Is Drama the New Bullying? Differentiating Bullying and Drama Among College Students

by

Katherine Magner

B.S.Sc. Criminology and Psychology, University of Ottawa, 2007

B.A. Psychology, University of Ottawa, 2008

M.A. Psychology, Carleton University, 2013

A thesis submitted to
the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Affairs
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in

Psychology

Carleton University
Ontario

© 2019

Katherine Magner

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Abstract

Compared to research on bullying in schools and in the workplace, little is known about the prevalence and typology of bullying among college age-students. Recent research suggests that young adults may be less in favour of the term “bullying”, but more open to the notion of “drama”. The concept of drama has existed for some time, and is common vernacular in both media and entertainment, as well as among students and teachers. Though drama has been conceptually linked to bullying, researchers have only just begun to explore this behaviour. The goal of this dissertation was to better understand this construct of drama, and explore it in the context of bullying amongst college students. A total of five studies were conducted using first- and second-year college students exploring conceptualizations of bullying and drama, associations with common forms of aggression, personality profiles of those who engage in bullying and drama, social-cognitive predictors of behavioural decision-making, and the consequences of these behaviours on mental health and well-being. Results indicated that while there is conceptual overlap between bullying and drama, the behaviours are measurably distinct, particularly in terms of the forms of aggression they are associated with, and the traits of those who engage in these behaviours. That being said, the decision-making precursors to engagement in drama appear similar to those involved in bullying: attitudes and norms predict intent and willingness to engage in both behaviours. Finally, bullying seems to remain a salient behaviour among college students, with continued concerns for mental health and well-being, and more importantly, drama appears also to have harmful effects on the psychological adjustment of those who engage in it. The results are discussed in

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

terms of the implications for theory, intervention, and practice in clinical and educational settings.

Acknowledgements

This research would not have been possible without the guidance and support of several important people. First and foremost, I want to acknowledge my incredible advisor Dr. Patrick Hill for encouraging my research vision from the beginning and supporting me through the entire process. Without your guidance and insight, this study would not have been possible. Thank you for your patience and for pushing me to succeed. Many thanks also to Dr. Anne Bowker, who graciously supported me over the last year. I would also like to extend my appreciation to the members of my committee, Dr. Andrea Howard and Dr. Cheryl Harasymchuk for offering excellent wisdom and expertise on how to make this study the best it could be. Finally, I would like to express my gratitude to my amazing husband, and my wonderful family and friends for their constant positivity, endless motivation, and unwavering love and support over the last few years. You all are a huge part of making this dream a reality – thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Table of Contents

Abstract	ii
Acknowledgements	iv
Is Drama the New Bullying? Differentiating Bullying and Drama Among College Students	1
Study 1: Prototypic Characteristics of Bullying and Drama	7
Definitions of Bullying	7
Lay Conceptions of Bullying	10
Developmental differences in definitions of bullying.	12
Drama as a Form of Bullying	14
The Prototype Approach	20
Purpose	22
Method	23
Participants	23
Procedure	23
Materials	25
Demographic information	25
Measure of perceptions of drama/bullying	25
Aggressive behaviour	26
Results	26
General Description of the Data	26
Data Coding and Organization	27
Support for Prototypes vs. Exemplar Representations	28
Description of Bullying Prototype	29
Description of Drama Prototype	33
Similarities Between Drama and Bullying	37
Other Findings	37
Descriptive statistics.	37
Correlations	40
Conclusion	41
Study 2: The Significance of Prototypic Characteristics of Bullying and Drama	42
Method	42
Participants	42
Procedures	43
Materials	43
Demographic information	43
Centrality rating of drama/bullying	43
Engagement in bullying and drama	44

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Results.....	45
Other Findings	47
Frequency of bullying and drama.	47
Gender differences.	47
Correlations.	47
Discussion	49
Bullying Prototype	50
Drama Prototype	52
Drama vs. Bullying Prototypes	55
Limitations and Future Directions	59
Implications and Conclusion.....	60
Study 3: Personality and Aggression Profiles that Predict the Use of Bullying and Drama	62
Drama and Other Forms of Aggression	62
Bullying and Personality	64
Bullying and the Big Five.	65
Bullying and The Dark Triad	68
Need for Drama as a Personality Dimension	71
Purpose and Hypotheses	72
Method	74
Participants.....	74
Procedure	74
Measures	74
Demographic information.....	75
Relational aggression	75
Cyber aggression.....	75
Bullying.....	76
Physical and verbal aggression	76
Drama.....	76
Proactive and reactive aggression.....	77
Need for drama	77
BFI-2 personality measure.....	78
Narcissism and Machiavellianism	78
Results.....	78
Descriptive Statistics.....	78
Associations between bullying, drama, and other types of aggression.....	79
Associations between bullying, drama, and personality	80
Hierarchical Linear Regressions	83

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Drama and other forms of aggression	84
Bullying and personality traits	85
Drama and personality traits	86
Discussion	87
Bullying, Drama and Other Forms of Aggression	87
Bullying and Personality	89
Drama and Personality	90
Implications and Conclusion	93
Study 4: Exploring the Value of the Prototype Willingness Model in Understanding Bullying and Drama	95
Reasoned and Socially Reactive Theories of Behaviour	96
The Prototype Willingness Model of Adolescent Risk Behaviour	98
Behavioural expectations or intent	99
Behavioural willingness	100
Applicability of the Prototype Willingness Model	102
Norms, Attitudes and Social Images in Aggression	104
Norms	105
Attitudes	107
Prototype images	109
Purpose and Hypotheses	111
Method	112
Participants	112
Procedure	112
Materials	113
Demographic information	113
Engagement in bullying and drama	113
Prototypical images	114
Subjective norms	114
Bullying and drama attitudes	115
Behavioural expectations (intent)	115
Behavioural willingness	116
Results	116
Descriptive Statistics for Bullying	116
Descriptive Statistics for Drama	117
Path Analysis	119
Path Analysis: Bullying	119
Path Analysis: Drama	121
Discussion	121

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Bullying and the Prototype Willingness Model.....	122
Drama and the Prototype Willingness Model.....	125
Overall Findings.....	127
Implications and Conclusion.....	130
Study 5: Bullying, Drama and Mental Health and Well-being.....	131
Bullying and Externalizing Problems	132
Bullying and Internalizing Problems	133
Subjective Well-being.....	136
Drama, Mental Health and Well-being	137
Purpose.....	139
Methods.....	140
Participants.....	140
Procedure	140
Materials	141
Demographic information.....	141
Engagement in bullying and drama	141
Life satisfaction.....	141
Subjective happiness	142
Positive and negative affect	142
Strengths and difficulties	142
Loneliness.	143
Depression, anxiety and stress	143
Results.....	143
Descriptive Statistics.....	143
Multiple Regression Analyses	146
Multiple Regressions for Bullying.....	146
Bullying predicting internalizing problems	146
Bullying predicting externalizing problems.....	147
Bullying predicting subjective well-being.....	148
Multiple Regressions for Drama.....	149
Drama predicting internalizing problems	149
Drama predicting externalizing problems.....	151
Drama predicting subjective well-being	152
Discussion	152
Bullying, Mental Health and Well-Being	153
Drama, Mental Health, and Well-Being	153
Implications and Conclusion.....	155
General Discussion	157

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Strengths	161
Limitations.....	163
Future Directions	161
Implications.....	171
Conclusion	174
References.....	176

List of Tables

Table 1. Bullying Features by Percentage of Participants Reporting and Centrality	30
Table 2. Drama Features by Percentage of Participants Reporting and Centrality	33
Table 3. Similarities Between Bullying and Drama	38
Table 4. Most Prototypical Bullying Features	48
Table 5. Most Prototypical Drama Features	49
Table 6. Overview of Findings from Big Five Personality Literature	66
Table 7. Overview of Findings from Dark Triad Personality Literature	69
Table 8. Descriptive Statistics of Various Forms of Aggression and Personality Traits	79
Table 9. Correlations Between Bullying, Drama, and Other Forms of Aggression	81
Table 10. Correlations Between Bullying, Drama, and Personality Traits.....	82
Table 11. Hierarchical Linear Regression for Aggression and Drama	84
Table 12. Hierarchical Linear Regression for Personality and Bullying	86
Table 13. Hierarchical Linear Regression for Personality and Drama	87
Table 14. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Path Analyses of Bullying Model.....	117
Table 15. Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Path Analyses of Drama Model.....	118
Table 16. Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Path Analysis of Bullying Model.....	120
Table 17. Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Path Analysis of Drama Model.....	122
Table 18. Descriptive Statistics for Bullying, Drama, Mental Health and Well-Being Variables.....	144
Table 19. Correlations for All Variables in Bullying and Drama Path Analyses Models	145
Table 20. Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Bullying as Predictors of Internalizing Problems	147
Table 21. Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Bullying as Predictors of Externalizing Problems	148
Table 22. Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Bullying as Predictors of Subjective Well-Being	149
Table 23. Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Drama as Predictors of Internalizing Problems	150
Table 24. Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Drama as Predictors of Externalizing Problems	151
Table 25. Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Drama as Predictors of Subjective Well-Being	152

List of Figures

Figure 1. Similarities and Differences Between Bullying and Drama.....	39
Figure 2. The Prototype Willingness Model.....	99
Figure 3. Standardized Results for the Path Analysis Model for Bullying.....	120
Figure 4. Standardized Results for the Path Analysis Model for Drama.....	122

Appendices

Appendix A: Demographic Questionnaire.....	229
Appendix B: Measure of Perceptions of Drama/Bullying.....	230
Appendix C: Aggressive Behaviour	234
Appendix D: Measure for Centrality Rating of Drama/Bullying	235
Appendix E: Engagement in Bullying and Drama	239
Appendix F: Bullying and Common Forms of Aggression.....	240
Appendix G: Relational Aggression	241
Appendix H: Cyber Aggression.....	244
Appendix I: Bullying	245
Appendix J: Physical and Verbal Aggression.....	246
Appendix K: Drama.....	247
Appendix L: Proactive and Reactive Aggression	249
Appendix M: Need for Drama	250
Appendix N: The Big Five Inventory–2	251
Appendix O: The Dark Triad Scale - Narcissism and Machiavellianism.....	253
Appendix P: Prototypical Images of Bullying.....	254
Appendix Q: Prototypical Images of Drama	255
Appendix R: Subjective Norms for Bullying and Drama.....	256
Appendix S: Bullying Attitudes.....	257
Appendix T: Drama Attitudes.....	258
Appendix U: Behavioural Expectations.....	259
Appendix V: Behavioural Willingness	260
Appendix W: Direct, Indirect and Total Effects of the Path Analysis for Bullying.....	261
Appendix X: Direct, Indirect and Total Effects of the Path Analysis for Drama.....	262
Appendix Y: Life Satisfaction Questionnaire.....	263
Appendix Z: Subjective Happiness Scale	264
Appendix AA: Positive and Negative Affect Schedule	265
Appendix BB: Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire	266
Appendix CC: Loneliness.....	268
Appendix DD: Depression, Anxiety, and Stress.....	269

Is Drama the New Bullying? Differentiating Bullying and Drama Among College Students

The term “drama” is frequently heard in the context of conflict among contemporary youth. While actions such as gossiping and joking about others among teens is often described within the language of “bullying” by adults, teens may be more likely to refer to these disagreements as “drama”. But what is drama? Drama is an elusive construct that is challenging to define. Preliminary research has attempted to capture the parameters of drama as a social construct, and the definition continues to evolve. Most commonly, drama is described in terms of the behaviours it involves: conflicts with others, gossiping and rumor spreading, excluding others, and seeking attention or “stirring the pot”. Youth often use the term to describe behaviours that are more commonly referred to in the aggression research as indirect, relational or social aggression, or even more frequently, bullying (Allen, 2012, 2015; Regan & Sweet, 2015).

Research on peer victimization and aggression has proliferated in the literature since the 1980s and 1990s (Steinberg & Morris, 2001), with research on bullying in particular predominating during the last few decades in popular and academic research (Salmivalli, Lagerspetz, Björkqvist, Österman, & Kaukiainen, 1996). According to Volk, Veenstra, and Espelage (2017), the growth in research on bullying has been exponential since researchers started to explore this behaviour in the 1970s. Over the last 3 decades, studies have explored prevalence rates, predictors and outcomes of bullying, and the effectiveness of prevention and intervention programs aimed at targeting these behaviours (see Espelage & Holt, 2012, for a review). Despite this vast amount of research, it is surprising that there are lingering issues regarding how to define bullying,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

and how aggressive behaviours might be evolving since researchers began exploring the behaviour over four decades ago.

Bullying has been investigated in great depth in the context of children and adolescents in school (e.g., Espelage & Swearer, 2003; Frisén, Holmqvist, & Oscarsson, 2008; Guerin & Hennessy, 2002; Menesini, Fonzi, & Smith, 2002; Monks & Smith, 2006; Naylor, Cowie, Cossin, de Bettencourt, & Lemme, 2006; Olweus, 1978; Smith, Cowie, Ólafsson, & Liefhoghe, 2002; Whitney & Smith, 1993), with a few exceptions exploring bullying in late adolescence (e.g., Byrne, Dooley, Fitzgerald, & Dolphin, 2016; Vaillancourt et al., 2008). Bullying is one of the most frequent and potentially harmful forms of aggression seen among school age children and youth (Nansel et al., 2001), and it is associated with long-term negative outcomes for well-being and social functioning (Pellegrini & Long, 2002; Ttofi, Farrington, Lösel, & Loeber, 2011).

Although most studies on bullying have narrowly focused on early development, research supports the notion that there is continuity in bullying behaviour (Curwen, McNichol, & Sharpe, 2011; Rospenda, Richman, Wolff, & Burke, 2013; Sanchez et al., 2016); bullying is not limited to early life. It continues to be a common phenomenon amongst emerging adults and adults in the workplace (e.g., Einarsen, 1999; Jennifer, Cowie, & Ananiadou, 2003; Ortega, Hogh, Pejtersen, & Olson, 2009; Rayner & Hoel, 1997; Vartia, 2001). Substantial evidence shows that bullying can have significant long-term consequences for the health and well-being of adults (e.g., Lereya, Copeland, Costello, & Wolke, 2015; Ttofi, Farrington, & Losel, 2012), making research on bullying in later life an important area of study. However, compared to research on bullying in schools and in the workplace, little is known about the prevalence and manifestation of

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

bullying among college age-students (Coleyshaw, 2010), otherwise known as emerging adults.

