aggressor, they reported not helping the victim. Similar responses were recorded in regard to being friends with or contrarily disliking the victim of peer victimization. Individuals are likely working to preserve the relationship with the person who is liked or regarded as a friend. Participants in this study also reported avoiding standing up to a powerful aggressor who was perceived to be higher on the social ladder (Thorberg, Tenebaum, Varjas, Meyes, Jungert, & Vanegas, 2012). In both these retrospective self-reported accounts of one's own behavior during peer victimization incidents, there was evidence of the interdependent relationship affecting potential bystanders' behavior toward aggressors and victims in the peer victimization situation.

Researchers investigating behavior among college students have analyzed whether in-group victims would be more likely to receive participants' help than out-group victims. Participants reported how likely they were to intervene in response to a staged victimization situation; they reported they were more likely to intervene when the victim was a fellow college student than when the victim was a community member (Levine et al., 2002). When hearing about hypothetical peer victimization situations, younger girls tended to rate that they liked the victim in the story more when that person was of the same gender as them (Gini et al., 2008a). In their qualitative study with the goal of creating a conceptual framework to understand defending behavior during peer victimization situations, Thornberg and colleagues reported that girls described defending other girls in interviews (Thornberg et al., 2012). The relation of shared

identity or similarity between bystanders and victims seems to affect whether they would defend one another even if their relationship was not a strong affiliation such as a close friendship.

It seems that relationships between bystanders can influence defending as well. Levine and colleagues (2002) explored whether shared identity with other bystanders would influence individuals to intervene, with the assumption that similarity among bystanders would reduce the social inhibition effect which causes individuals to diffuse responsibility and not respond to another's distress. They found that in an experimental condition that involved watching a video of an attack on an individual, participants were more likely to report that they would intervene in the event of the incident occurring in real life if the other bystanders stated they would intervene and were also in-group members. They concluded that socially comparing oneself to others reduces uncertainty about whether or not to intervene when the fellow bystanders are of one's in-group (Levine et al., 2002). In another study, college-aged friends more quickly intervened on behalf of a stranger in need than nonfriends (strangers to each other) in an experimental setting (Latané & Rodin, 1969). It was suggested by the authors that perhaps the participants who were friends were better able to read each other's cues about whether they should help the victim, but perhaps they also felt more comfortable intervening together because there was no risk of acting out of line with what the other was thinking—they were already familiar with one another.

Much of the research on peer victimization occurs in schools—one of the only settings in which almost all young people are present (Merrell et al., 2008). In schools, children and adolescents are all part of the same involuntary social group, but within that meta-group, smaller individual groups form, based on factors such as gender, race or ethnicity (Ennett & Bauman, 1996), friendship, reputation or crowd (Brown, Eicher, & Petrie, 1986). Huitsing and colleagues (2012; 2014) have made an impact on the study of defending by beginning to answer the

important question of who defends whom in the school environment. In addition to finding that individuals tended to defend others of the same gender and grade, they found evidence that victims who shared aggressors tended to defend each other and that aggressors who shared victims defended each other when they themselves were victims. An area ripe for future research is the investigation of whether and how the relationships with both victims and aggressors (e.g. friendships) affect bystander behavior in episodes of peer victimization, how these relationships impact cognitions about responses to peer victimization episodes, and how cognitions are related to enacted defending responses.

A Closer Look at Interdependence Theory

As individuals relate to each other through their interdependent relationships, they affect each other's outcomes. In Kelley and colleagues' writing, these may be depicted via matrix representations, which represent the possible actions and costs and benefits to each actor given a specific action. In certain circumstances it is helpful to numerically represent the values of costs and benefits, but an understanding that decisions within certain interactions result in different costs and benefits to individuals in interdependent relationship dyads may be sufficient in the victimization situations that will be used as examples throughout this review. The behaviors enacted depend on multiple factors. Similar to Latané and Darley's first requirement that the potential defender identify the situation as an emergency (Latané & Darley, 1968), youth may first have to identify the peer victimization situation as peer victimization, an event distressing to the victim. Then, some of the specific components of interdependence theory will affect whether an individual will or will not defend. Each individual in an interpersonal relationship or situation brings his or her own individual tendencies, attitudes, and values to that interaction, referred to as the *person factors* (Kelley et al., 2003a). Then, the *informational conditions*, or how much the

actors know about a situation, also affects their interdependent actions. Informational conditions affect an individual's interpretation of a situation. As individuals interact, they consider the possible outcomes for each person that could occur given particular behaviors they could possibly enact. How much knowledge each actor has about potential outcomes for each interdependent relationship member may influence behavior, whether through maximizing own outcomes, maximizing others' outcomes, or minimizing another's outcomes. Last, *response conditions*, which are the possible responses dyad and triad members may enact in a given interaction, informed by rules of temporality, can impact interdependent behavior.

Person Factors

Bystanders' own social and interpersonal goals or individual tendencies may contribute to whether or not they will defend a victimized peer. These are referred to as "person factors" by Kelley and colleagues (2003b), and include the motives, attitudes, or tendencies individuals bring into their interactions with those with whom they are in interdependent relationships. These may be the individual's initial behavioral impulse in the interdependent situation that drives the individual toward behavior aligned with the typical outcome they strive for when they witness peer victimization. In an interdependent relationship, actors' and partners' person factors impact interdependent relationships during instances of peer victimization among the peer group. Person factors are also what contribute to the value or satisfaction associated with different response conditions.

Choi and colleagues (2011) discussed habitual patterns of behavior enacted by individuals, which they labeled predispositions in their discussion of social interdependence theory. Although it is believed that these predispositions are to some degree innate, they may become more concrete over time through social learning. They may also be reinforced by

experiencing the costs and benefits associated with enacting different behaviors in line with one's predispositions (Choi, Johnson, & Johnson, 2011). These researchers framed research on aggression and victimization in interdependence theory by describing predispositions to engage cooperatively with, competitively with, and independently of others; they then associated those predispositions with victimization and aggression (Choi et al., 2011). Although predispositions were not related to victimization, cooperative youth were less likely to enact harm-intended aggression and were more likely to engage in prosocial behavior among their peers. The authors also described how participation in cooperative learning experiences might be negatively related to enactment of harmful peer-directed aggression, in that those who engaged in cooperative learning experiences had more cooperative predispositions. This research demonstrated that predispositions for different interpersonal preferences impact behavior in regard to peer victimization, however the study did not assess the effect of the interpersonal relationship on interpersonal behavior, how response conditions may override or interact with person factors, nor did it describe how additional factors, such as empathy or morality, impact interpersonal behavior.