Emerging adulthood is the period of development between ages 18 and 30 (Arnett, 2000; 2007). Emerging adulthood is theoretically and empirically distinct from both adolescence and adulthood, as this period of development is a time of frequent change and exploration (Arnett, 2000). This is also a period of transition between two very distinct contexts where bullying seems to be common: school and the workplace. Researchers have only recently started to acknowledge the importance of exploring this developmental phase between adolescence and adulthood as a unique period; as such, there remain gaps in multiple research areas regarding emerging adults, including aggression (Arnett & Tanner, 2006). Some studies suggest bullying in post-secondary school is quite rare, with only 3% to 7% of college students involved in bullying (Chen & Huang, 2015; Lappalainen, Meriläinen, Puhakka, & Sinkkonen, 2011; NUS, 2008), while other research suggests that bullying remains a common problem in college (Chapell et al., 2004; Marraccini, Brick, & Weyandt, 2018).

Although this research sheds light on the frequency or prevalence of bullying in college, there is a noticeable gap in the literature regarding how college and university students experience and conceptualize bullying, and how the behaviour manifests in this stage of development (Marraccini et al., 2018). More overt forms of bullying (i.e., physical and verbal) tend to be more common in early childhood and significantly decrease thereafter. In contrast, covert forms of bullying, like cyber bullying and relational bullying, generally increase from early adolescence onward, with the corresponding developmental increase in verbal and social skills (Crick, Ostrov, &

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Kawabata, 2007; Nelson, Springer, Nelson, & Bean, 2008). Thus, the few studies that have explored bullying in college and university students have focused primarily on cyber bullying (e.g., Boulton, Lloyd, Down, & Marx, 2012; Grigg, 2012) or relational aggression (e.g., Prather, Dahlen, Nicholson, & Bullock-Yowell, 2012; Storch, Bagner, Geffken, & Baumeister, 2004; Verona, Sadeh, Case, Reed, & Bhattacharjee, 2008; Werner & Crick, 1999) as they are assumed to be more developmentally relevant. Since researchers have shown that the nature of bullying changes over time from more overt forms in childhood to more covert forms in adolescence, it is possible that the typology of bullying might continue to evolve into emerging adulthood, and that unique forms of aggression might emerge among college students. Reported involvement in bullying among college students might be misleading because the behaviours of emerging adults are not adequately captured by current researcher conceptualizations of bullying and similar forms of aggression.

Recent research suggests that adolescents and emerging adults of today are less comfortable with the term “bullying”, yet seem to be much more willing and open when describing similar behaviours they refer to as “drama” (boyd, 2009). In fact, drama is a behaviour commonly referred to by youth (Marwick & boyd, 2011). The idea of *drama* in social interactions has existed for several decades (Buss & Briggs, 1984; Hare & Blumberg, 1988), and has become common vernacular in media and entertainment. Depictions of drama in media often feature extremely high levels of indirect, relational, and social aggression, and present conflict, social upheaval, exclusion, and gossiping as entertaining and exciting (Ward & Carlson, 2013). In the last decade, a few researchers have started to explore drama as a unique behaviour. Though drama has been investigated

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

mostly in the context of online social interactions (e.g., Marwick & boyd, 2011; Regan & Sweet, 2015), emerging research suggests that drama is commonly understood by teachers and students in school settings as well (Allen, 2012, 2013; Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015).

The issue is that researchers have only begun to explore the concept of drama. We know very little about drama and how it compares to bullying and other forms of aggression. Is drama a form of bullying commonly used by college students, or is it a distinct form of aggression? How is drama conceptualized and defined? Who engages in drama? How is drama associated with bullying and other forms of aggression? What are the individual, social, cognitive, and psychological factors associated with the use of bullying and drama in college? What are the consequences of engagement in drama on mental health and well-being?

The aim of the following body of research was to advance the literature on several fronts by addressing these questions. The goal of this research was to better understand drama by exploring how drama is defined and the factors that differentiate drama from bullying. The ensuing studies explored: (1) perceptions and definitions of bullying and drama among college¹ students; (2) the association between bullying, drama, and other forms of aggression; (3) the concurrent correlates of bullying and drama, such as social and personality traits of those who engage in these behaviours; (4) the social-cognitive

¹ Although there may be differences in how people define college and university worldwide, I will be using the term *college* to refer to degree-granting post-secondary institutions, though the populations included in these studies were students attending a Canadian university.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

factors that motivate engagement in bullying and drama; and finally, (5) the psychosocial consequences of engaging in bullying and drama.

A total of five studies were conducted. Studies 1 and 2 were a mixed-method (qualitative and quantitative) exploration of college students' perceptions of the characteristic features of bullying and drama, to address the question of how drama is conceptualized and defined and whether it is distinct from bullying. The aim of Study 3 was first to explore how the newly defined construct of drama was associated with bullying and other established forms of aggression and social conflict. A further aim of Study 3 was to examine the types of people who are likely to engage in these behaviours by exploring the personality profiles of college students who reported engaging in bullying and/or drama. The focus of Study 4 was to investigate common social-cognitive predictors involved in decision-making to act aggressively. Reasoned and socially-reactive factors were explored as predictors of both intent and willingness to engage in drama and bullying. Finally, Study 5 investigated the consequences of bullying and drama by examining how engagement in these behaviours was uniquely associated with psychosocial adjustment, mental health, and well-being.

The following research contributes to the slowly growing body of research on drama by better understanding how it is conceptualized, who engages in these behaviours, what predicts these behaviours, and what are the consequences of engaging in these behaviours. By contextualizing drama in the well-established field of research on bullying, the ultimate goal of this research is to more firmly establish drama as a new and unique form of aggression worthy of further investigation.

Study 1: Prototypic Characteristics of Bullying and Drama

Prevalence rates of bullying among children and adolescents range considerably, from estimates of 9 to 80 percent (Jimerson, Swearer, & Espelage, 2010; Nansel, Craig, Overpeck, Saluja, & Ruan, 2004; Nansel et al., 2001; Sanders & Phye, 2004), and the prevalence rates of bullying after adolescence are even less clear. A potential cause of discrepancies in prevalence rates and reporting lies in the tremendous variations in definitions of bullying and the measurements and methods used (Espelage & Swearer, 2003). Studies investigating differences in researcher and child and adolescent bullying definitions suggest that the ways in which researchers view and define bullying differ from how students define the behaviour (e.g., Vaillancourt et al., 2008). The aim of Study 1 was to address some of the gaps that exist in the research by identifying how bullying and drama are characterized among college students.

Definitions of Bullying

More than three decades of research has resulted in a much better understanding of bullying, though concerns still remain regarding how bullying should be defined and measured (Hawley, Stump, & Ratliff, 2011; Swearer, Siebecker, Johnsen-Frerichs, & Wang, 2010). In his innovative research, Olweus (1978, 1993) described bullying as the repeated oppression, or harm doing of an individual or a group of individuals in an interpersonal relationship. One of the most widely cited definitions of bullying comes from Olweus' later work:

“a person is being bullied when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other persons. It is a negative action when someone intentionally inflicts, or attempts to inflict, injury or discomfort upon another”. (1999, p.10)

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Others have provided similar yet not synonymous definitions of the construct (e.g., Olweus, 1991; Pepler, Craig, & Connolly, 1997). For example, another commonly cited definition proposes the following:

“We say a young person is being bullied, or picked on, when another child or young person, or a group of young people, say nasty and unpleasant things to him or her. It is also bullying when a young person is hit, kicked or threatened, locked inside a room, sent nasty notes, when no-one ever talks to them and things like that. These things can happen frequently and it is difficult for the young person being bullied to defend him or herself. It is also bullying when a young person is teased repeatedly in a nasty way. But it is not bullying when two people of about the same strength have the odd fight or quarrel”. (Whitney & Smith, 1993, p.7)

Whitney and Smith’s (1993) definition adds the element that bullying involves an imbalance of strength or power between the bully and the victim. However, this notion of power is open to interpretation as power imbalances can emerge from many sources. Power can arise from the physical characteristics of the bully or victim, for example, differences in size, strength, or age (Olweus, 1993). Power can also emerge from a superior position in a social group or environment, or through the support and encouragement of peers (Olweus, 1993; Salmivalli, Huttunen, & Lagerspetz, 1997).

Another unique element of Whitney and Smith’s (1993) definition is the idea that bullying can be verbal, physical, *or indirect*. Though many definitions of bullying acknowledge indirect or relational forms of bullying, the social nature of bullying is often neglected. Indirect aggression is more covert, tends to involve the participation of peers, and includes behaviours like spreading rumours, gossiping, and excluding or isolating others. Further research has emphasized the unique nature of these more indirect forms of aggression (Björkqvist, Ekman, & Lagerspetz, 1982) in relation to constructs such as

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

relational aggression (Crick & Grotpeter, 1995, 1996) and social aggression (Galen & Underwood, 1997).

While some researchers view bullying as a frequent and repeated action, others claim that it is not necessary that bullying be long-term and repeated over time (e.g., (Arora, 1996; Volk, Dane, & Marini, 2014). These researchers argue that the repetitive and long-term nature of bullying should relate more to the long-term *effects* bullying can have on the victim, rather than long-term or repeated targeting of victims by bullies. In other words, a single act of aggression or threat to a vulnerable individual might have the same psychological impact (e.g., fear, anxiety, distress) as low intensity acts over a longer period of time.

Bullying has always been considered a subset of aggression (Hawley et al., 2011; Smith et al., 2002), a behaviour in which *intent to harm* is a necessary component. Indeed, bullying has most commonly been conceptualized as deliberative and intentional in nature (Elinoff, Chafouleas, & Sassu, 2004). However, some recent definitions (e.g., Gladden, Vivolo-Kantor, Hamburger, & Lumpkin, 2014; Volk et al., 2014) have removed intent as a criterion as researchers shed light on other goals that motivate bullying, not just intent (e.g., see Pikas, 1989; Salmivalli & Nieminen, 2002, for other motives).

In summary, there is no universally agreed upon definition of bullying in research. Over the years, common elements that differentiate bullying from other aggressive behaviours include: (a) intent to cause hurt or harm to another, (b) an imbalance of power, and (c) repetition over time (Farrington, 1993; Olweus, 1993; Gladden et al., 2014; Rigby, 2002; Smith & Sharp, 1994). However, these elements are often debated and open to interpretation. Volk et al. (2014) argue that a power imbalance is what most

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

clearly distinguishes bullying from other forms of aggression. However, researchers' definitions still tend to differ with respect to (a) how power imbalance is defined, (b) whether bullying can be indirect in nature, (c) whether it needs to be repeated over time, and (d) if it needs to be intentional.

Lay Conceptions of Bullying

Researcher definitions of bullying do not always reflect how adolescents conceptualize bullying. As an example, Arora and Thompson (1987) provided secondary school students with a lengthy list of typical bullying behaviours, as defined by researchers, and asked students to add any *other* behaviours they would typically view as bullying. Nearly half of the sample added behaviours or characteristics of bullying not previously captured in the researchers' definition, including taunting, picking on someone, and threats. Similarly, Smith and Levan (1995) used pictorial questionnaires to explore bullying definitions in students and found a general consistency between what they expected to see in young children's definitions and experiences of bullying. However, behaviours described by children did not always meet researcher criteria for bullying, such as the requirement for repetition. According to these findings, children and adolescents seem to have a much broader conceptualization of bullying, including anything from hitting and name calling, to stealing possessions, fighting, and general aggression.

Boulton, Trueman, and Flemington (2002) suggest that many youth do not share researcher and adult views of which behaviours and actions are classified as bullying. In their study, though 80% of students viewed physical actions such as hitting, pushing, threats, and coercion as bullying, substantially fewer students (just over 50%) described

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

verbal assaults, such as name calling, as bullying. In this sample, social exclusion was viewed as bullying by only about 20%, making it the least exemplary behaviour of bullying. It is disturbing that, when asked to define examples of bullying, so many youth do not nominate behaviours typically described by researchers as bullying. Bullying may reflect more of a continuum for adolescents, including a range of behaviours from being mean to physical harassment, suggesting that it is significantly different from researcher definitions of bullying (deLara, 2012). In terms of the behaviours involved, it seems that children and youth generally have a broad understanding of bullying.

Researchers have also explored student perceptions of the main criteria of bullying --- intentionality, repetition and power imbalance. In terms of intent to bully, studies have found that only between 2 and 17% of teens perceive bullying to involve intent to harm (Everett & Price, 1995; Guerin & Hennessey, 2002; Madsen, 1996; Naylor et al., 2006; Vaillancourt et al., 2008). However, a more recent study found that nearly 55% of teens believed that intent to harm was necessary to define behaviour as aggression (Cuadrado-Gordillo, 2012). Repetition has been identified as a key characteristic of bullying in only 3 to 6% of adolescents across several studies (Cuadrado-Gordillo, 2012; Madsen, 1996; Naylor et al., 2006; Vaillancourt et al., 2008). However, other findings suggest that this proportion might be higher --- between 27 and 30% of adolescents referred to repetition in their perceptions of bullying in other studies (Frisen et al., 2008; Guerin & Hennessey, 2002). Finally, power imbalance seems to be the most easily identified characteristic of bullying for adolescents. Between 16 and 40% of teens identified a power imbalance between perpetrator and victim as characteristic of bullying (Cuadrado-Gordillo, 2012; Frisen et al., 2008; Guerin & Hennessey, 2002;

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Madsen, 1996; Naylor et al., 2006; Vaillancourt et al., 2008), though this has been found to be more common among older students (Vaillancourt et al., 2008).

A recent study by Byrne and colleagues (2016) explored the self-generated definitions of adolescents regarding bullying. Though over 4500 adolescents (aged 12 to 19) participated, the themes of intent, power imbalance, and repetition were not found in the definitions of adolescents in this study.

The findings suggest that there is discord between what youth experience, and what researchers deem as central components of bullying, which ultimately influences measurement and distorts results. This issue becomes particularly problematic as research findings are being used to develop targeted interventions for bullying and victimization, though these findings suggest that the behaviours being targeted might not map onto what is really going on in aggressive social interactions.

Developmental differences in definitions of bullying. When exploring whether researcher operationalizations of bullying correspond with children's conceptions, researchers have examined how definitions might differ with age (e.g., Byrne et al., 2016). Older students are more likely to define behaviours as bullying than younger students (Maunder, Harrop, & Tattersall, 2010). In terms of the *types* of behaviours, older children are able to make greater distinctions between different forms of aggression and peer victimization than younger children. Younger children (6-8 year olds) tend to be able to distinguish aggressive and non-aggressive behaviours, though they have greater difficulty distinguishing between different forms of aggression, like physical bullying, relational bullying, and verbal bullying (Monks & Smith, 2006; Smith et al., 2002; Smith & Levan, 1995). Young children generally have an overly inclusive

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

definition of bullying that includes fighting and other non-bullying forms of aggression and conflict (Madsen, 1996; Menesini et al., 2002; Monks & Smith, 2006; Smith et al., 2002; Smith & Levan, 1995), and most commonly define bullying in terms of physical aggression (Menesini et al., 2002).

By middle school, children's conceptualizations of bullying are more closely aligned with those of adults (Menesini et al., 2002), and by adolescence, teens are better able to distinguish bullying from other forms of aggression, and are also better at distinguishing different types of bullying (verbal, relational, physical) (Smith et al., 2002). Adolescents are more inclined than children to describe bullying in terms of relational behaviours (e.g., exclusion, rumour spreading) (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992). Emerging adults' descriptions of aggression tend to be even more complex than younger samples (Nelson et al., 2008); the behaviours they identify as aggression are quite diverse including indirect/direct relational aggression, verbal and non-verbal aggression, indirect/direct physical aggression, and non-verbal aggression.

Collectively, these findings suggest that definitions continue to change through development. Little research has explored adolescents beyond the age of 13 or 14 years (e.g., Frisé et al., 2008; Guerin & Hennessy, 2002; Naylor et al., 2006; Menesini et al., 2002; Monks & Smith, 2006; Smith et al., 2002), and even less has investigated the definitions of late adolescents 18 or 19 years of age (e.g., Byrne et al., 2016; Vaillancourt et al., 2008). Research is needed with college students and emerging adults to address the gap in the literature regarding how these individuals conceptualize and define bullying and similar forms of aggression.

Drama as a Form of Bullying

Over the last few decades, the word “bullying” has been propagated and sensationalized through academia, media, and public discourse to the point that there is much stigma associated with issues related to bullying (Cohen & Brooks, 2018). Children and youth seem to understand that it is a problem that requires addressing; however, given that bullies aim to avoid detection and punishment they may be hesitant to report or discuss involvement in bullying, or deliberately hide or misrepresent their behaviours (Boulton et al., 2002; Craig & Pepler, 1998; deLara, 2012). Preliminary research examining the changing dynamic of adolescent friendships in the digital media age found that youth were less inclined to refer to current notions and operationalizations of the term “bullying” when describing peer conflict, yet were more disposed to refer to similar behaviours they describe as “drama” (boyd, 2009). Miller (2016) found similar results in interviews with late adolescent women; more than half of the women rejected the idea that they had experienced or participated in “bullying”, opting instead to refer to these experiences as “drama”.

The idea of *drama* in social interactions has existed for quite some time (Buss & Briggs, 1984; Hare & Blumberg, 1988). The *dramaturgical perspective* (DP) put forth by Erving Goffman (1959), compares everyday social interactions to the interactions between actors in a play. In essence, life is compared to theatre, and drama refers to the presentation of the self in social interactions (Buss & Briggs, 1984; Hare & Blumberg, 1988).

In recent years, this notion of *drama* has become common vernacular in media and entertainment. Particularly in the last two decades, reality television has emerged as

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

a new popular genre. Recently popularized media includes TV dramas such as *The Real Housewives*, and *Pretty Little Liars*, *Gossip Girl*, *The Bachelor/Bachelorette*, and *Keeping Up With the Kardashians*, as well as films like *Mean Girls*, which depict the often-ugly side of social relationships. These shows and movies feature extremely high levels of indirect, relational, and social aggression, and present conflict, social upheaval, exclusion, and gossiping as entertaining and exciting (Ward & Carlson, 2013). They also normalize these behaviours as typical ways of interacting with peers. It is not that these behaviours are presented as socially acceptable, just that they are depicted as commonplace, implying a general apathy or lack of concern regarding the seriousness of these behaviours.

In the first study of drama, Marwick and boyd (2011) were interested in how drama plays out online and in cyber peer interactions. They found that youth (13-19 year-olds) commonly referred to the practice of drama, which included relational conflict, gossip, and attention seeking primarily related to social media posting. Marwick and boyd (2014) defined drama as, “performative, interpersonal conflict that takes place in front of an active, engaged audience, often on social media” (p.1191).

Taking this concept of drama into the school context, Allen (2012, 2013) found that both staff and students frequently spoke about “drama”. Though students often indicated that there was no bullying at their school, or were silent on that topic, when asked about drama, youth were enthusiastic to talk about this, and discussed it as a central component of the social environment at their school. Based on her findings, Allen (2012) characterizes drama as a form of social interaction that either leads to, or is derived from, some sort of conflict, and is characterized by overreaction and excessive emotionality. It

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

primarily occurs within established friendships or friendship groups. Drama usually involves exaggeration of some trivial issue, over-exaggerated upset, or over-reactions by one or more individuals involved. It can also involve the participation of extraneous individuals (those not initially involved). While bullying can be long-term or repeated, according to Allen (2012), drama is generally short-lived. Behaviours involved in drama include gossiping, spreading rumours, and talking behind others' backs, many of which are the same behaviours involved in relational forms of bullying and relational/social/indirect aggression (Allen, 2012). Like Marwick and boyd (2014), Allen (2012, 2015) found that students described drama as distinct from bullying, aggression and conflict, but as something that could evolve and escalate into bullying.

In a network-based field experiment of an anti-harassment intervention for high school students, Shepherd and Levy Paluck (2015) investigated “drama” as a form of peer harassment and conflict. Shepherd and Levy Paluck (2015) defined drama as “talking behind the backs of other students or to their faces in a mean or rude way; spreading rumours by text, Facebook, MySpace posts, or IMs; giving other students mean or rude looks in the hall” (p.178). Students and school staff in their study often equated drama with gossip, rumours, exclusion, and the occasional physical confrontation (Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015). Like others, Shepherd and Levy Paluck (2015) conceptualized drama as a relational form of conflict (Archer & Coyne, 2005; Bjorkqvist, 1994), and found that these behaviours were more associated with girls than with boys. While Allen (2012, 2013) suggests that drama is a more acceptable and normative behaviour than bullying, Shepherd and Levy Paluck (2015) actually found that students

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

did not support drama-related behaviours when they evaluated the collective norms of students.

Regan and Sweet (2015) conducted interviews and focus groups with females between the ages of 15 and 22 to explore the meaning and purpose of online drama among young women. The authors conceptualize three frameworks for understanding drama based on their qualitative findings. First, they equate drama with relational/social aggression. They view drama as a form of interpersonal conflict often associated with “mean girls”, but also as a broader social phenomenon of girls exerting their power through these aggressive behaviours. Second, in terms of the performative nature of drama referred to by other researchers (e.g., Marwick & boyd, 2014), Regan and Sweet (2015) talk about what they refer to as the *surveillance lens* of drama. They view online drama as a case of social curiosity, monitoring, and norm-setting, whereby participants watch or judge the behaviours of others to keep them accountable, but also watch themselves in order to be accountable to others. In other words, surveillance is about actively watching others and watching and judging oneself, and the impact this has on self-presentation and identity formation. Third, also related to the performative nature of drama, Regan and Sweet (2015) view drama as form of entertainment. Watching drama unfold or engaging in drama is done for the enjoyment and pleasure it brings, much like watching a dramatic TV show or movie. For example, one of the main functions of gossip (a common element of both relational aggression and drama) is entertainment (Fine & Rosnow, 1978). In sum, Regan and Sweet (2015) define drama as a relational form of interpersonal conflict that involves the surveillance and judgement of one’s own behaviours and the behaviours of others, and serves as a form of entertainment and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

pleasure. Regan and Sweet (2015) view their conceptualization of drama as compatible with Marwick and boyd's (2014) definition.

What is evident from the limited research on drama to date is that much like the construct of bullying, drama as a concept is difficult to define. Drama is not a simple, one-dimensional phenomenon (Regan & Sweet, 2015). When asked to define it, most people typically give examples (Marwick & boyd, 2014). These examples vary widely and include inappropriate social media posts, conflicts, attention seeking, relationship making and breaking, joking, and a range of direct and indirect aggressive interactions between friends as well as enemies. Even amongst researchers, drama has been defined in slightly different ways across existing studies. Though this construct is quite novel and not yet well understood by researchers, it appears to be commonly understood and referred to by adolescents and popular media (e.g., Gibson & Fiber, 2013; Hinduja, 2013; Levine, 2010).

The notion of drama might act as more of an umbrella term, encompassing elements of bullying, relational aggression, and gossiping, but viewed as distinct from each (Marwick & boyd, 2011). As Allen (2012, 2015) suggested, drama might be something that evolves and escalates into bullying. Most researchers perceive drama to most closely overlap with bullying (Allen, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2011; Miller, 2016; Ringrose, Harvey, Gill, & Livingstone, 2013), and/or relational aggression (Allen, 2012; Coyne, Linder, Nelson, & Gentile, 2015; Marwick & boyd, 2011; Regan & Sweet, 2015; Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015).

What appears to makes drama distinct from these other forms might be that it is both reciprocal and performative (Ito, 2008; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Regan & Sweet,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

2015). While bullying and relational aggression tend to be directional in that they are targeted toward a victim, drama is more bidirectional and reciprocal in nature, and there are no clear victims in drama (Marwick & boyd, 2011). Unlike bullying which involves a power difference between bully and victim, drama may or may not involve differences in power --- it can occur between individuals in the same social circle with equal power dynamics or social status (Marwick & boyd, 2011). Individuals often engage in drama in their social interactions primarily to entice and attract the attention of others.

Furthermore, drama might serve as a form of entertainment and pleasure for those involved, particularly for the audience (whether real or imagined).

As drama is only an emerging construct, further research is needed to better understand this phenomenon. Many of these studies, with the exceptions of the research conducted by Allen (2013, 2015) and Shepherd and Levy Paluck (2015), have focused on drama in online settings. Research on drama needs to move beyond exploring this behaviour solely in a digital context, as it is likely relevant in face-to-face situations as well (Livingstone, 2014). Furthermore, little is known about how drama might overlap and differ from better-understood forms of aggression, including bullying and relational aggression. Further research is needed to better understand drama, whether or not it might be utilized to deflect against the harmful realities of aggression and bullying (Marwick & boyd, 2014), and whether it is equally as harmful as other forms of aggression. By focusing on bullying, relational aggression, or gossiping independently rather than drama as a whole, we might be ignoring the complexity and potentially equally harmful effects of drama in peer relationships.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

As such, the present study sought to expand on our current, yet limited understandings of drama. Thus far, like bullying it appears that there is little consensus on clear criteria that define whether something is or is not drama. Accordingly, to differentiate bullying and drama, it may be valuable to consider which criteria are viewed as more or less indicative of these behaviours. Given that drama appears more widely condoned by students, if the key characteristics of bullying and drama are similar, it may suggest that actions that would often be deemed as “bullying” are being inappropriately viewed as normative by virtue of being labeled as “drama”.

The Prototype Approach

One method of defining constructs is based on the premise that concepts are defined by criteria that are both necessary and sufficient. As such, if an example fits these criteria, this is representative of the construct. In the case of bullying, definitions of the behaviour require (a) intent, (b) power difference, and (c) repetition. Rosch (1973) has stated that many experts fail to agree on definitions because the constructs cannot be classically defined by criteria that are both necessary and sufficient. Where traditional definitions identify a set of criteria that a construct must meet (as in the case of bullying), the prototype approach does not assume or require all elements of a construct to be present at all times. Instead, constructs may be better understood by characteristics or examples that people see as representative of that construct. This method of understanding constructs is known as prototype analysis and involves ranking characteristics as more central or peripheral, rather than identifying critical elements of a definition that must *always* be present.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Prototype analysis has been valuable for clarifying multidimensional constructs, understudied concepts (also described as “fuzzy constructs”) that are challenging to define or lack classical definitions (Rosch, 1973), and has been an effective method for highlighting properties of a construct that have been previously overlooked (Harasymchuk & Fehr, 2012). For example, prototype analysis has been used for understanding “fuzzy constructs”, including love and commitment (Fehr, 1988), romantic jealousy (Sharpsteen, 1993), relational boredom (Harasymchuk & Fehr, 2012), and greed (Seuntjens, Zeelenberg, Breugelmans, & van de Ven, 2015).

It is evident that there are inconsistencies in how researchers define bullying, and definitions continue to evolve. Thus, prototype analysis was chosen as the methodology for Study 1 and Study 2 in an attempt to address some of the issues that have been raised regarding current researcher definitions of bullying (Hawley, Stump, & Ratliff, 2011; Swearer, Siebecker, Johnsen-Frerichs, & Wang, 2010), and to explore the newly emerging construct of drama which has proven to be challenging to define to date.