Just as girls have been found to more often have cooperative predispositions in comparison to boys (Choi et al., 2011), they are also more likely to defend victimized peers. Girls, in comparison to boys, are most commonly identified as defenders by self-reports, teacher reports, observation, or through describing their behavior in hypothetical peer victimization situations (Caravita, Gini, & Pozzoli, 2012; Espelage, Green, Polanin, 2011; Gini, 2006; Gini et al., 2008a; Gini et al., 2007; Gini et al., 2008b; Goossens et al., 2006; O'Connell, Pepler, & Craig, 1999; Pöyhönen et al., 2010; Pozzoli & Gini, 2010; Pozzoli, Gini, & Vieno, 2012; Salmivalli et al., 1996; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004), although some studies have shown

exceptions even when only prosocial defending was considered (Craig & Pepler, 1997; Menesini et al., 1997). It has been suggested that when girls act prosocially toward their victimized peers, they are exemplifying stereotypical female characteristics including the display of caretaking and helping behaviors (Salmivalli et al., 1996). Girls also report believing that their friends expect them to defend victimized peers more than boys believe this about their friends (Rigby & Johnson, 2006), suggesting that defending may be a gender-typical and expected behavior among girls. Girls also are more likely to defend other girls (Fox, Jones, Stiff, & Sayers, 2014), while boys tend to defend boys (Hawkins et al., 2001; Sainio et al., 2011). In childhood and early adolescence, children tend to be involved in gender-segregated groups (Rose & Rudolph, 2006); this may provide more opportunities to provide within-gender defending toward victimized peers.

Person factors are also what contribute to the value or satisfaction associated with different response conditions. Defenders are more likely to report that they would feel guilt and shame for not helping victims in response to hypothetical instances of peer victimization (Pronk, Olthof, & Goossens, 2014). Because it is defenders' tendency to act prosocially and help others who are experiencing victimization, the thought of acting against this predisposition is attached to negative emotions about the self.

Although consideration of person factors has been useful in beginning to tease apart factors that may contribute to defending in attempts to understand what distinguishes these prosocial children and adolescents from their peers, youth may have quite nuanced outcomes that they want to see occur driven by their predisposition to behave in certain ways. Youth who have prosocial, cooperative predispositions, those with the predisposition to defend, still may enact any variety of behaviors in a peer victimization situation. This is why the consideration of person

factors in conjunction with other aspects of interdependence theory best informs processes that lead to defending. Simultaneous consideration of response conditions, informational conditions, and person factors and their interpersonal antecedents and consequences may be necessary to explain the important and complex phenomenon of defending.

Informational Conditions

Informational conditions affect one's interpretation of a situation. What individuals know (or think they know) about a peer victimization situation contributes to whether they defend or do not defend. As noted earlier, peers are present in the majority of peer victimization episodes, and are together throughout their time spent in school, neighborhood, as well as in cyber communication environments. Not only do interdependent partners learn from their own interactions, but those outside the relationship learn who has power, and who does not, as well (Kelley, Holmes, Kerr, Reis, & Rusbult, et al., 2003b). Whether an individual recognizes a situation as a peer victimization episode may be affected by contextual factors such as who is present and absent from a given situation, how the aggressor and victim relate to each other in the larger peer group, and which third parties may become involved in a triadic interdependent relationship with the aggressor and the victim. Recognition of victims as chronic victims or of aggressors as those with a reputation for bullying others informs an individual about whether a peer victimization situation is occurring. A recognized bully-victim dyad may inform a potential defender that there is truly a need for intervention—that the victim is distressed, unable to help his or herself, that there is a power difference between victim and aggressor, and so on.

It is important to note that a positive association between victimization and defending has been found over time, and even concurrently (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Caravita et al., 2010; Pozzoli et al., 2012), although not in all studies (Barhight et al., 2013). It may also be that youth

who have been victimized themselves and victims who share an aggressor (Huitsing et al., 2014) experience different informational conditions, in that they recognize the victimization of their peers due to their heightened empathy and perspective taking (Perren, Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, Malti, & Hymel, 2012) and awareness of other victims' distress (Pronk et al., 2014), factors that have been associated with defending, and which inform how individuals interpret peer victimization situations.

A number of characteristics have been associated with defending that may inform whether an individual will intervene above and beyond their natural predispositions, or person factors. These factors may impact individuals' interpretations of the peer victimization situations. Affective empathy, related to understanding others' emotional states (Gini et al., 2007), has been associated with defending for boys and girls (Caravita et al., 2010). Which specific forms of empathy are related to defending and what other covariates have been in models testing the association between empathy and defending have varied, though. For example, one study found that perspective-taking, defined as being able to see things from another's psychological state, was related to willingness to intervene, while empathic concern was not. Another study found the association between affective empathy and defending only among boys (Caravita et al., 2009). Gini and colleagues' model of the association between empathy and defending only converged in their model including boys' data (Gini et al., 2007). Barchia and Bussey (2011) found general empathy to be related to defending at a later time point only for adolescent girls. A number of other researchers have found a significant association between empathy and defending concurrently among their early adolescent and adolescent samples that included boys and girls (Correia & Dalbert, 2008; Gini et al., 2008b; Nickerson, Mele, & Princiotta, 2008). Although

empathy does seem to be somewhat related to defending, an exploration of other moderators and contextual factors that could help explain additional variance seems necessary.

Understanding others' cognitive mental states (not necessarily emotional states, as in studies of the empathy-defending relation) also predicts defending, although this ability, referred to as theory of mind skills, may be attributed to defenders as well as aggressors (Caravita et al., 2010, Gini, 2006). Aggressors may use their theory of mind skills to effectively attack victims, while defenders are likely motivated by them to help their victimized peers. Those who are aware of victims' distress are more likely to be victims than those less aware (Pronk et al., 2014).

Moral disengagement, a construct that represents the tendency to cognitively disengage from self-sanctions in order to justify aggression (Gini, 2006), has been investigated in relation to defending as well. Among early adolescents but not older children in their sample, Caravita and colleagues (2012) found that acceptance of moral transgressions was negatively associated with defending. Only among girls in their older child sample was moral disengagement negatively associated with defending. Another study did not find an association between moral disengagement and defending (Barchia & Bussey, 2011). Defenders tended to report that they would feel guilty and ashamed if they were to fail to intervene when a peer is experiencing victimization (Pronk et al., 2014).

When individuals have an understanding of another person's circumstances in a situation, it can lead to moral emotions (Malti, Ongley, Dys, & Colasante, 2012) or feelings that impact whether they will act in line with the predispositions (Person Factors) to be helpful and act prosocially. Those who felt it was their moral responsibility to help a victimized peer because peer victimization is wrong reported they would try to help (Thornberg, 2012). Those who expected their defending to decrease bullying, make the victim feel better, and also improve their

own status were more often defenders, especially if they valued the victim feeling better about their plight. Valuing bullying decreasing also contributed to the prediction of defending (Pöyhönen, Juvonen, & Salmivalli, 2012). Defenders may feel a sense of responsibility to behave in line with their expectations of themselves and their values.

Response Conditions

Response conditions are the temporal circumstances that limit or expand opportunities individuals have to respond to situations in certain ways. They describe when and in what order possible behavioral responses can be enacted (Kelley, Holmes, Kerr, Reis, Rusbult, & Van Lange, 2003). Defending occurs when someone is in need of peer support. As in Latané and Darley's emergency situations, for an individual to defend, there must be a situation to defend an interdependent partner from, and the potential defender must feel it is his or her personal responsibility to intervene. Victims may not have the freedom to decide when they will or will not become part of an active defender/victim dyad, in that defenders may decide to support victims or intervene on behalf of peers on their own accord. Victims may also wish certain bystanders would intervene, but may not be able to fill their role as defended victims because a peer must first decide to defend.

A child or adolescents' perceived power, ability, and awareness of one's own wellbeing may influence the probability that intervention on behalf of a victimized peer will occur. For instance, defenders may intervene only when they are socially powerful and do not fear their own victimization, or when they know the act of defending will be viewed favorably (Rigby & Johnson, 2006; Salmivalli, et al., 1996). Defenders are regarded favorably by their peers. They are both liked and socially preferred, which means they are accepted and tend not to be rejected by their peers, and also are perceived by others to be popular, which suggests they are visible

within the peer group and have power and prominence among their peers (Caravita, Gini, & Pozzoli, 2012; Caravita et al., 2009; Caravita et al., 2010; Goossens et al., 2006; Pöyhönen, Juvonen, & Salmivalli, 2010; Salmivalli et al., 1996; Sainio et al., 2011). Victims especially nominate their defenders as popular, although the general peer group tends to perceive defenders as popular as well (Sainio et al., 2011). However, some researchers have found that social preference is associated with defending, while popularity is a characteristic more related to aggressing against peers (Caravita et al., 2012).

Interviews with children and adolescents affirm that they evaluate the social positions of others in comparison to themselves during peer victimization situations when trying to decide how they should act. For example, one participant described avoiding standing up to a powerful aggressor who was perceived to be higher on the social ladder (Thornberg et al., 2012). Craig and Pepler (1997) observed that individuals within the peer group were more respectful to bullies than they were to victims during episodes of peer victimization. This type of behavior has been considered by many to be that of reinforcing the bully (Juvonen & Galvan, 2008), but it also calls into question how feasible it is in the minds of potential defenders to disrupt this hierarchy by standing up to aggressors and siding with victimized peers. Situations in which an individual could potentially defend are unique from other situations that may require prosocial conduct in that intervening in favor of the victim represents a risky behavior. The defender's behavior, while likely to positively affect the victim, is also disruptive of the aggressor's goals (Pozzoli, Gini, & Vieno, 2012). Even if the majority of peers have pro-victim attitudes (Rigby & Slee, 1991) and have positive regard for defenders, defenders are "challenging the status and power of perpetrators by taking sides with the victim" (Salmivalli, Voeten, & Poskiparta, 2011, p. 669), which could be especially risky in a case in which defending proves unsuccessful, which

according to observational studies, may occur 25% of the time (Hawkins et al., 1998). One's social self-efficacy, one's perception about his or her ability to behave effectively in social situations (Pronk et al., 2013), is another factor that has been explored to learn more about what differentiates defenders from other children and adolescents in the peer group. In order to decide to defend when witnessing an episode of peer victimization, individuals likely have to believe that they can perform the behavior that will help them reach their goal of dissipating the situation (Gini et al., 2008b). Defenders reported higher efficacy to defend in hypothetical episodes of peer victimization than did outsiders, those not involved (Pronk et al., 2013), and efficacy to defend has been associated with defending concurrently (Pöyhönen et al., 2010). However, contradictory results were found in one study; efficacy to defend was not significantly related to self-reports of frequency of defending over time, although the two constructs were correlated (Barchia & Bussey, 2011).

Efficacy, which could relate to individual's expectations about the outcomes of particular behavior within interdependent relationships, clearly seems connected to defending. The effect of popularity and efficacy to defend on defending suggests that those who perceive little risk to themselves due to their high standing in the eyes of the peer group and their confidence in their abilities to help are those most likely to help their victimized peers. Bystanders' expectations about the result of their defending explains some variance in defending. They have to consider the potential outcome of the behavior for themselves, for the victim, for the aggressor, and for the relationships with the two. Even if they value their peers' wellbeing, if defenders do not have high expectations about the impact of defending decreasing bullying, and if they fear being victimized themselves, (Thornberg et al., 2012), their concern for their peers may not be motivation enough to intervene (Pöyhönen et al., 2012).

Although there is general agreement between studies about predictors of defending, there are some factors that vary by age. Younger participants report more defending across studies than older participants (Menesini et al., 1997; Pöyhönen et al., 2010; Pozzoli, Ang, & Gini, 2012; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). Younger individuals have also reported a perception that their peers provide help in peer victimization situations at a higher frequency than older individuals (Menesini et al., 1997). Some of the interpersonal correlates of defending have also varied by age, such as whether perceived popularity is related to defending. Caravita and colleagues (2009) found this association among their younger middle childhood sample, but not their adolescent sample. Positive attitudes toward peer victims have also been found to be higher among younger children and adolescents versus older adolescents (Rigby & Slee, 1991).

Bullying tends to peak in early adolescence (Eslea, & Rees, 2001). As youth transition to middle school, social dominance hierarchies that may have been in place throughout elementary school, may become reorganized (Juvonen & Graham, 2015). Bullying has been found to facilitate gaining status during this transition (Pellegrini, & Long, 2002). These factors may facilitate a change in observed social norms among the peer group. Even youth who have a predisposition to act prosocially and defend victimized peers may interpret this behavior as risky in a context where bullying is more common and passive bystanding is the norm.

A study by Gini, Pozzoli, Borghi, and Franzoni (2008) involved the presentation of hypothetical victimization situations to youth; peers in the vignette responded by either a) joining in with the aggressors, b) intervening and defending the victim, or c) passively bystanding. Older, middle-school aged participants exposed to the defender vignette reported liking the hypothetical victim more than participants in the “joining in” condition. There were no differences between conditions and liking the hypothetical victim among the elementary-school-

aged participants. Even within this experimental manipulation, there was evidence of an effect of peer norms and behavior influencing attitudes towards victims among older youth, but not younger youth. Although person factor variables, such as the individual tendency to act prosocially may be present, older youth, who begin to place greater importance on their peer relationships (Brown, 1990), and may better understand the peer norms around bullying, the consequences of defending, and may limit their responses during an episode of peer victimization in order to protect their own outcome. This has not been empirically tested, but it would be of interest to test whether predispositions to behave in prosocial ways among the peer group are more attenuated by an understanding of social norms and consequences that develop throughout adolescence.

Third Parties

Within the peer group, there are many potential partners with whom individuals interact one-on-one, as well as those who interact with a dyad (such as an aggressor/victim pair) within a relationship of triadic interdependence. Third parties can enter a situation occurring between a dyad and influence it in a variety of ways. The possible outcomes of the interaction between the interdependent dyad is no longer a product of only the actions of the actor and partner, but now includes the person factors of the third party as well as the relationship factors of the third party with each individual and within the triad. The interaction within the triad could both affect and be affected by future interactions based on past interactions and situational and contextual factors (Kelley et al., 2003d). With the additional person, the interaction becomes more complex, but may actually provide the individual with more information about choices of actions in a given situation in that it may provide more information about the situation and possible outcomes (Kelley et al., 2003d).