Top-down approaches whereby researchers seek to better understand a construct by starting with a precise and rigid definition are unlikely to result in a deeper meaning or understanding of the construct. In the case of bullying, substantial evidence suggests that researcher definitions do not always coincide with participant perceptions (e.g., Byrne et al., 2016; Cuadrado-Gordillo, 2012; Frisen et al., 2008; Guerin & Hennessey, 2002; Madsen, 1996; Naylor et al., 2006; Vaillancourt et al., 2008). In order to minimize differences in definitions of bullying between researchers and participants, Volk et al. (2017) have suggested the use of grounded theory procedures or bottom-up methods whereby researchers explore bullying using participant-driven or developed definitions

(e.g., Mishna, Saini, & Solomon, 2009; Thornberg, 2011). Using a prototype approach could be a useful method to help develop a better, participant-driven, or “bottom-up” understanding of what bullying or drama is according to lay perspectives. Lay perceptions could help generate definitions of bullying or drama that are closer to how the average person understands these behaviours. As such, prototype analysis could help clarify definitions of bullying, and also be particularly important in the case of drama, which is a very new construct in the field and is still not well understood.

Purpose

The aim of Study 1 was to consider how college students think about the constructs of drama and bullying, and whether these behavioural constructs follow a prototype structure. Evidence for a prototype structure would be shown if participants can list characteristics that are relevant to the concept, and reliably rate the centrality of the characteristics to the concept (Rosch, 1975). These elements were addressed through two separate studies. In Study 1, college students reported on features or characteristics that come to mind related to both bullying and drama. The methods and procedures used were based on the recommendations of previous prototype researchers (e.g., Fehr & Russell, 1984; Kearns & Fincham, 2004).

The purpose was to better understand how college students perceive two forms of aggressive behaviour by having them list characteristics or attributes of the concepts of *bullying* and *drama*. Participants were asked to list features or characteristics of *bullying* and *drama* using a free-response format. If these constructs were organized more like a prototype than an exemplar, the generated features would vary in frequency, with some features more characteristic and others less common. In contrast, if participants all

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

reported consistent attributes, then one would assume that the constructs of *bullying* and *drama* were more clearly defined and universally understood. Another goal was to examine whether perceptions of positivity or negativity of the attributes of these behaviours were associated with reports of perpetrating and being targeted by aggressive behaviours.

Method

Participants

Participants were 74 undergraduate students aged 18 to 34 ($M_{\text{age}} = 22.36$, $SD = 3.79$; 77.6% female) in first- and second- year social science courses at a Canadian university in Ontario. The self-reported ethnicity of the sample was 67% Caucasian (12% Asian, 9% African American, 3% Hispanic, and 7% Other), and the majority of students were upper middle class ($M_{\text{SES}} = 63.51$, $SD = 14.94$; range 0 to 100 based on self-report scale of socioeconomic status). Although the targeted sample was college students, Arnett (2007) argues that emerging adulthood can include individuals up to the age of 29 or 30. Four participants were over the age of 30; however, the responses of these individuals were examined and were not significantly different from the responses of the rest of the college sample. Therefore, these individuals were retained in the sample for further analyses.

Procedure

A recruitment notice was posted online, and participants who wished to participate accessed the survey via the online Qualtrics system. Following informed consent, the participants were asked to complete several surveys, starting with basic

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

demographic information (Appendix A). Students were compensated for their time with course credit.

Participants were asked to list all of the features or characteristics of drama and bullying they could think of using a free-response format. The participants were given the following set of instructions (adapted from Fehr & Russell, 1984, Study 6):

This is a study on the perceptions and attributes of forms of conflict in your peer group. We are interested in what you have in mind when you hear and use certain words. For example, if you were asked to list the characteristics of a person experiencing fear, you might write: possible danger occurs, attention is focused on the threat, heart beats wildly, the person runs as fast as they can. In the current study, we are not interested in attributes of fear but in attributes of *drama* and *bullying*. Imagine that you are explaining either of the words to someone who has no experience with these types of peer interactions. Write down in the spaces provided all of the characteristics you think of when you hear these words. Remember that these attributes can be positive or negative. Include the obvious; however, try not to just free-associate. Use either single words or short phrases rather than full sentences. There are no right or wrong answers and your personal opinion is of particular interest to us.

Following the instructions, the participants were given 10 to 15 minutes to list the attributes related to drama in a free-response format. Participants were given a survey with 20 blank response boxes and instructed to provide one characteristic per box (Appendix B).

The same procedure was repeated for the construct of bullying. Half of the participants were asked to list the characteristics of drama first and then do the same for bullying, while the other half of participants listed the attributes of bullying first and drama after in order to counterbalance measures and avoid the potential for biased results due to response fatigue. Finally, participants completed self-report measures regarding their aggressive tendencies. These scales were used to determine whether individuals

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

with aggressive tendencies differ with respect to how positively or negatively they rate the characteristics of bullying or drama.

Earlier research by Vaillancourt and colleagues (2008) asked children and youth to define what “a bully” was rather than what “bullying” was. More than half of the sample ended up referring to the personality characteristics of someone who bullies others. This choice of wording was intentionally used for their younger sample of children and youth, as it is generally easier to describe characteristics of people rather than phenomena. However, for the present study I opted not to limit categorization into primarily characteristics of those who bully or use drama, as the aim was to be able to learn more about lay conceptions of the motives, functions, situational factors, and outcomes of bullying and drama.

Materials

Participants completed surveys online. All surveys were self-report format and responses were anonymous. No identifying information was collected from participants aside from the demographic information below.

Demographic information. First, participants provided their age, gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (see Appendix A). This data was collected in order to explore the diversity of the sample, though there were no planned analyses related to these variables.

Measure of perceptions of drama/bullying. Participants were asked to list the features or characteristics of drama using a free-response format (Appendix B). The same procedure was repeated for the construct of bullying. These measures were counterbalanced in order to ensure fatigue did not impact the range of responses.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Participants were also asked to rate the positivity or negativity of each of the characteristics listed on a scale ranging from 3 (extremely positive) to -3 (extremely negative), and a total positivity score was computed based on the mean of all items.

Aggressive behaviour. Participants completed a self-report measure of the frequency with which they engaged in anti-social behaviours in the past month. This measure was based on the Child Social and Behaviour Questionnaire (CSBQ; Warden, Cheyne, Christie, Fitzpatrick, & Reid, 2003), which identified involvement in antisocial behaviour (including verbal and physical abuse, rejection, and delinquency) as both perpetrators and targets (Appendix C). Although this measure was designed for utilization with children, the items were relevant and appropriate for college students and thus no modifications to language were needed. There were 2 subscales comprised from the 14 items: 7 items assessed aggressive perpetrators, and 7 items assessed targets of aggression. Participants rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (never) to 5 (very often) in the past month. Higher scores indicated greater frequency of anti-social perpetration or victimization. This measure was found to be quite reliable (Cronbach's $\alpha = .85$).

Results

General Description of the Data

Participants did not seem to have difficulty generating features of both drama and bullying. For the construct of drama, participants listed a total of 831 characteristics ($M_{features} = 10.93$ per person, $SD = 7.98$). Similarly, participants listed a total of 824 characteristics ($M_{features} = 10.84$ per person, $SD = 7.86$) for the construct of bullying.

Data Coding and Organization

Two independent coders explored the content of the features in the prototypes listed by participants. The characteristics were analyzed using a step-by-step procedure to reduce the overall number of characteristic features or units into a smaller number of themes or categories.

The primary investigator compiled a verbatim list of the 831 characteristics listed for drama, and the 824 characteristics listed for bullying. These features were then coded and analysed guided by the methods used by other prototype analyses (e.g., Fehr, 1988; Hepper, Ritchie, Sedikides, & Wildschut, 2011; Kearns & Fincham, 2004; Seuntjens et al., 2015). The procedure involved: (1) grouping characteristics of the same word or lexeme (generally a single linguistic unit or word); (2) grouping characteristics or features of the same semantic meaning (e.g., gossip, gossiping); (3) the condensing of categories of the same meaning (e.g., backstabbing, talking behind others' backs); and (4) grouping features or characteristics that shared a common idea (e.g., hot-headed, easily angered). This process was more challenging when the characteristic was a phrase, as it was necessary to determine whether the phrase fit into a single category or whether it was more appropriately divided across two or more categories. Characteristics preceded by a descriptor were coded as a single category (e.g., *extremely upsetting* was categorized as *upsetting*). In order to ensure richness of responses and reduce the risk of bias in coding, a conservative approach was taken to coding and analysis.

The governing method for reducing the number of items was for the primary investigator to first categorize all responses according to the four criteria identified above. Once the principal investigator had created initial categories, additional coders

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

largely naïve to the hypotheses being tested looked over the preliminary categories and suggested additional categories, combining categories, or provided commentary on whether attributes should or should not be in existing or additional categories. Judgment was more difficult when responses were phrases; however, coder disagreement was resolved through group discussion.

Items that were only reported by a single participant were excluded from any further analyses. Only single reporter items were excluded in an attempt to be conservative with the responses given the small number of participants. Excluding items reported by only two or three participants would have only eliminated responses from 2.7% or 4.1% of participants, respectively, which is not substantially more than the cutoff chosen. Therefore, the exclusions chosen were not considered too lenient. Excluding items reported by only a single participant removed a total of 46 items for *drama*, and 30 items for *bullying*. For the construct of drama, the remaining 785 items were classified and reduced into 131 distinct categories by independent researchers. The remaining 794 items for bullying were reduced to 106 different categories.

Support for Prototypes vs. Exemplar Representations

As anticipated, the features of bullying and drama produced varied characteristics, which is consistent with a prototype perspective. For both constructs, no single attribute was identified by *all* participants, and there was considerable variability in the frequency with which characteristics were reported. Findings suggested that the constructs of drama and bullying were organized more like a prototype than single exemplar, as the generated features varied in frequency, with some features more recognizable or characteristic than others.

Description of Bullying Prototype

The complete list of the characteristics of bullying reported by participants is presented in Table 1². There was no single attribute mentioned by the whole sample, and there was considerable variability in the frequency of responses reported (ranging from 2.7% to 54.1% of respondents).

The most frequently reported attribute was physical harm (54.1% of the sample), followed by being mean (51.4%). It is noteworthy that these two features were mentioned by more than half the sample, which was not the case for any of the features of drama. Other frequently reported features characterized bullying as abusive, hurtful, and unnecessary, involving verbal harm, picking on someone weaker, teasing and insulting others, and relating to both emotional and social media harm. These were reported by 20 to 40% of participants and reflected categories primarily related to various forms and the harmfulness of bullying. Some of the least frequently reported attributes were also those mostly related to negative consequences or harmfulness of bullying (e.g., scary, suffering, lonely, segregating, unsafe, consequential).

In terms of the criteria commonly used to define bullying, only 8.1% of participants referred to repetitive or long-term nature of bullying. However, the power imbalance was referenced more frequently (e.g., powerful = 17.6%, strong/forceful = 17.6%, intimidating/threatening = 14.9%). No participants reported intentionality as a characteristic feature of bullying.

² Centrality ratings from Study 2 are not discussed here, but they are presented in Table 1 and Table 2 for comparability across the two studies. The centrality ratings will be discussed in Study 2.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 1.

Bullying Features by Percentage of Participants Reporting and Centrality

	Study 1 (N = 74)	Study 2 (N = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (M)	SD
Physical Harm	54.1%	6.03	2.33
Mean	51.4%	5.97	2.33
Abusive	37.8%	5.97	2.31
Verbal Harm	31.1%	5.99	2.47
Picking on Others	27.0%	6.02	2.40
Hurtful	23.0%	6.02	2.39
Teasing	23.0%	6.03	2.32
Unnecessary	21.6%	5.93	2.40
Insulting	21.6%	6.05	2.40
Emotional Harm	21.6%	6.00	2.26
Social Media Harm	20.3%	5.89	2.31
Depressed	18.9%	5.51	2.36
Aggressive	18.9%	6.05	2.35
Insecurity	18.9%	5.74	2.32
Violent	18.9%	5.85	2.31
Powerful	17.6%	6.02	2.21
Creates Victims	17.6%	5.68	2.29
Strong/Forceful	17.6%	5.32	2.31
Rude	16.2%	5.87	2.25
Intimidating	14.9%	6.02	2.38
Threatening	14.9%	6.12	2.37
Low Self-Esteem	14.9%	5.73	2.42
Fear	14.9%	5.65	2.26
Ignoring	14.9%	5.38	2.19
Harmful	14.9%	6.01	2.29
Having Mental Health Issues	14.9%	5.11	2.42
Suicidal	14.9%	5.50	2.43
Ganging Up on People	14.9%	5.91	2.33
Sad	13.5%	5.34	2.27
Gossiping/Rumour Spreading	13.5%	5.76	2.38
Fighting	13.5%	5.89	2.44
Painful	13.5%	5.66	2.20
Isolating	13.5%	5.74	2.30

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Table 1 continued)	Study 1 (<i>N</i> = 74)	Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (<i>M</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Lack of Empathy	13.5%	5.48	2.35
High Self-Esteem	12.2%	4.41	2.43
Hateful	12.2%	5.96	2.25
Controlling	10.8%	6.09	2.31
Anger	10.8%	5.92	2.14
Name-Calling	10.8%	5.95	2.44
Immature	10.8%	5.88	2.24
Targeting Others for Differences	9.5%	6.01	2.35
Harassment	9.5%	5.93	2.39
Occurs in School	9.5%	6.05	2.21
Common	9.5%	5.81	2.22
Evil	9.5%	5.59	2.44
Presence of Bystanders	9.5%	5.65	2.20
Racism	9.5%	5.50	2.35
Provoking Others	9.5%	5.65	2.35
Humiliating	8.1%	5.93	2.37
Low Self-Confidence	8.1%	5.59	2.43
Attention Seeking	8.1%	5.48	2.35
Bullying	8.1%	6.23	2.44
Stupid	8.1%	5.60	2.37
Long-Term	8.1%	5.23	2.22
Enjoyment	8.1%	4.41	2.40
Popular	8.1%	4.70	2.35
Excluding	6.8%	5.53	2.38
Shaming	6.8%	5.84	2.29
Selfish	6.8%	5.42	2.30
Anxiety	6.8%	5.44	2.26
During Childhood/Youth	6.8%	5.99	2.28
Problematic	6.8%	5.99	2.29
Stealing from Others	6.8%	5.30	2.24
Targeting Others	6.8%	6.06	2.33
Judging Others	6.8%	5.95	2.24
Disrespectful	6.8%	6.02	2.23
Negative	5.4%	6.01	2.31
Coward	5.4%	5.28	2.31
Tormenting	5.4%	5.95	2.39
Friendships	5.4%	4.39	2.31

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Table 1 continued)			
	Study 1 (<i>N</i> = 74)	Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (<i>M</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Embarrassing	5.4%	5.91	2.30
Deadly	5.4%	5.49	2.39
Disgusting	5.4%	5.59	2.44
Hopeless	5.4%	5.16	2.22
Manipulating	5.4%	5.53	2.26
Sexual Harassment	5.4%	5.52	2.32
Outcome/Prevention	5.4%	5.01	2.21
Domineering	4.1%	5.64	2.41
Inconsiderate	4.1%	5.76	2.33
Crying	4.1%	5.19	2.32
Uncomfortable	4.1%	5.76	2.25
Oppressive	4.1%	5.65	2.34
Upsetting	4.1%	5.84	2.28
Not Fitting In	4.1%	5.49	2.33
Indifference	4.1%	5.12	2.22
Hostile	4.1%	5.82	2.26
Bad Family Life	4.1%	5.25	2.20
Acceptance	4.1%	4.46	2.41
Two-Faced	4.1%	5.20	2.33
Sexist	4.1%	5.47	2.41
Prejudice	4.1%	5.52	2.38
Looking Good	4.1%	4.07	2.31
Undeserved	4.1%	5.65	2.34
Lies	4.1%	5.36	2.15
Rebel	4.1%	5.01	2.26
Thought	4.1%	4.23	2.30
Hidden	4.1%	4.90	2.36
Scary	2.7%	5.68	2.19
Backstabbing	2.7%	5.51	2.46
Suffering	2.7%	5.79	2.23
Lonely	2.7%	5.34	2.26
Segregating	2.7%	5.39	2.29
Misunderstanding	2.7%	4.93	2.24
Jealousy	2.7%	5.63	2.23
Unsafe	2.7%	5.56	2.37
Consequential	2.7%	5.41	2.24
Character Building	2.7%	3.93	2.35

Description of Drama Prototype

The complete list of characteristics of drama reported by participants is presented in Table 2. Again, there was no single attribute mentioned by all of the participants, and there was substantial variability in the frequency with which features were reported. Gossiping was most frequently listed (37.8% of the sample), followed by exaggerating, fighting, cheating on partner, lying, emotionality, attention seeking and excluding/isolating others (all reported by more than 20% of the sample). The features that were reported with the lowest frequency, or were the least prototypical of drama included performative themes (e.g., performance, play), and themes related to the intensity of drama situations (e.g., tense, hot-headed, sudden, crisis, intense).

Table 2.

Drama Features by Percentage of Participants Reporting and Centrality

	Study 1 (N = 74)	Study 2 (N = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (M)	SD
Gossiping	37.8%	5.73	2.42
Exaggerating	25.7%	5.45	2.16
Fighting	24.3%	5.43	2.17
Cheating on Partner	24.3%	5.23	2.40
Lies	23.0%	5.51	2.37
Emotional	23.0%	5.74	1.97
Attention Seeking	20.3%	5.38	2.19
Exclusion/Isolation	20.3%	5.30	2.22
Backstabbing	18.9%	5.68	2.48
Broken Relationships	17.6%	5.53	2.19
Friendships	16.2%	5.30	2.13
Anger	16.2%	5.27	2.28
Misunderstanding	16.2%	5.29	2.12
Occurs in School	14.9%	5.74	1.95
Exciting	14.9%	4.21	2.29

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Table 2 continued)			
	Study 1 (<i>N</i> = 74)	Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (<i>M</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Argument	14.9%	5.66	2.13
Women	14.9%	5.19	2.32
Unnecessary	13.5%	5.02	2.33
Drama	13.5%	6.03	2.39
Hurtful	12.2%	5.09	2.38
Immature	12.2%	5.39	2.26
Conflict	12.2%	5.37	2.23
Social Media Harm	12.2%	5.27	3.31
Occurs in Family	12.2%	5.14	2.01
Resolution	10.8%	4.34	2.10
Rumour Spreading	10.8%	5.73	2.43
Occurs in Social Gatherings	10.8%	5.48	2.20
Jealousy	10.8%	5.59	2.15
Sad	10.8%	4.54	2.08
Sharing/Over-Sharing	10.8%	5.03	1.99
Long-Term	10.8%	4.72	2.03
Bullying	10.8%	5.46	2.43
Money	10.8%	5.03	2.09
Creative	10.8%	3.93	2.39
Weakness	10.8%	4.49	2.19
Annoying	9.5%	5.00	2.29
Causing Problems	9.5%	5.54	2.30
Stressful	9.5%	5.11	2.26
Overreacting	9.5%	5.53	2.30
Anxiety	9.5%	4.84	2.20
Rude	8.1%	5.09	2.27
Mean	8.1%	5.18	2.40
Untrustworthy	8.1%	5.03	2.27
Dumb	8.1%	4.78	2.31
Entertaining	8.1%	4.38	2.33
Miscommunication	8.1%	5.23	2.18
Insecurities	8.1%	5.27	2.23
Negative Climate	8.1%	5.28	2.23
Difference of Opinion	8.1%	5.51	2.07
Substance Use	8.1%	4.82	2.24
Enthusiastic	8.1%	3.84	2.38
Powerful	6.8%	5.30	2.02

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Table 2 continued)			
	Study 1 (<i>N</i> = 74)	Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (<i>M</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Violent	6.8%	4.95	2.39
Dishonesty	6.8%	5.44	2.34
Frustrating	6.8%	5.08	2.28
Love	6.8%	5.38	2.19
Evil	6.8%	4.69	2.31
Judgment	6.8%	5.50	2.24
Confusion	6.8%	4.83	2.16
Fear	6.8%	4.68	2.19
Confrontation	6.8%	5.58	2.17
Occurs at Work	6.8%	5.01	2.08
Racism	6.8%	5.03	2.37
Looking Good	6.8%	4.36	2.22
Acting	6.8%	4.42	2.45
Disrespectful	5.4%	5.18	2.36
Betrayal	5.4%	5.62	2.52
Pointless	5.4%	4.86	2.30
Avoidable	5.4%	4.83	2.37
Upsetting	5.4%	5.12	2.16
Causing Trouble	5.4%	5.35	2.30
Popular	5.4%	5.44	1.98
Painful	5.4%	4.80	2.22
Negativity	5.4%	5.24	2.43
Pleasurable	5.4%	3.71	2.24
Bored	5.4%	3.30	1.88
Disagreement	5.4%	5.65	2.05
Overwhelming	5.4%	5.34	2.14
Complaining	5.4%	4.98	2.13
Blackmail	5.4%	5.18	2.40
Defensive/Fighting Back	5.4%	5.37	2.17
Closed-Minded	5.4%	5.02	2.29
Thinking About Next Move	5.4%	4.78	2.00
Glorified	5.4%	4.50	2.05
Charismatic	5.4%	3.90	2.41
Sassy	4.1%	5.36	2.12
Catty	4.1%	5.21	2.29
Distrusting	4.1%	4.92	2.20
Secretive	4.1%	5.66	2.20

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

(Table 2 continued)			
	Study 1 (<i>N</i> = 74)	Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (<i>M</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Two-faced	4.1%	5.75	2.46
Snobby	4.1%	5.19	2.15
Loud	4.1%	5.03	2.11
Action	4.1%	4.93	2.08
Hardship	4.1%	4.95	2.06
Dating	4.1%	5.33	2.17
During Youth/Childhood	4.1%	5.24	2.17
Funny	4.1%	4.21	2.28
Verbal Harm	4.1%	5.43	2.31
Competitive	4.1%	5.46	2.07
Depressed	4.1%	4.44	2.22
Hate	4.1%	5.01	2.33
Language	4.1%	5.04	2.06
Blown out of Proportion	4.1%	5.57	2.31
Panic	4.1%	4.76	2.23
Affects Many People	4.1%	5.51	2.08
Negative Attitude	4.1%	5.22	2.32
Conformity	4.1%	4.69	2.04
Divorce	4.1%	4.99	2.31
Religion	4.1%	4.73	2.26
Stealing from Others	4.1%	4.80	2.34
Sensitive	2.7%	4.84	1.99
Arrogant	2.7%	5.22	2.20
Hot-headed	2.7%	5.44	2.24
Learning	2.7%	4.19	2.18
Sudden	2.7%	4.43	2.09
Crisis	2.7%	4.75	2.15
Deception	2.7%	5.07	2.24
Impulsive	2.7%	5.10	2.14
Unhealthy	2.7%	5.11	2.37
Pressure	2.7%	4.86	2.13
Dislike	2.7%	4.93	2.24
Spiteful	2.7%	5.16	2.32
Enemies	2.7%	5.40	2.35
Self-Conscious	2.7%	5.11	2.10
Intense	2.7%	5.35	2.06
Tense	2.7%	5.34	2.21

(Table 2 continued)	Study 1 (<i>N</i> = 74)	Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (<i>M</i>)	<i>SD</i>
Accusations	2.7%	5.41	2.31
Partying	2.7%	4.95	2.14
Hopeful	2.7%	3.68	2.27
Play	2.7%	3.97	2.27
Performance	2.7%	4.24	2.38

Similarities Between Drama and Bullying

Several attributes were listed for both the prototype of drama and the prototype of bullying, suggesting that these constructs might be similar. A total of 36 characteristics were listed for both drama and bullying (Table 3). Participants reported gossiping, backstabbing, lying, and verbal harm as behaviours characteristic of both constructs. Common motives listed for both behaviours included anger, attention seeking, exclusion, insecurities, jealousy, popularity, and power. Both drama and bullying were viewed as mean, harmful, disrespectful, hurtful, and immature. Participants also frequently referred to impact of involvement in both drama and bullying including anxiety, depression, fear, pain, and sadness. Despite the overlap, these constructs had many attributes that were unique to each, suggesting that they are not synonymous forms of aggression (for a sample of some of the overlapping and unique items, see Figure 1). For example, some features that were constrained to the bullying prototype included threats, intimidation, teasing/picking on others, and harm, while some characteristics that were unique to drama included exaggerations, overreactions, excitement, and entertainment.

Other Findings

Descriptive statistics. Descriptive statistics indicated that drama was perceived somewhat negatively by the sample, though less negatively than bullying (lower scores

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 3.

Similarities Between Bullying and Drama

Feature	Bullying		Drama	
	Study 1 (N = 74)	Study 2 (N = 171)	Study 1 (N = 74)	Study 2 (N = 171)
	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (M(SD))	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (M(SD))
Anger	10.8%	5.92(2.14)	16.2%	5.27(2.28)
Anxiety	6.8%	5.44(2.26)	9.5%	4.84(2.20)
Attention Seeking	8.1%	5.48(2.35)	20.3%	5.38(2.19)
Backstabbing	2.7%	5.51(2.46)	18.9%	5.68(2.48)
Bullying	8.1%	6.23(2.44)	10.8%	5.46(2.43)
Depressed	18.9%	5.51(2.36)	4.1%	4.44(2.22)
Disrespectful	6.8%	6.02(2.23)	5.4%	5.18(2.36)
Evil	9.5%	5.59(2.44)	6.8%	4.69(2.31)
Excluding/Isolating	6.8%	5.53(2.38)	20.3%	5.30(2.22)
Fear	14.9%	5.65(2.26)	6.8%	4.68(2.19)
Fighting	13.5%	5.89(2.44)	24.3%	5.43(2.17)
Friendships	5.4%	4.39(2.31)	16.2%	5.30(2.13)
Gossiping	13.5%	5.76(2.38)	37.8%	5.73(2.42)
Hurtful	23.0%	6.02(2.39)	12.2%	5.09(2.38)
Immature	10.8%	5.88(2.24)	12.2%	5.39(2.26)
Insecurities	18.9%	5.74(2.32)	8.1%	5.27(2.23)
Jealousy	2.7%	5.63(2.23)	10.8%	5.59(2.15)
Lies	4.1%	5.36(2.15)	23.0%	5.51(2.37)
Long-term	8.1%	5.23(2.22)	10.8%	4.72(2.03)
Looking Good	4.1%	4.07(2.31)	6.8%	4.36(2.22)
Mean	51.4%	5.97(2.33)	8.1%	5.18(2.40)
Misunderstanding	2.7%	4.93(2.24)	16.2%	5.29(2.12)
Occurs at School	9.5%	6.05(2.21)	14.9%	5.74(1.97)
Painful	13.5%	5.66(2.20)	5.4%	4.80(2.22)
Popular	8.1%	4.70(2.35)	6.8%	5.30(2.02)
Powerful	17.6%	6.02(2.21)	6.8%	5.30(2.02)
Racism	9.5%	5.50(2.35)	6.8%	5.03(2.37)
Rude	16.2%	5.87(2.25)	8.1%	5.09(2.27)
Sad	13.5%	5.34(2.27)	10.8%	4.54(2.08)
Social Media	20.3%	5.89(2.31)	12.2%	5.27(3.31)
Stealing from Others	6.8%	5.30(2.24)	4.1%	4.80(2.34)

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

	Bullying		Drama	
(Table 3 continued)	Study 1 (<i>N</i> = 74)	Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 171)	Study 1 (<i>N</i> = 74)	Study 2 (<i>N</i> = 171)
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (<i>M</i> (<i>SD</i>))	Feature	Percentage of Participants
Two-Faced	4.1%	5.20(2.33)	4.1%	5.75(2.46)
Unnecessary	21.6%	5.93(2.40)	13.5%	5.02(2.33)
Upsetting	4.1%	5.84(2.28)	5.4%	5.12(2.16)
Verbal Harm	31.1%	5.99(2.47)	4.1%	5.43(2.31)
Violent	18.9%	5.85(2.31)	6.8%	4.95(2.39)

Figure 1. *Similarities and Differences Between Bullying and Drama*

denoted more negative perceptions). The mean positivity rating across the features of bullying was -1.10 (*SD* = 0.94, range = -3.00 to 0.75), while the mean positivity rating across the features of drama was -0.54 (*SD* = 0.68, range = -2.70 to 0.80). In other words, the attributes related to bullying were rated less positively (or less favourably)

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

than attributes related to drama. Females rated bullying significantly more negatively than males ($t(71) = -2.40, p < .05$), but no gender difference was found for drama.