An example of an interdependent triadic relation in regard to peer victimization is the defender-victim-aggressor triad. Attention must be paid to the dyadic relationships within the triadic relationship, as well as the triadic relationship to explain the costs and benefits of enacting helpful bystanding behaviors. As Card (2011) explained, “a child’s outcomes are dependent not only on the behaviors that the child enacts, but also the responses of the peer who is the target of these behaviors as well as the peers who might intercede in the interaction” (p. 192). As described in regard to aggressor-bystander and victim-bystander dyads, established aggressor-bystander and victim-bystander relationships may affect bystander lack of intervention or defending. The third person invokes social norms that promote conflict resolution (Kelley et al., 2003d), but in the case of a defender-victim-aggressor triad, consideration must be given to multiple relationships and the maximization of all individuals’ outcomes, especially one’s own.

If someone defends a victimized peer and as a result becomes the next victim of that aggressor, this will likely deter him or her from defending this peer against this aggressor (or perhaps any aggressor) in the future, as the person would find that maximizing another’s outcomes over their own did not pay off. Perhaps these children perceive from the information at hand that they are more likely to maximize their own outcomes if they refrain from defending others. The informational condition is one that suggests that refraining from defending is the best way to maximize one’s own outcomes. Assistants might assist aggressors in order to maximize the aggressor’s success while meeting their own goal of gaining the aggressor’s favor or peer group status. Or, an individual may show favor toward a victimized individual because they genuinely want what’s best for the victim. In these situations, defenders, as third parties in interdependent relationships, are working toward the overall pattern of outcomes that will benefit themselves and victims, or (rarely) only the victims (Kelley, Holmes, Kerr, Reis, & Rusbult, et

al., 2003d). Kelley (1982) explains that in regard to maximizing their own outcomes, individuals are better off being partially altruistic, rather than wholly altruistic, and that “well-adapted persons will always give some weight to their own outcomes” (p. 81).

Kelley and colleagues (2003d) specify that a third party’s place in the interdependent relationship could be fleeting or stable. Indeed, although defending roles have shown to be fairly stable, the dyadic interdependencies of who defends whom have not (Huitsing et al., 2014). How much commitment a third party feels to continue a pattern of interaction after a particular incident may impact his willingness to intervene. Furthermore, particularly within the peer group, the third party is likely aware of the interdependence between the aggressor and victim, and aware of his or her own interdependent relationships with both partners and as a triad (Kelley et al., 2003d). If third parties have some power over the dyad, they may act on what they believe is fair and right versus what is wrong. They could maximize their own outcomes in these instances because they are acting in line with their own beliefs and morals about victimization, or their altruistic tendency to help others, by trying to stop it from continuing, or could be acting in line with what they believe will be externally rewarded by others (peers, teachers, parents, etc.) by acting in line with social norms and moral expectations.

Although the outcome for the third party defender may not seem significant, the victim’s outcomes may be altered substantially. Interdependence of defender-victim dyads in particular is an example of *asymmetric dependence*, which occurs when one person can exert influence over the other, but the other person does not have the power to influence the outcomes of the first. The outcomes of the one dyad partner are therefore dependent on the first, but not vice versa (Kelley et al., 2003c). Defender-victim relationships may be marked by asymmetric dependence in that the defender is able to impact the victim’s outcomes, but the victim may have little influence on

the defender's outcomes. In fact, victims may not even have control over whether defenders choose to defend them, although it might behoove the victim to coordinate his or her behavior with that of the defender third party, who holds the power (Kelley, Holmes, Kerr, Reis, & Rusbult et al., 2003c). It is important to note that both aggressors and defenders tend to have status in the peer group, and tend to have supporters of their interpersonal behavior among peers. Therefore the aggressor-defender interdependent relationship *would not* be considered one of asymmetric dependence. Defenders have been observed to successfully stop victimization from continuing 75% of the time among children (Hawkins et al., 2001). By having the interdependent relationship, including its patterns of interaction between the victim and aggressor, dismantled by the third party, it may alter the actor and partner's senses of self in relation to the other, decreasing some of the power the aggressor has over the victim, and increasing the defender and victim's power as the aggressor loses some. But, standing up for a victimized peer may not always contribute to defender wellbeing. It is possible that a defender will be unsuccessful in his or her attempt, or, even if successful, create a more competitive and antagonistic relationship with the aggressor. Therefore, the defender and victim's interests may conflict, resulting in the dependent victim relying on the defender putting the victim's interests before his or her own (Kelley et al., 2003c). The effect of defending on defenders is only beginning to be established empirically (Meter & Card, 2015), but how defending contributes to defender wellbeing is an important step to take in understanding why defenders may or may not defend.

It seems necessary to note that likely not all defender-victim relationships are asymmetrically dependent chronically, but they may be situationally (Kelley et al., 2003c). Children may engage in different roles at different times. It has been suggested that perhaps victims defend each other, in line with correlations between victimization and defending

(Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Caravita et al., 2010; Pozzoli et al., 2012). Researchers have investigated secondary participant roles in addition to the primary role designation (e.g. a bully, but also received nominations for the reinforce role) and have examined correlations between participant role behaviors in order to understand if youth who fulfill one role are likely to fulfill others. These investigations have shown that defenders may also be recognized as victims, and vice versa (Fitzpatrick & Bussey, 2011; Salmivalli et al., 1996; Sutton & Smith, 1999). In an examination of dyadic relations between victims and defenders, victims were more likely to nominate each other mutually as defenders than would be expected by chance (Sainio et al., 2011). There is evidence that over time, individuals victimized by the same aggressor tended to defend each other (Huitsing et al., 2014).

If victims of peer victimization stand up for each other, within *one* peer victimization episode there may be asymmetric power between the two, in that the victim is relatively powerless, while the defender has the potential to stand up to a powerful aggressor. This may not be true in all situations with the same triad in past or future instances. In the future, the power differential between defender and victim could switch, even in a triadic episode with the same aggressor, or the power difference between defender and victim could change depending on who the aggressor is. It is not necessary for the power difference in the interdependent relationship to remain static for it to exist. If the power differential is more situational than static, victims who could potentially defend each other may recognize that when they defend, they are maximizing the chance the defending will be reciprocated at a time when the partner has more power in the future (Kelley et al., 2003c).

Kelley and colleagues (2003c) further described how when the actor or partner believed the power holder's behavior to be truly altruistic and maximized the dependent's wellbeing

above the defender's own, both the power holder and dependent (in our example defender and victim) felt added value in response to the power holder behaving so as to maximize the dependent's outcomes. Sainio and colleagues (2011) found that defended victims reported higher self-esteem than undefended victims. Perhaps those who perceive defender's support feel valued by having someone else work to maximize their own outcomes. This would be an interesting avenue for future research on how received defending impacts victim wellbeing.

Interdependent Relationships with the Larger Peer Group: Maintenance of Social Norms

Interdependent relationships with partners in the peer group may also refer to relationships outside the defender-victim, defender-aggressor, or defender-victim-aggressor dyads and triads, in that behaviors enacted among the peer group have consequences that depend on peer group values and norms. These norms may be in favor of supporting victims, or they could be more in line with reinforcing or assisting aggressors. "In the absence of powerful social norms or higher order goals favoring benevolence, [maximizing victim outcomes rather than one's own], it is not surprising that power holders frequently behave in a self-oriented manner" (Kelley et al., 2003c, p. 255). Bystanders with a greater understanding of social norms have more information about potential response conditions and outcomes, which, in turn, helps them demonstrate socially-normative behavior.