In terms of the general aggressive tendencies of respondents, collectively participants reported infrequent involvement in aggressive behaviours as perpetrators ($M = 1.81, SD = .62$; range 1 to 5). Notably, 85% of college students in this sample reported that they perpetrated at least *two* anti-social behaviours *once or more* in the previous month. Less than 5% of college students indicated they had *never* engaged in aggressive or anti-social behaviours in the previous month.

On average, participants reported slightly more frequent involvement in aggressive behaviours as targets ($M = 2.42, SD = .71$; range 1 to 5) than they did as perpetrators, suggesting that they were victimized by aggression more frequently than they perpetrated aggression toward others. Approximately 95% of participants were the targets of at least *two* anti-social behaviours *once or more* in the previous month, while less than 2% of college students reported having *never* been the target of anti-social behaviour in the previous month.

Correlations. Bivariate correlations were examined between the overall positivity/negativity of the reported attributes, and engagement in aggressive behaviours as perpetrators and targets. Positivity ratings for the features of bullying and drama were not significantly associated with perpetrating aggressive behaviour ($r = -.05, p = .69$ for bullying, and $r = .15, p = .26$ for drama), nor were ratings significantly associated with being a target of aggressive behaviour ($r = -.22, p = .09$ for bullying, and $r = -.02, p = .87$ for drama).

Conclusion

Study 1 provided the first evidence that drama is a multidimensional phenomenon, and conceptualizations of bullying among college students may be more complex than researcher definitions, which are based on a few, specific criteria. Bullying and drama are complex behaviours that, while overlapping in characteristics, also appear to remain independent with many characteristics unique to both behaviours. In order to continue to explore the prototype structure of these constructs, further exploration of the centrality of these characteristics was explored in Study 2.

Study 2: The Significance of Prototypic Characteristics of Bullying and Drama

According to Rosch (1975), to demonstrate a prototype structure, participants should be able to list characteristics that are relevant to the concept, and then reliably rate the centrality of the characteristics to the concept. In Study 1, college students were asked to list the features or characteristics of both bullying and drama. The purpose of Study 2 was to *verify* whether the constructs of bullying and drama had a prototype-based structure. The study investigated whether certain characteristics were more representative and easily judged by participants to be more central or peripheral to bullying and drama. The aim of this study was to have participants rate the centrality of the *bullying* and *drama* characteristics gathered in Study 1. The methods and procedures used were based on the recommendations of previous prototype researchers (e.g., Fehr & Russell, 1984; Kearns & Fincham, 2004).

A further aim of this study was to examine how the frequency of characteristics listed in Study 1 would be associated with centrality ratings of these characteristics in Study 2. It was anticipated that the attributes most frequently reported in Study 1 would be strongly correlated with the highest rated (most central) characteristics in the present study, as they are both measures of the prototypicality of a construct.

Method

Participants

A total of 171 undergraduate students ($M_{\text{age}} = 20.32$, $SD = 4.13$; range = 17 to 30; 58.7% female) were recruited online from first- and second- year social science courses at a Canadian university in Ontario. In terms of ethnicity, most participants (50%) were Caucasian (21% Asian, 12% African American, 4% Hispanic, and 9% Other), and on a

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

self-report scale of socioeconomic status, most students described themselves as middle, to upper middle class ($M_{SES} = 57.84$, $SD = 17.46$; range 0 to 100).

Procedures

A recruitment notice was posted online. Participants who wished to participate accessed the survey via the Qualtrics system. Following informed consent, participants were asked to complete a series of questionnaires, starting with demographic information. Students were compensated with course credit for their participation.

Materials

Participants completed surveys online. All surveys were self-report format and responses were anonymous. No identifying information was collected from participants aside from the demographic information below.

Demographic information. First, participants provided their age, gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (Appendix A). As with Study 1, this data was collected in order to explore the diversity of the sample, though no analyses were planned related to these variables.

Centrality rating of drama/bullying. Participants in this study did not rate all items per construct derived from the free-listing phase in Study 1. Instead, participants were presented with the abridged categories derived from the data coding and reduction procedures: 131 categories for drama and 106 categories for bullying (Appendix D; see Study 1 for data reduction procedures). First, the participants were given the following set of instructions (adapted from Kearns & Fincham, 2004):

In a previous study, we asked people to tell us their views of drama or bullying. Specifically, we asked them to “list the characteristics or attributes of drama/bullying that come to mind”. Below are the responses of some of the people in our earlier study. After you have read each one, please rate how central

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

or important you think each of the characteristics are to the concept of drama or bullying. There are no right or wrong answers and your personal opinion is of particular interest to us.

Participants were asked to rate each of the attributes obtained in Study 1 on how well it characterized the experience of drama or bullying. The features were rated on a scale from 1 (e.g., extremely poor feature of drama) to 8 (e.g., extremely good feature of drama). For half of the participants, the characteristics of drama were presented first followed by bullying, while the features were presented in reverse order for the other half of participants to prevent bias in favour of the attributes listed first.

Engagement in bullying and drama. Participants were asked to rate whether they typically engaged in bullying or created drama in their social interactions based on characteristics identified in Study 1 (Appendix E). Participants were asked, “How often do you typically bully others?” followed by 5 questions asking how often they engaged in specific bullying behaviours derived from the initial categories listed in Study 1. These top 5 bullying behaviours were: being mean, physically harming, verbally abusing, teasing, and causing harm to others. Participants were also asked, “How often do you create drama?” followed by 5 items that reflected the most frequent forms of drama derived from the initial categories listed in Study 1 (gossiping, lying, exaggerating, excluding, and backstabbing). Participants responded to each question by rating how often they engaged in these behaviours on a scale from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Everyday). Mean scores were computed for each of the constructs (bullying and drama – 6 items each) with higher scores reflecting greater engagement in the behaviour. This measure demonstrated excellent reliability (Cronbach’s alpha = .88 for bullying, .83 for drama).

Results

Mean centrality ratings for all attributes are listed in Table 1 and Table 2 (presented above in Study 1). Centrality ratings ranged from 3.30 to 6.03 for drama on the 8-point scale, with a mean rating of 5.05 ($SD = 2.23$) for the 131 attributes. For bullying, the centrality ratings ranged from 3.93 to 6.23, with a mean rating of 5.58 ($SD = 2.32$) for the 107 attributes. As anticipated, the range of centrality ratings was fairly broad, though participants used the very low and very high ends of the scale infrequently. These results suggest that the features were moderate to good characteristics of both drama and bullying.

Bivariate correlations and descriptive statistics were also examined. It was anticipated that the attributes most frequently reported in Study 1 would be associated with the highest rated (most central) characteristics in the present study, as they were both measures of the prototypicality of a construct. The frequency counts from Study 1 and centrality ratings for drama were significantly and positively correlated ($r = .30, p < .001$), as were the frequencies and centrality ratings for bullying ($r = .38, p < .001$), indicating that the two measures of the prototypicality of features were related, though not perfectly correlated. Mean centrality ratings did not differ as a function of gender.

With respect to the centrality ratings, the features of drama that received the highest rating in the present sample were being two-faced and emotional, both reflecting characteristics of those who engage in drama. Additional characteristics that were rated as most central were the types of behaviours involved (e.g., gossiping, rumour spreading, backstabbing, arguments, being secretive, etc.). Motives of drama were also more central to drama, including betrayal, jealousy, things being blown out of proportion, and lies.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

The most *peripheral* features were again associated with the performative nature of drama, including play and being creative, as well as some characteristics of those who engage in drama (e.g., charismatic, enthusiastic, hopeful, bored).

For bullying, the most representative attributes were threatening, controlling, targeting others, and insulting others, in addition to several other typical behaviours that are involved (e.g., physical harm, and teasing/picking on others). Further themes that emerged related to the power differential involved (e.g., powerful, intimidating) and the consequences of bullying (e.g., hurtful, harmful, emotional harm, negative). In contrast, the *least* central characteristics of bullying were related to the potential positive motivators for engaging in bullying, including being popular and accepted, having high self-esteem, looking good, and finding it enjoyable.

To compare the two metrics (frequencies and centrality ratings) of attribute prototypicality for each construct, the top 50 most frequently listed and the top 50 most central ratings were examined given that they were the most “central” features to the constructs, and a list of the top attributes that appeared for *both* indices was compiled. This analysis was not a principle aim of the study, but was intended to help further clarify the findings. Study 1 resulted in 131 categories of drama and 107 categories of bullying, which was considerably more than most prototype analyses (25 to 75 attributes, on average). In general, many components were both frequently endorsed, and rated as central. However, a relatively small proportion of Study 1 participants endorsed some components, though these components were given high centrality ratings in Study 2 (and vice-versa). Although it is understood that the centrality ratings were of a continuous nature (rather than dichotomous), identifying the most central features according to both

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

metrics allowed for the most prototypical features to emerge. Therefore, this procedure was chosen to identify a more manageable list of features derived from the most prototypical attributes of both constructs. Of the top 50 characteristics for both metrics of the constructs, only those that appeared in the top 50 of *both* measures were retained. As a result, 35 features were rated as the most prototypical for bullying (Table 4), while 26 attributes were rated as the most prototypical for drama (Table 5).

Other Findings

Frequency of bullying and drama. In terms of the frequency with which these behaviours are perpetrated, college students reported relatively infrequent involvement in both behaviours. Approximately 75% of college students in this sample reported engaging in drama, while only 52% of the sample engaged in bullying (as measured by engaging in at least *two* of the behaviours more than *not at all* (a response of 2 or more) in the previous month). In fact, only 30% of college students reported having *never* engaged in bullying, and less than 11% *never* engaged in drama. On average, participants reported engaging in slightly more drama ($M = 2.19$, $SD = .99$; range 1 to 5) than bullying ($M = 1.81$, $SD = .95$).

Gender differences. While there were no gender differences in the average frequency of self-reported use of drama for males ($M = 2.21$, $SD = 1.00$) and females ($M = 2.18$, $SD = .99$), males ($M = 2.13$, $SD = .99$) reported significantly more engagement in bullying, on average, than females ($M = 1.63$, $SD = .88$; $t(143) = -3.14$, $p < .01$).

Correlations. Self-reported use of bullying and drama were significantly associated ($r = .64$, $p < .001$), indicating that individuals who bully others more frequently are also more likely to engage in drama in their peer interactions. This lends

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 4.

Most Prototypical Bullying Features

	Study 1 (N = 74)	Study 2 (N = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (M)	SD
Threatening	14.9%	6.12	2.37
Controlling	10.8%	6.09	2.31
Insulting	21.6%	6.05	2.40
Aggressive	18.9%	6.05	2.35
Occurs in School	9.5%	6.05	2.21
Physical Harm	54.1%	6.03	2.33
Teasing/Picking on Others	23.0%	6.03	2.32
Picking on Someone Weaker	27.0%	6.02	2.40
Hurtful	23.0%	6.02	2.39
Powerful	17.6%	6.02	2.21
Intimidating	14.9%	6.02	2.38
Harmful	14.9%	6.01	2.29
Picking on Others for Differences	9.5%	6.01	2.35
Emotional Harm	21.6%	6.00	2.26
Verbal Harm	31.1%	5.99	2.47
Mean	51.4%	5.97	2.33
Abusive	37.8%	5.97	2.31
Hateful	12.2%	5.96	2.25
Name-Calling	10.8%	5.95	2.44
Unnecessary	21.6%	5.93	2.40
Harassment	9.5%	5.93	2.39
Humiliating	8.1%	5.93	2.37
Anger	10.8%	5.92	2.14
Ganging Up on People	14.9%	5.91	2.33
Social Media Harm	20.3%	5.89	2.31
Fighting	13.5%	5.89	2.44
Immature	10.8%	5.88	2.24
Rude	16.2%	5.87	2.25
Violent	18.9%	5.85	2.31
Common	9.5%	5.81	2.22
Gossiping/Rumour Spreading	13.5%	5.76	2.38
Insecurity	18.9%	5.74	2.32
Isolating	13.5%	5.74	2.30
Low Self-Esteem	14.9%	5.73	2.42
Creates Victims	17.6%	5.68	2.29

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 5.

Most Prototypical Drama Features

	Study 1 (N = 74)	Study 2 (N = 171)	
Feature	Percentage of Participants	Centrality Rating (M)	SD
Emotional	23.0%	5.74	1.97
Occurs in School	14.9%	5.74	1.95
Gossiping	37.8%	5.73	2.42
Rumour Spreading	10.8%	5.73	2.43
Backstabbing	18.9%	5.68	2.48
Argument	14.9%	5.66	2.13
Jealousy	10.8%	5.59	2.15
Causing Problems	9.5%	5.54	2.30
Broken Relationships	17.6%	5.53	2.19
Overreacting	9.5%	5.53	2.30
Lies	23.0%	5.51	2.37
Difference of Opinion	8.1%	5.51	2.07
Occurs in Social Gatherings	10.8%	5.48	2.20
Bullying	10.8%	5.46	2.43
Exaggerating	25.7%	5.45	2.16
Fighting	24.3%	5.43	2.17
Immature	12.2%	5.39	2.26
Attention Seeking	20.3%	5.38	2.19
Conflict	12.2%	5.37	2.23
Exclusion/Isolation	20.3%	5.30	2.22
Friendships	16.2%	5.30	2.13
Misunderstanding	16.2%	5.29	2.12
Negative Climate	8.1%	5.28	2.23
Anger	16.2%	5.27	2.28
Social Media Harm	12.2%	5.27	3.31
Insecure	8.1%	5.27	2.23

support to the notion that drama is in fact related to other forms of peer victimization, including bullying.

Discussion

The aim of Studies 1 and 2 was to examine the features and structure of the concepts of drama and bullying from the perspective of college students through

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

prototype analysis. The patterns of results across both studies suggested that both drama and bullying are multidimensional constructs that were agreeable to a prototype conceptualization. Bullying and drama both reflected more multifaceted constructs than can be captured by any single definition; therefore, the results of these studies support the idea that individuals tend to have a prototype for these types of negative social interactions.

When comparing the mean centrality ratings of Study 2 with the frequency of the attributes listed in Study 1, as anticipated, many features were both frequently listed and rated high in centrality. This suggests that, for the most part, features that were more frequently reported, or more readily came to mind when asked about these constructs, tended to be the most central. As these two metrics are both indicators of the prototypicality of these features, it was expected that there would be many commonalities.

Bullying Prototype

This study was among the first to explore the perceptions of bullying according to college students. In terms of the common definitional criteria of bullying, strength and power (and related constructs like intimidating, threatening, controlling, tormenting) were reported by less than 20% of college students in the sample, though they were rated as some of the most central features of bullying. This suggests that perhaps *power* is not one of the first or the most salient characteristics to come to mind when describing bullying, but that it is a central characteristic when all characteristics or features are considered together. A smaller proportion of the sample (< 10%) reported the long-term nature of bullying, though no one specifically mentioned repetition as central

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

characteristic. This characteristic of bullying was also rated as only moderately central to the concept of bullying. Remarkably, intentionality was not reported at all as a characteristic feature of bullying, in line with previous work (Byrne et al., 2016). Collectively, these findings suggest that participants did not fully concur with criteria outlined in formal definitions of bullying, providing further evidence that bullying may be more amenable to prototype conceptualization than a classical definition.

In contrast, college students readily identified various types and forms of bullying including, physical, verbal, relational (e.g., gossiping), emotional, and cyber aggression. However, they also associated bullying with other aggressive behaviours including abuse, harassment, violence, racism, and fighting which are constructs that are rarely associated with childhood bullying, but are commonly associated with bullying in the workplace (Crawshaw, 2009).

Most research on bullying has taken place in primary or secondary school settings. Over 20% of college students in this study reported that bullying takes place via social media, while less than 10% reported that it takes place in schools. This suggests that bullying might remain a prevalent issue in college, but that it more commonly takes place in online settings at this age. Furthermore, in terms of the long-term outcomes, college students described bullying as hurtful, emotionally harmful, and psychologically harmful (e.g., depression, low self-esteem, mental health problems, suicide), indicating that bullying remains a harmful behaviour in emerging adulthood.

While most studies on bullying have taken place in childhood or adolescence, this study was among the first to explore conceptions of bullying in a college or university sample. The findings suggest that college students' conceptualizations of bullying are

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

complex. Most commonly used definitions of bullying include that (a) the behaviour is repeated, (b) it involves an imbalance of power, and (c) there is hostile intent (Olweus, 1991; Pepler et al., 1997). Earlier research suggests that older adolescents and adults are more likely to refer to repetition, imbalance of power, and intentionality in their definitions of bullying (Madsen, 1996; Monks & Smith, 2006). Contrary to these findings, power imbalance and repetition were infrequently reported, and intentionality was *not* mentioned at all by participants. Collectively, the results support research indicating a lack of alignment between researcher conceptualizations and the frequency with which the main definitional criteria of bullying are reported (e.g., Cuadrado-Gordillo, 2012; Frisen et al., 2008; Guerin & Hennessey, 2002; Madsen, 1996; Naylor et al., 2006; Vaillancourt et al., 2008).

Drama Prototype

Although the findings with respect to bullying are novel and shed light on perceptions of bullying among college students who have previously been under studied in the context of bullying, the primary aim of the study was to explore the characteristics of drama, and whether this behaviour is a potential new form of aggression or antisocial behaviour worthy of further investigation.

First, much of the preliminary research on drama conceptualizes this behaviour as overlapping with relational aggression (Allen, 2012, Marwick & boyd, 2011; Regan & Sweet, 2015; Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015). Indeed, college students described gossiping, rumour spreading, and exclusion/isolation as frequent and central behaviours that are synonymous with relational aggression. Furthermore, the limited existing research on drama has described drama as intersecting with conflict, aggression, and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

bullying (Allen, 2015; Marwick & boyd, 2014). Fighting, conflict, and bullying were all attributes listed by participants in this study as being prototypical of drama (between 10% and 25%), suggesting that there may be overlap between drama and other forms of conflict and aggression.

In terms of setting, drama has primarily been conceptualized as an online behaviour (Marwick & boyd, 2011; Regan & Sweet, 2015). However, according to participants, school settings and social gatherings were more central characteristics of drama than online settings. Thus, though research to date suggests drama operates primarily through social media, it seems that it need not be restricted to online settings and takes place in face-to-face settings as well (Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015).

The performative nature of drama has been debated among researchers. While some researchers refer this as a central aspect of drama (Marwick & boyd, 2014; Regan & Sweet, 2015), other researchers do not require that drama be a performative behaviour for the benefit of an audience (Allen, 2012; Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015). College students did refer to some of these elements (e.g., acting, looking good, action, performance, play); however, these elements were referred to by less than 7% of the sample, and were not identified as central components of drama. However, being “two-faced” was one of the most central features of drama identified.

Preliminary research on drama suggests that drama is typically associated with females (Allen, 2012; Regan & Sweet, 2015; Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015).

Participants in the present sample characterized drama as typical of females, though this was reported by less than 15% of participants and it was not one of the most central features of drama. Although these findings partially support previous work, these results

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

should be interpreted with caution given the skewed gender distribution and the lack of analyses on gender differences in responses.

Whereas bullying is primarily assumed to be associated with intent to cause harm, drama seems to be motivated by excessive emotionality and a desire for attention, which is in line with how drama has been conceptualized previously (Allen, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2011). Allen's (2015) preliminary research on drama described drama as over-reacting, exaggerating, and being excessively emotional. Consistent with these findings, college students in this study also listed sharing and over-sharing as common characteristics, and many reported overreaction, exaggerations, and excessive emotionality as characteristics of drama. Furthermore, drama seems to be associated with disagreements and misunderstandings.

Bullying has long been conceptualized as a relational problem (Pepler, Craig, Yuile & Connolly, 2004), particularly among groups of individuals (Pepler, Craig & O'Connell, 1999, 2010). A focus on relationships also seems to be a fundamental component of drama. Allen (2015) described drama as involving broken confidences and alliance building. Similarly, Marwick and boyd (2014) described drama as often involving romantic relationships, sexual encounters and sexual reputations. In this study, college students described lies, exclusion and isolation, friendships and broken relationships as central features of drama, and also frequently reported cheating on partners as another common attribute.

College students reported more than just the actions or types of behaviours involved in drama. Characteristics also included emotions, with some emotions positive (e.g., exciting, entertaining), though more frequently emotions were negative (e.g.,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

anxiety, stress, sadness). Livingstone (2014) found that teens described both positive and negative feelings associated with engaging in online drama, with adolescents vacillating between enjoyment and disgust as they describe their online interactions and the struggles they experienced maintaining control of these encounters. Thus, while drama can be upsetting for some, it also seems to be quite exciting and entertaining for others.

Regan and Sweet (2015) suggest that drama serves personal, interpersonal, and group purposes. Some characteristics identified in the present research were a desire for attention, a need for excitement and entertainment, jealousy, insecurities, and exclusion/isolation, all of which reflect both personal and interpersonal goals that might motivate the use of drama. Furthermore, participants reported aspects of drama that might speak to the roles or characteristics of those involved. For example, college students reported features such as popular, rude, mean and catty, which could describe those who frequently engage in drama.

Based on the central elements of drama as described by participants, I propose the following working conceptualization of drama: *Drama involves highly emotional interactions that take place in existing relationships or friendships. Like relational aggression, it involves gossiping, rumour spreading, backstabbing, and the exclusion or isolation of others. However, while relational aggression can be more covert or hidden in nature, what makes drama unique is that drama is overt, highly emotional, attention-seeking behaviour that involves considerable exaggeration and overreaction. Furthermore, it commonly involves lies and manipulation of others.*

Drama vs. Bullying Prototypes

College students in this study described several similarities between the constructs

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

of drama and bullying. When the most central features and attributes of drama and bullying were compared, there were many overlapping features that described behaviours typical of both drama and bullying. Drama and bullying were both associated with gossiping, backstabbing, and excluding/isolating others. This is not surprising, given that relational bullying is a subtype of bullying that resembles relational aggression.

However, these characteristics were more frequently reported and more central to the construct of drama. Similarly, both drama and bullying were associated with verbal harm and cyber aggression (via social media), though both were more central to the concept of bullying. This lends support to the idea that drama reflects elements of other forms of peer victimization including bullying, verbal aggression, and relational aggression (Allen, 2012, 2015; Marwick & boyd, 2014).

Drama and bullying were both linked with school settings *and* online settings. Interestingly, bullying has been studied more in school settings and drama in online settings, but the reverse associations were found in the present study. College students associated drama more with school settings, and bullying with online and social media settings. These findings might simply be a function of the age of the sample, as bullying has been understudied among college students.

Both drama and bullying seem to be driven by a variety of motives, though attention seeking and a desire to look good to others seemed to be particularly salient to both. Participants also frequently referred to emotional factors involved in drama and bullying, though there was a mix of positive (e.g., enjoyment) and negative emotions (e.g., anger, anxiety).

Despite the overlap, there were still substantial differences between the two

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

constructs in terms of the attributes listed, indicating that while there may be some overlap, drama and bullying really reflect two different aggressive or antisocial behaviours. For example, victimization is a large component of bullying. In fact, research into the dynamics of bullying suggests that there is consistency in the various roles involved (e.g., victim, bully, bully-victim, assistant to bully, outsider, etc.). In the present study, college students referred to targeting others, and creating victims in their descriptions of bullying, but this identification of roles (particularly the victim role) was not clear in the characterization of drama. It might be that the variety of roles so clearly characterized in bullying are less clear in the case of drama. Recall that drama has been conceptualized as more bidirectional and reciprocal in nature than bullying, with no clear victims (Marwick & boyd, 2011).

Established relationships appear to be a central component of drama (Allen, 2012). Though bullying has long been conceptualized as a relational problem (Pepler et al., 2004), particularly among groups of individuals (Pepler et al., 1999, 2010), in the case of drama, the focus seems to be causing harm to more intimate relationships, like established close-friendships, or romantic relationships (Feshbach, 1969), whereas bullying can take place between individuals in any type of interpersonal relationship.

While both behaviours are described as mean, it seems that bullying is perceived as more aggressive and more severe than drama. College students associated bullying with several other forms of aggression (verbal, physical, cyber, social), as well as conflict, fighting, violence, harassment, and abuse. In contrast, the characteristic features of drama were not as harsh. Although drama was associated with conflict, participants described drama as involving arguments, secrets, betrayal, jealousy, and confrontations,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

which, while negative, do not reflect the same degree of severity as the types of conflict associated with bullying.

What seems to make drama unique, is that it is just that, highly dramatic. It involves elevated emotions, over-reacting, and exaggeration. Unlike bullying, drama is perceived as exciting, entertaining and pleasurable, much like relational aggression (e.g., Owens, Shute, & Slee, 2000). Combined with the fact that drama seems to be less focused on victimization of others, the pleasure and excitement derived from drama might result in this behaviour being misconceived as less harmful than other forms of aggression.

Drama does not seem to be characterized by the imbalance of power that is a fundamental feature of bullying. Threatening, controlling and intimidating were reported as central characteristics of bullying, but were not identified as characteristics of drama. Furthermore, while bullying is characterized as a long-term or repeated behaviour (the victim is repeatedly targeted over time), participants also characterized drama as a long-term behaviour. However, while bullying is long-term in the sense that the victim is often repeatedly targeted over time, it is unclear from the evidence of this study whether the “long-term” nature of drama refers to the same thing. For example, drama may be more of a “long-term” behaviour in the sense that it involves people in a *prolonged* single event, rather than a repeated involvement in drama through multiple events over time.

The evidence suggests that both bullying and drama are multifaceted concepts that are better organized as prototype concepts rather than classical definitions. The prototype approach allowed for new insights, as participants mentioned characteristics not specifically detailed in previous work. Furthermore, there were additional features

listed for both constructs that do not appear in definitions of drama and bullying discussed by researchers. Collectively, the results suggest that there are no essential or satisfactory features that would suggest that bullying and drama are concepts that completely align with existing definitions. In summary, the results of this study were informative in conceptualizing everyday perspectives of bullying and drama.

Limitations and Future Directions

The aim of Study 1 and Study 2 was to identify the characteristics of bullying and drama reported by participants, using an approach previously employed with social constructs. Prototype analysis was chosen as the preferred method given that it is often effective for exploring constructs that are challenging to define --- like drama and bullying. One limitation of the prototype analysis method is that the context often is lost. Participants only describe the features or characteristics, and do not describe the context from which this characteristic was perceived. For example, a person might list “hurt” as a characteristic of bullying, but it is unknown whether this refers to intent to hurt or harm others, or one’s own emotional or physical hurt or harm. In a sense, some meaning can get lost in prototype analysis.

Although the prototype analysis method was effective for the aims of these studies, future research should consider that other qualitative methods could be equally or even more effective for understanding what people mean when discussing bullying and/or drama. Prototype analysis is much like content analysis or thematic analysis in its simplest form. However, grounded theory methods could be a particularly good follow-up or complementary analysis to the prototype analysis results from this study. Grounded theory is a more thorough inductive qualitative research methodology involving the cycle

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

of continually collecting qualitative data, reviewing the results and the ideas, concepts or elements, grouping the concepts into themes or categories, and eventually generating a new theory based on the collection of categories.

Another important limitation that should be acknowledged is that most prototype analysis studies include follow-up studies of cognitive or implicit measures or evaluations of the construct of interest. These studies generally recognition and recall tasks, memory tasks, reaction time tasks, or evaluations of hypothetical vignettes. Often the prediction is that more central features of a construct will be recalled or lead to quicker responses than more peripheral features. While these methods were not conducted following Study 1 and Study 2, these approaches certainly provide an important avenue for future research as they would more closely align these studies with the prototype methodology and procedures, and confirm the prototype structure of the constructs of interest.