Defender designation or behavior is fairly stable over time (Barchia & Bussey, 2011; Huitsing et al., 2014; Meter & Card, 2015; Salmivalli, Lappalainen, & Lagerspetz, 1998), but change in classroom environment seems to affect stability in roles (Salmivalli et al., 1998), suggesting that peer behavior within the classroom context may affect this role. It is possible, however, that the changes seen in role designation also occur due to changes in peer nominators that also change when classroom compositions change (Goossens et al., 2006). Children and

adolescents' participant roles are additionally determined by peer group behavioral norms. Above and beyond the effects of individual characteristics, including provictim attitudes, which were positively associated with defending, a perception of peer pressure (expectation) to defend was significantly associated with defending among an older elementary and middle school samples (Pozzoli & Gini, 2010; Pozzoli et al., 2012). Interestingly, those who felt a strong personal responsibility to defend peer victims did not differ in whether perceived peer expectations to intervene additionally contributed to the prediction of their intervening, but those who felt a low personal responsibility were influenced to defend anyway (Pozzoli & Gini, 2010). Rigby and Johnson (2006) also found perceptions of peer expectations to be related to reports that one would defend. Furthermore, researchers have found that the average extent to which peers in the smaller peer group, the classroom, believed that defending was a normative behavior was associated with defending (Pozzoli et al., 2012). Salmivalli and colleagues similarly assessed the effect of frequency of defending and frequency of reinforcing aggressors in the classroom to see how each affected frequency of classroom aggression (Salmivalli et al., 2011). They found that 35% of the variation in defending in their large sample was due to between classroom differences. Above the effect of all control variables in question, the mean level of classroom defending was associated with the frequency of peer victimization. Complimentary to this finding, the researchers also found a positive effect of mean reinforcing at the classroom level on peer victimization within the classroom. The level of defending versus reinforcing of peer victimization also attenuates or compounds the association between risk factors for (and correlates of victimization, social anxiety and peer rejection (Kärnä et al., 2010). Espelage, Green, and Polanin, (2011) looked at even smaller subgroups within the peer group—friendship groups—to assess whether friendship group membership influenced willingness to intervene in

hypothetical peer victimization situations. Individuals in peer groups involved in bullying negatively predicted willingness to intervene after controlling for individual predictors among boys. However, they did not find the same effect among girls. Whether the effect is the same for boys and girls, the results from these two studies give credence to the importance of considering contextual effects in relation to participant roles and peer victimization among children in peer groups (Salmivalli et al., 2011). Investigation of the process of internalizing norms and how that translates into individual perceptions and beliefs that then guide behavior would be an important avenue to help understand how interventions might create changes in perceptions and beliefs that then guide behavior.

In addition to this contextual effect, the norms in the form of beliefs and attitudes may affect bystander behavior as well. Aggressive behavior toward peers can be justified by aggressors (Gini, Pozzoli, & Hymel, 2013) and by a small minority of bystanders who tend to blame victims for their plight. Victims in hypothetical stories were more likely to be blamed by participants when bystanders to the incident in the story were passive or assisted the aggressors rather than when they intervened (Gini et al., 2008a). This shows that youth pay attention to the behaviors of others during episodes of peer victimization and may take their cues about how to interpret the situation from others' reactions. Unfortunately, many young individuals underestimate their peers' provictim attitudes. Those who do underestimate their peers' provictim attitudes tend to report defending their victimized peers less than those who perceive the peer group to hold more provictim norms (Sandstrom et al., 2013). When teacher reports were used to measure participant roles, this overestimation of the discrepancy between own victimization attitudes and those of the peer group was not predictive of defending, but did positively predict those in the sample who were likely to stand by passively rather than

intervening (Sandstrom & Bartini, 2010). This behavior may be indicative of an act of preservation. As discussed in the section about dyadic interdependence, if individuals fear their interdependent partners in the peer group may disapprove of their provictim behavior, they may fail to intervene to promote self-preservation. In these instances they have chosen to maximize their own outcomes rather than another's.

Conclusion

Interdependence theory can be used to frame hypotheses about individual, interpersonal, and peer group-level influences on bystanders to defend. The nature of the relationship between peers, such as the type of affiliation, in addition to response conditions, informational conditions, person factors, and peer group behavioral norms have all been shown to impact potential defenders' behavior or cognitions. Interdependence theory helps explain how these different factors interact with contexts to predict behavior. Although interdependence theory has not often been applied to the study of youth behavior in participant roles (but see Card, 2011), many of the studies that have already been conducted have considered aspects of the theory when forming and testing their hypotheses, such as expecting that friendship relationships will impact behavior, or by suggesting that power, status, or popularity may contribute to whether or not individuals defending victims and stand up to aggressors. Rather than replace other theories of defending including the bystander effect and goal-framing approach, interdependence theory encompasses many of concepts included in these theories and provides a framework for testing the multiple levels of effects on defending.

Future Directions

A number of person factors have been and continue to be investigated to better understand the individual tendencies that motivate bystanders to intervene. Triadic victim-

defender-aggressor interdependencies and peer group relationships and norms further influence defending both in immediate situations, and have the potential to impact future interdependent behaviors due to their consequences. Much of the research on defending has only focused on one or a few of these components of the complex mechanisms influencing defending behavior.

Interdependence theory helps bring together the variety of previous defending research that allows multiple components to simultaneously explain defending behavior. It also provides a framework for building future research questions that include multiple levels and complexities.

As described previously, some researchers have already begun to include both person factor predictors and peer group norm predictors in their studies to help explain peer defending, or have focused on interpersonal relationships in addition to person factors. With evidence now that all of these factors contribute to the prediction of defending, it is time to design studies to test these different groups of predictors in unison. Three areas of defending research ripe for future inquiry of described below.

1) Recent research has begun to uncover the question of who defends whom and why in the peer group (Huitsing et al, 2014; Veenstra, Verlinden, Huitsing, Verhulst, & Tiemeier, 2013).

Future studies can build on this research by investigating more relations and similarities between victims and defenders as well as defenders and aggressors to help explain under what circumstances peers may defend.

2) Through what processes do individuals in the peer group internalize peer group norms in regard to peer victimization, and how do these internalized norms affect individual perceptions and beliefs that then guide behavior? An understanding of these processes could help inform empirical research and also interventions that attempt to change peer group norms to those that are not supportive of an aggressive peer culture.

3) It is also important that researchers and those evaluating anti-bullying interventions that include a defending component pay attention to the effects of received defending on victims, but also on the defenders themselves as well as the interpersonal relationships between these actors in episodes of peer victimization. Youth refrain from defending victimized peers for a variety of reasons including that they do not know what they should do to help, they fear becoming the next victim, they believe they might do the wrong thing and actually exacerbate the situation, and they are afraid of losing social influence (Hazler, 1996; Stevens, Van Oost, & De Bourdeaudhuij, 2000). If young people in the peer group are concerned about these individual and interpersonal factors in regard to defending peer victims, researchers and interventionists should be too. It has been suggested that based on findings that exemplify the importance of the interpersonal and peer group component in regard to behavior during occurrences of peer victimization, intervention and prevention programs need to pay attention to the primary peer group, such as by considering how intervening is viewed by friends, rather than solely focusing on improving empathy or promoting prosocial behavior (Espelage et al., 2012). O'Connell and colleagues (1999) note the importance of teaching children effective, non-hostile, non-aggressive strategies to diffuse peer victimization situations that do not put them at risk of becoming victims themselves. Without the skills to effectively defend and the social context to support efforts to defend, defending may not result in the positive outcomes for interdependent partners in the peer group adults and interventionists may anticipate. Further research on these factors is clearly needed to accompany encouragement of the peer group to defend.

Limitations

Despite the strengths of interdependence theory in the framing of defending research, there are some limitations to be discussed. Namely, some of the research on different factors'

impact on defending has not shown consistent results. For example, the relationship with the aggressor has been shown in one study to be associated with defending (Tisak & Tisak, 1996), but not in another (Oh & Hazler, 2009). Rather than disprove the usefulness of interdependence theory, these examples show the importance of attending to multiple influential factors in unison in studies, rather than focusing only on one specific aspect. For instance, might the quality of the relationship with the aggressor or the aggressors' status affect whether youth will be more or less likely to defend if they have a friendship with the aggressor? Similarly, as discussed, there are age differences in some of the associations found between predictors and defending in previous research. Although social norms can help explain why these differences may occur, in that when weighing benefits and disadvantages to behaving in certain ways to impact interdependent interaction partners, these risks and benefits may vary with age norms; further research is needed to test the assumptions discussed in this section. Last, it is possible that there would be differences in defender responses to bullying and peer victimization situations. It is our assumption that, given the established relationships in a bully-victim dyad, the processes explained through interdependence theory would be even stronger given the ongoing relationships and power differentials among involved parties.

Conclusion

Defending has proven to be a successful mechanism through which peer group members can contribute to their peers' and their peer group's wellbeing. As researchers continue to investigate the processes that lead to defending and could be used to encourage additional peer defenders, it is important to integrate the many levels of factors which contribute to whether individuals will act prosocially on behalf of the peer group by defending victimized peers into their research. The overarching interdependence theory can be used to frame hypotheses and

organize findings about different predictors and consequences of defending into a meaningful whole that can contribute to our understanding of defending and how it is related to victim, defender, and school community wellbeing.

References

- Barchia, K., & Bussey, K. (2011). Predictors of student defenders of peer aggression victims: Empathy and social cognitive factors. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35(4), 289-297. doi: 10.1177/0165025410396746
- Barhight, L. R., Hubbard, J. A., & Hyde, C. T. (2012). Children's Physiological and Emotional Reactions to Witnessing Bullying Predict Bystander Intervention. *Child Development*.
- Boulton, M. J., Trueman, M., & Flemington, I. (2002). Associations between Secondary School Pupils' Definitions of Bullying, Attitudes towards Bullying, and Tendencies to Engage in Bullying: Age and sex differences. *Educational Studies*, 28(4), 353-370. doi: 10.1080/0305569022000042390
- Brown, B. B., Eicher, S. A., & Petrie, S. (1986). The importance of peer group ("crowd") affiliation in adolescence. *Journal of Adolescence*, 9(1), 73-96. doi: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971\(86\)80029-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0140-1971(86)80029-X)
- Caravita, S. C. S., Di Blasio, P., & Salmivalli, C. (2009). Unique and interactive effects of empathy and social status on involvement in bullying. *Social Development*, 18(1), 140-163. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00465.x
- Caravita, S. C. S., Di Blasio, P., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). Early Adolescents' Participation in Bullying: Is ToM Involved? *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 30(1), 138-170. doi: 10.1177/0272431609342983
- Caravita, S., Gini, G., & Pozzoli, T. (2012). Main and moderated effects of moral cognition and status on bullying and defending. *Aggressive Behavior*, 38(6), 456-468. doi: 10.1002/ab.21447

- Card, N. A. (2011). Toward a relationship perspective on aggression among schoolchildren: Integrating social cognitive and interdependence theories. *Psychology of Violence, 1*(3), 188-201.
- Card, N. A., & Hodges, E. V. E. (2008). Peer victimization among schoolchildren: Correlations, causes, consequences, and considerations in assessment and intervention. *School Psychology Quarterly, 23*(4), 451-461. doi: 10.1037/a0012769
- Card, N. A., Isaacs, J., & Hodges, E. V. E. (2007). Correlates of school victimization: Implications for prevention and intervention. In J. E. Zins, M. J. Elias & C. A. Maher (Eds.), *Bullying, victimization, and peer harassment: A handbook of prevention and intervention* (pp. 339-366). New York: Haworth Press.
- Casper, D. M. (2013). *Participant roles in aggression: Analysis of the overt and relational aggression participant role scales with confirmatory factor analysis. ProQuest Dissertations and Theses*, 146. Retrieved from <http://ezproxy.library.arizona.edu/login?url=http://search.proquest.com/docview/1477859675?accountid=8360>. (1477859675).
- CDC, 2014. <http://www.cdc.gov/violenceprevention/youthviolence/bullyingresearch/>
- Correia, I., & Dalbert, C. (2008). School bullying: Belief in a personal just world of bullies, victims, and defenders. *European Psychologist, 13*(4), 248-254. doi: 10.1027/1016-9040.13.4.248
- Craig, W. M., Pepler, D., & Atlas, R. (2000). Observations of Bullying in the Playground and in the Classroom. *School Psychology International, 21*(1), 22-36. doi: 10.1177/0143034300211002

- Craig, W. M., & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of Bullying and Victimization in the School Yard. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13*(2), 41-59. doi: 10.1177/082957359801300205
- Darley, J. M., & Latané, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: Diffusion of responsibility. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8*(4, Pt.1), 377-383. doi: 10.1037/h0025589
- Ennett, S. T., & Bauman, K. E. (1996). Adolescent Social Networks School, Demographic, and Longitudinal Considerations. *Journal of Adolescent Research, 11*(2), 194-215.
- Espelage, D. L., Green, H., & Polanin, J. (2011). Willingness to intervene in bullying episodes among middle school students: Individual and peer-group influences. *The Journal of Early Adolescence, XX*(X), 1-26. doi: 10.1177/0272431611423017
- Fitzpatrick, S., & Bussey, K. (2011). The development of the Social Bullying Involvement Scales. *Aggressive Behavior, 37*(2), 177-192. doi: 10.1002/ab.20379
- Fox, C. L., Jones, S. E., Stiff, C. E., & Sayers, J. (2014). Does the gender of the bully/victim dyad and the type of bullying influence children's responses to a bullying incident? *Aggressive Behavior, n/a-n/a*. doi: 10.1002/ab.21529
- Gini, G. (2006). Social cognition and moral cognition in bullying: what's wrong? *Aggressive Behavior, 32*(6), 528-539. doi: 10.1002/ab.20153
- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoè, G. (2007). Does empathy predict adolescents' bullying and defending behavior? [Article]. *Aggressive Behavior, 33*(5), 467-476. doi: 10.1002/ab.20204

- Gini, G., Albiero, P., Benelli, B., & Altoè, G. (2008a). Determinants of adolescents' active defending and passive bystanding behavior in bullying. *Journal of Adolescence*, 31(1), 93-105. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2007.05.002>
- Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., Borghi, F., & Franzoni, L. (2008b). The role of bystanders in students' perception of bullying and sense of safety. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46(6), 617-638. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2008.02.001
- Gini, G., Pozzoli, T., & Hymel, S. (2014). Moral disengagement among children and youth: A meta-analytic review of links to aggressive behavior. *Aggressive Behavior*, 40(1), 56-68. doi: 10.1002/ab.21502
- Goossens, F. A., Olthof, T., & Dekker, P. H. (2006). New Participant Role Scales: comparison between various criteria for assigning roles and indications for their validity. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(4), 343-357. doi: 10.1002/ab.20133
- Hawker, D. S. J., & Boulton, M. J. (2000). Twenty Years' Research on Peer Victimization and Psychosocial Maladjustment: A Meta-analytic Review of Cross-sectional Studies. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry*, 41(4), 441-455. doi: 10.1111/1469-7610.00629
- Hawkins, D. L., Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (2001). Naturalistic Observations of Peer Interventions in Bullying. *Social Development*, 10(4), 512-527. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00178
- Hazler, R. J. (1996). Bystanders: An overlooked factor in peer on peer abuse. *The Journal for the Professional Counselor*, 11(2), 11-21.

- Howard, A. M., Landau, S., & Pryor, J. B. (2013). Peer bystanders to bullying: Who wants to play with the victim?. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 42(2), 265-276. doi: 10.1007/s10802-013-9770-8
- Huitsing, G., Snijders, T. A., Van Duijn, M. A., & Veenstra, R. (2014). Victims, bullies, and their defenders: A longitudinal study of the coevolution of positive and negative networks. *Development and Psychopathology*, 1-15. doi: 10.1017/S0954579414000297
- Huitsing, G., & Veenstra, R. (2012). Bullying in classrooms: participant roles from a social network perspective. *Aggressive Behavior*, 38(6), 494-509. doi: 10.1002/ab.21438
- Jimerson, S. R., Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (2010). International scholarship advances science and practice addressing bullying in schools. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective*. New York: Routledge.
- Juvonen, J., & Galván, A. (2008). Peer influence in involuntary social groups: Lessons from research on bullying. In M. J. Prinstein & K. A. Dodge (Eds.), *Understanding peer influence in children and adolescents*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Kärnä, A., Voeten, M., Poskiparta, E., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). Vulnerable children in varying classroom contexts: Bystanders' behaviors moderate the effects of risk factors on victimization. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 56(3), 261-282. doi: 10.1353/mpq.0.0052
- Kelley, H. H. (1982). The transformation of motivation: Responsiveness to patterns of interdependence. *Personal Relationships: Their structures and Processes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kelley, H. H., Holmes, J. G., Kerr, N. L., Reis, H. T., Rusbult, C. E. & Van Lange, P. A. M.

(2003a). Entry #2: Mutual Partner Control: I Scratch Your Back, You Scratch Mine. *An Atlas of Interpersonal Situations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kelley, H. H., Holmes, J. G., Kerr, N. L., Reis, H. T., Rusbult, C. E. & Van Lange, P. A. M.

(2003b). Entry #3: Corresponding Mutual Join Control: Getting in Sync. *An Atlas of Interpersonal Situations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kelley, H. H., Holmes, J. G., Kerr, N. L., Reis, H. T., Rusbult, C. E. & Van Lange, P. A. M.

(2003c). Entry #11: Asymmetric Dependence. *An Atlas of Interpersonal Situations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Kelley, H. H., Holmes, J. G., Kerr, N. L., Reis, H. T., Rusbult, C. E. & Van Lange, P. A. M.

(2003d). Entry #19: Third Parties. *An Atlas of Interpersonal Situations*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Latané, B., & Darley, J. M. (1968). Group inhibition of bystander intervention in emergencies.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 10(3), 215-221. doi: 10.1037/h0026570

Latané, B., & Rodin, J. (1969). A lady in distress: Inhibiting effects of friends and strangers on

bystander intervention. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 5(2), 189-202.

doi.org/10.1016/0022-1031(69)90046-8

Levine, M., Cassidy, C., Brazier, G., & Reicher, S. (2002). Self-categorization and bystander

non-intervention: Two experimental studies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*,

32(7), 1452-1463. doi: 10.1111/j.1559-1816.2002.tb01446.x

Lindenberg, S. (2008). Social rationality, semi-modularity and goal-framing: What is it all

about? *Analyse & Kritik*, 30(2).

- Malti, T., Ongley, S.F., Dys, S.P., & Colasante, T. (2012). Adolescents' emotions and reasoning in contexts of moral conflict and social exclusion. *New Directions for Youth Development*, 136, 27-40. doi: 10.1002/yd.20036
- Menesini, E., Eslea, M., Smith, P. K., Genta, M. L., Giannetti, E., Fonzi, A., & Costabile, A. (1997). Cross-national comparison of children's attitudes towards bully/victim problems in school. *Aggressive Behavior*, 23(4), 245-257. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1098-2337(1997)23:4<245::aid-ab3>3.0.co;2-j
- Merrell, K. W., Gueldner, B. A., Ross, S. W., & Isava, D. M. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23(1), 26-42. doi: 10.1037/1045-3830.23.1.26
- Meter, D. J., & Card, N. A. (2015). Effects of defending: The longitudinal relations among peer-perceived defending of victimized peers, victimization, and liking. *Social Development*, XX(XX), XX-XX. doi: 10.1111/sode.12129
- Musher-Eizenman, D. R., Boxer, P., Danner, S., Dubow, E. F., Goldstein, S. E., & Heretick, D. M. L. (2004). Social-cognitive mediators of the relation of environmental and emotion regulation factors to children's aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30(5), 389-408. doi: 10.1002/ab.20078
- Nickerson, A. B., Mele, D., & Princiotta, D. (2008). Attachment and empathy as predictors of roles as defenders or outsiders in bullying interactions. *Journal of School Psychology*, 46, 687-703. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2008.06.002
- Obermann, M.-L. (2011). Moral Disengagement Among Bystanders to School Bullying. *Journal of School Violence*, 10(3), 239-257. doi: 10.1080/15388220.2011.578276

- O'Connell, P., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: insights and challenges for intervention. *Journal of Adolescence*, 22(4), 437-452. doi: 10.1006/jado.1999.0238
- Oh, I., & Hazler, R. J. (2009). Contributions of personal and situational factors to bystanders' reactions to school bullying. *School Psychology International*, 30(3), 291-310. doi: 10.1177/0143034309106499
- Olthof, T., Goossens, F. A., Vermande, M. M., Aleva, E. A., & van der Meulen, M. (2011). Bullying as strategic behavior: Relations with desired and acquired dominance in the peer group. *Journal of School Psychology*, 49(3), 339-359. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2011.03.003
- Perren, S., Gutzwiller-Helfenfinger, E., Malti, T., & Hymel, S. (2012). Moral reasoning and emotion attributions of adolescent bullies, victims, and bully-victims. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 30(4), 511-530. doi: 10.1111/j.2044-835X.2011.02059.x
- Perry, D. G., Kusel, S. J., & Perry, L. C. (1988). Victims of peer aggression. *Developmental Psychology*, 24(6), 807-814. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.24.6.807
- Polanin, J. R., Espelage, D. L., & Pigott, T. D. (2012). A meta-analysis of school-based bullying prevention programs' effects on bystander intervention behavior. *School Psychology Review*, 41(1), 47-65.
- Porter, J. R. (2009). *Children's tendency to defend victims of school bullying: Gender, social identity, and normative pressure*. (Doctoral dissertation). Retrieved from http://etd.fcla.edu/UF/UFE0024196/porter_j.pdf.
- Pöyhönen, V., Juvonen, J., & Salmivalli, C. (2010). What does it take to stand up for the victim of bullying? The interplay between personal and social factors. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 56(2), 143-163.

- Pöyhönen, V., Juvonen, J., & Salmivalli, C. (2012). Standing Up for the Victim, Siding with the Bully or Standing by? Bystander Responses in Bullying Situations. *Social Development*, 21(4), 722-741. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2012.00662.x
- Pozzoli, T., Ang, R. P., & Gini, G. (2012). Bystanders' Reactions to Bullying: A Cross-cultural Analysis of Personal Correlates Among Italian and Singaporean Students. *Social Development*, 21(4), 686-703. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2011.00651.x
- Pozzoli, T., & Gini, G. (2010). Active Defending and Passive Bystanding Behavior in Bullying: The Role of Personal Characteristics and Perceived Peer Pressure. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 38(6), 815-827. doi: 10.1007/s10802-010-9399-9
- Pozzoli, T., & Gini, G. (2013). Why Do Bystanders of Bullying Help or Not? A Multidimensional Model. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 33(3), 315-340. doi: 10.1177/0272431612440172
- Pozzoli, T., Gini, G., & Vieno, A. (2012). The role of individual correlates and class norms in defending and passive bystanding behavior in bullying: A multilevel analysis. *Child Development*, 83(6), 1917-1931. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01831.x
- Pozzoli, T., & Gini, G. (2013). Why Do Bystanders of Bullying Help or Not? A Multidimensional Model. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 33(3), 315-340. doi: 10.1177/0272431612440172
- Pronk, J., Goossens, F. A., Olthof, T., De Mey, L., & Willemsen, A. M. (2013). Children's intervention strategies in situations of victimization by bullying: Social cognitions of outsiders versus defenders. *Journal of School Psychology*. doi: 10.1016/j.jsp.2013.09.002

- Pronk, J., Olthof, T., & Goossens, F. A. (2014). Factors influencing interventions on behalf of victims of bullying: A counterfactual approach to the social cognitions of outsiders and defenders. *Journal of Early Adolescence*, (1-25).
- Rigby, K., & Johnson, B. (2006). Expressed readiness of Australian schoolchildren to act as bystanders in support of children who are being bullied. *Educational Psychology*, 26(3), 425-440. doi: 10.1080/01443410500342047
- Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1991). Bullying among Australian school children: Reported behavior and attitudes toward victims. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 131(5), 615-627. doi:10.1080/00224545.1991.9924646
- Rivers, I., Poteat, V. P., Noret, N., & Ashurst, N. (2009). Observing bullying at school: The mental health implications of witness status. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 24(4), 211-223. doi: 10.1037/a0018164
- Rose, A. J., & Rudolph, K. D. (2006). A review of sex differences in peer relationship processes: Potential trade-offs for the emotional and behavioral development of girls and boys. *Psychological Bulletin*, 132(1), 98-131. doi: 10.1037/0033-2909.132.1.98
- Sainio, M., Veenstra, R., Huitsing, G., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). Victims and their defenders: A dyadic approach. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 35(2), 144-151. doi: 10.1177/0165025410378068
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15, 112-120. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007
- Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukialnen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group.

- Aggressive Behavior*, 22(1), 1-15. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:1<1::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-T
- Salmivalli, C., Voeten, M., & Poskiparta, E. (2011). Bystanders matter: Associations between reinforcing, defending, and the frequency of bullying behavior in classrooms. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 40(5), 668-676. doi: 10.1080/15374416.2011.597090
- Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behavior in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28(3), 246-258. doi: 10.1080/01650250344000488
- Salmivalli, C., Lappalainen, M., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1998). Stability and change of behavior in connection with bullying in schools: A two-year follow-up. *Aggressive Behavior*, 24(3), 205-218. doi: doi:10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1998)24:3<205::AID-AB5>3.0.CO;2-J
- Sandstrom, M., Makover, H., & Bartini, M. (2012). Social context of bullying: Do misperceptions of group norms influence children's responses to witnessed episodes? *Social Influence*, 8(2-3), 196-215. doi: 10.1080/15534510.2011.651302
- Sandstrom, M. J., & Bartini, M. (2010). Do Perceptions of Discrepancy Between Self and Group Norms Contribute to Peer Harassment at School? *Basic and Applied Social Psychology*, 32(3), 217-225. doi: 10.1080/01973533.2010.495645
- Stevens, V., Van Oost, P., & De Bourdeaudhuij, I. (2000). The effects of an anti-bullying intervention programme on peers' attitudes and behaviour. *Journal of Adolescence*, 23(1), 21-34. doi: 10.1006/jado.1999.0296

- Sutton, J., & Smith, P. K. (1999). Bullying as a group process: An adaptation of the participant role approach. *Aggressive Behavior*, 25(2), 97-111. doi: 10.1002/(sici)1098-2337(1999)25:2<97::aid-ab3>3.0.co;2-7
- Thornberg. (2012). Bystander motivation in bullying incidents: To intervene or not to intervene? *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 13(3), 247. doi: 10.5811/westjem.2012.3.11792
- Thornberg, R., Tenenbaum, L., Varjas, K., Meyers, J., Jungert, T., & Vanegas, G. (2012). Bystander motivation in bullying incidents: To intervene or not to intervene? *Western Journal of Emergency Medicine*, 13(3), 247. doi: 10.5811/westjem.2012.3.11792
- Tisak, M. S. & Tisak, J. (1996). Expectations and judgments regarding bystanders' and victims' responses to peer aggression among early adolescents. *Journal of Adolescence*, 19, 383-392. doi: 10.1006/jado.1996.0036
- Ttofi, M. M., & Farrington, D. P. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal of Experimental Criminology*, 7, 27-56. doi: 10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Huitsing, G., Sainio, M., & Salmivalli, C. (2014). The role of teachers in bullying: The relation between antibullying attitudes, efficacy, and efforts to reduce bullying. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. doi: 10.1037/a0036110
- Veenstra, R., Verlinden, M., Huitsing, G., Verhulst, F. C., & Tiemeier, H. (2013). Behind Bullying and Defending: Same-Sex and Other-Sex Relations and Their Associations with Acceptance and Rejection. *Aggressive Behavior*, 9999, 1-10. doi: 10.1002/ab.21495