Implications and Conclusion

It remains to be determined whether drama is more or less harmful than other forms of aggression, like bullying. Although participants indicated that drama was associated with harm, it will be important to explore the consequences of engaging in drama, particularly if these behaviours are perceived less negatively than more direct forms of aggression like bullying. If college students perceive drama to be a less harmful behaviour, this could justify their continued use of this behaviour, regardless of the potential consequences.

Studies 1 and 2 were the first to explore college students' conceptualizations of bullying and drama using the prototype approach. The findings with respect to bullying

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

shed light on the fact that perceptions of bullying among college students do not necessarily coincide with the thematic categories often associated with researcher definitions of bullying: intent, repetition, and imbalance of power. Furthermore, the results indicated that drama seems to be a well-understood concept for college students. More importantly, many of characteristic features of drama seem to also be associated with bullying and other forms of aggression, suggesting that drama might be a concerning form of peer aggression worthy of further investigation. As such, Study 3 aimed to explore the empirical association between drama and other forms of aggression, as well as the personality traits of those typically involved in drama.

Study 3: Personality and Aggression Profiles that Predict the Use of Bullying and Drama

The previous studies explored the characteristic features of bullying, and investigated drama as a potential new form of aggression. Participants described drama as a behaviour involving gossiping, exclusion, backstabbing, and verbal harm, behaviours that seem to resemble verbal and relational forms of bullying. Moreover, drama and bullying are forms of social conflict that are perceived to be mean, hurtful, and harmful, associated with both physical and psychological harm and distress (i.e., anxiety, depression, fear, pain, sadness). These findings suggest the need for further exploration into drama, thus the first aim of Study 3 was to explore how the newly defined construct was associated with bullying and other established forms of aggression and social conflict.

Furthermore, given that drama is an emerging construct, an important question arises: who is engaging in drama? Study 3 attempted to address this question by identifying the personality profiles of those who engage in this behaviour. Thus, the second aim of the current research was to explore the associations between drama and personality traits, and contrast those with the personality profiles associated with bullying.

Drama and Other Forms of Aggression

Broadly speaking, aggression defines any actions with the intent to harm or hurt another individual. Several forms of aggression exist, most of which share characteristics with bullying (a comprehensive list of various forms of aggression discussed can be found in Supplemental Table 1, Appendix F). Some bullying is direct in nature,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

consisting of physical and verbal assaults or threats. This type of bullying most closely aligns with overt forms of aggression, including physical aggression and verbal aggression, and involves causing harm (or threatening to cause harm) to another person physically or verbally (e.g., pushing, hitting, kicking, biting, shoving, punching, insulting someone, name calling, or making verbal threats) (Coie & Dodge, 1998; Ostrov, Ries, Stauffacher, Godleski, & Mullins, 2008).

Other forms of bullying are indirect, involving covert actions such as exclusion, social rejections, teasing, gossiping, telling lies, and spreading rumours. This type of bullying is associated with relational aggression, which involves causing harm or threatening to cause harm to another person by openly or covertly damaging social relationships, friendships, or feelings of acceptance and inclusion in the peer group (e.g., Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Nelson, Robinson, & Hart, 2005).

Drama fits well into this indirect or covert category of bullying. In fact, in Studies 1 and 2, many of the characteristic features of drama described by college students resembled features of bullying and relational aggression. Respondents listed bullying as a potential characteristic of drama, and also described relationally aggressive behaviours including gossiping, rumour spreading, and the exclusion or isolation of others as characteristic features of drama as well. However, while bullying targets specific victims, and can be quite mean, drama is perceived to be more pleasurable and less focused on victimization of others, and may be misconceived as less harmful than bullying and other forms of aggression and social conflict. Though bullying and other common forms of conflict and aggression have been well researched, little is known about drama as a potential new form of aggression. The present study examined how

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

drama fits into existing taxonomies of aggression, and the types of people who typically engage in both bullying and drama in college.

Bullying and Personality

Broadly defined, personality is the dynamic organization of the characteristic thoughts, behaviours, and feelings of an individual (Allport, 1961). Most researchers today focus on the trait approach to personality. Two trait taxonomies potentially valuable to the exploration of bullying are the Big Five and the Dark Triad. The Big Five trait taxonomy is one of the most frequently employed in personality research (Costa & McCrae, 1997). Several decades of research have identified five major dimensions of personality: Extraversion, Neuroticism, Agreeableness, Openness, and Conscientiousness. These personality domains describe the degree to which an individual is social, assertive, and energetic versus quiet, introspective, and reserved (Extraversion); anxious, insecure, and unstable versus confident and emotionally stable (Neuroticism); tolerant, kind, and good-natured versus callous, selfish, and ill-tempered (Agreeableness); curious, independent, and creative versus conventional and conservative (Openness); and persistent, careful, and reliable versus impetuous and impulsive (Conscientiousness).

The Big Five framework is focused on identifying broad, universal traits, and thus does not capture several more specific ones. In contrast, the Dark Triad is a theory of personality that focuses specifically on malevolent or antisocial traits. The Dark Triad includes three related, yet independent personality traits: Machiavellianism, Narcissism, and Psychopathy. Machiavellianism is a trait identified by the cold, calculated manipulation of others to achieve a desired goal. Narcissism is characterized by feelings

of entitlement, grandiosity, and superiority. Finally, Psychopathy describes individuals who are callous or unemotional, lack empathy and fear, and are highly impulsive and easily provoked. These Dark Triad traits have been associated with various antisocial and aggressive behaviours, including bullying in both youth and adults (e.g., van Geel, Goemans, Toprak, & Vedder, 2017).

Bullying and the Big Five. Mitsopoulou and Giovazolias (2015) conducted a meta-analysis of the association between personality, bullying, and victimization. The researchers found 4 studies specifically investigating Big-Five traits. According to the results, bullying was strongly negatively associated with Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Openness, though the effect sizes were small to moderate in strength. Neuroticism and Extraversion were also found to be significantly positively associated with bullying.

A further review of the literature on bullying and the Big Five personality taxonomy resulted in less than a dozen studies (refer to Table 6 for a list of studies reviewed). Of these studies, only 4 were included in the meta-analysis by Mitsopoulou and Giovazolias (2015) (i.e., Bollmer, Harris, & Milich, 2006; Book, Volk, & Hosker, 2012; Menesini, Camodeca, & Nocentini, 2010; Tani, Greenman, Schneider, & Fregoso, 2003). The additional studies examine a wide range of developmental age groups (i.e., children, adolescents, and adults), use a variety of measures, and numerous methods of assessment (i.e., teacher, parent, peer, and self-report).

The clearest correlates between bullying and personality were Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and Neuroticism. There were several consistent findings across the studies to support this. All studies found that greater reported bullying was associated

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 6.

Overview of Findings from Big Five Personality Literature

Study	Sample	Bullying Measure	Personality Reporter	E	A	C	N	O
Tani et al. (2003)*	Children (ages 8 to 10)	Participant Role Scale – Pro-Bully	Peer nomination	+	–	ns	+	ns
Ehrler, Evans, & McGhee (1999)	Children (ages 9 to 13)	Conduct problems	Teacher	ns	–	–	ns	–
		Social problems	Teacher	–	–	–	+	–
Bollmer, Harris, & Milich (2006)*	Children (ages 10 to 13)	Reactive-Proactive Aggression Questionnaire (RPAQ)	Self-report Parent- report	ns	–	–	ns	ns
Menesini, Camodeca, & Nocentini (2010)*	Children (ages 10 to 12)	Bullying/Victimization Questionnaire	Self-report	+	–	ns	+	ns
Book, Volk, & Hosker (2012)*	Children and adolescents (ages 10 to 18)	Bullying Questionnaire	Self-report	ns	–	–	–	ns
Kodžopeljić et al. (2014)	Adolescents (ages 15 to 19)	Peer Violence Questionnaire (PVQ)	Self-report	ns	–	–	+	ns
van Geel et al. (2017)	Adolescent and emerging adults (ages 16 to 21)	Bullying Participant Role Questionnaire	Self-report	+	–	–	ns	ns
Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias (2015)	Children, adolescents, and emerging adults (ages 8 to 25)	Meta-analysis	Self-report Peer nominations	+	–	–	+	–
Wilson & Nagy (2017)	Adults (no age range specified)	Negative Acts Questionnaire – Revised (NAQ-R)	Self-report	ns	–	–	+	–
Plopa et al. (2017)	Adults (ages 22 to 62)	Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ)	Self-report	–	–	–	+	ns
Mathisen et al. (2011)	Adults (mean age 26)	Negative Acts Questionnaire (NAQ)	Self-report	ns	–	–	+	ns

Note: E = extraversion, A = agreeableness, C = conscientiousness, N = neuroticism, O = openness; – = significant negative association; + = significant positive association; ns = non-significant association; *included in Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias (2015) meta-analysis

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

with less Agreeableness. Similarly, all but two studies (Menesini et al., 2010; Tani et al., 2003) found lower Conscientiousness scores among participants who scored higher on measures of bullying. Many of the studies also found that greater Neuroticism was associated with increased reported bullying.

The findings with respect to Extraversion were much less clear. While some studies indicated bullies were more likely to be Extraverted (i.e., Menesini et al., 2010; Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias, 2015; Tani et al., 2003; van Geel et al., 2017), others suggest that bullying is associated with lower Extraversion (i.e., Ehrler, Evans, & McGhee, 1999; Plopa, Plopa, & Skuzinska, 2017). Most studies have found no significant association between bullying and Openness, with some exceptions (Ehrler et al., 1999; Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias, 2015; Wilson & Nagy, 2017). Looking at the results across the studies, there seemed to be more consistent findings regarding the association between Big Five traits and bullying for studies in adolescence and emerging adulthood, as well as studies that relied on self-reports of personality traits.

Collectively, the evidence suggested that low Agreeableness (e.g., a tendency to be calloused, selfish, and ill-tempered) and low Conscientiousness (e.g., a tendency to be impetuous and impulsive) might be strong predictors of bullying. Given the convergence of evidence, these specific personality traits could be useful in predicting the tendency to engage in bullying behaviour. Further exploration of this might help predict that the presence of certain personality traits is actually associated with a greater likelihood of bullying others in college, but more importantly, this could shed light on the role of personality traits in the use of drama.

Bullying and The Dark Triad. As with the literature on bullying and the Big Five, research on the association between bullying and the Dark Triad is somewhat limited. A review resulted in 11 studies published in the last two decades (see Table 7 for a list of these studies).

Research in the field of bullying suggests that bullies may be skilled at manipulating others (Sutton, Smith, & Swettenham, 1999), traits that are significantly associated with Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism is identified by insincerity and callous unemotional tendencies, as well as the calculated manipulation of others to achieve a desired goal. Research consistently indicates that Machiavellianism is positively associated with bullying in school age children (Andreou, 2004; Chabrol, Van Leeuwen, Rodgers, & Séjourné, 2009; Kerig & Stellwagen, 2010; Sutton & Keogh, 2000), adolescents (Peeters, Cillessen, & Scholte, 2010; van Geel et al., 2017), and emerging adults and adults (Baughman, Dearing, Giammarco, & Vernon, 2012). However, some research indicates that Machiavellianism is only associated with bullying among males (Andreou, 2004).

Psychopathy describes individuals who are callous and unemotional, lack empathy and remorse, and are highly impulsive, manipulative, and exploitative. Psychopathy is also consistently found to be positively associated with bullying behaviours across childhood, adolescence, and adulthood (Ang et al., 2010; Baughman et al., 2012; Fanti & Henrich, 2015; Fanti & Kimonis, 2012; Ragatz, Anderson, Fremouw, & Schwartz, 2011; Stellwagen & Kerig, 2013; van Geel et al., 2017). Results have been mixed with respect to the relationship between bullying and Narcissism. Narcissism is characterized by feelings of dominance, entitlement,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 7.

Overview of Findings from Dark Triad Personality Literature

Study	Sample	Bullying Measure	Personality Reporter	M	N	P
van Geel et al. (2017)	Adolescents and emerging adults (ages 16 to 21)	The Bullying Participant Role Questionnaire	Self-report	+	ns	+
Baughman et al. (2012)	Adults (ages 18 to 70)	The Bullying Questionnaire	Self-report	+	+	+
Sutton & Keogh (2000)	Children (ages 8 to 12)	Olweus' Bully Questionnaire	Self-report	+	n/a	n/a
Ragatz et al. (2011)	Emerging adults (mean age 19)	Revised Olweus Bully Questionnaire	Self-report	n/a	n/a	+
Andreou (2004)	Children (ages 9 to 12)	Bully Behaviour Scale	Self-report	+	n/a	n/a
Fanti & Kimonis (2012)	Adolescents (ages 12 to 14)	Student Survey of Bullying Behaviour-Revised	Self-report	n/a	+	+
Ang et al. (2010)	Children and adolescents (ages 9 to 13)	Bullying Questionnaire	Self-report	n/a	n/a	+
Stellwagen & Kerig (2013)	Children and adolescents (ages 10 to 15)	Ringleader Bullying – Participant Roles in the Bullying Process	Clinician assessment	n/a	n/a	+
Fanti & Henrich (2015)	Children and adolescents (ages 11 to 13)	Student Survey of Bullying Behaviour - Revised	Self-report	n/a	n/a	+
Reijntjes et al. (2016)	Children (mean age 10)	Bullying Role (Peer) Nominations	Self-report	n/a	+	n/a
Peeters et al. (2010)	Adolescents (mean age 13)	Peer Nominations and Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire	Self-report	+	n/a	n/a

Note: M = Machiavellianism, N = narcissism, P = psychopathy; - = significant negative association; + = significant positive association; ns = non-significant association; n/a = not applicable/not tested; * for boys only, not for girls

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

grandiosity, and superiority. Narcissistic individuals often have a greater sense of entitlement, superiority, and arrogance, and lower empathy for others, making these individuals particularly prone to aggression. Definitions of bullying have long explored the role of power and need for dominance that often motivates bullying perpetration (e.g., Pellegrini & Long, 2002); in fact, the desire for greater social status and prestige is often a reason for bullying (Salmivalli et al., 1996). As such, Narcissism has been positively associated with bullying in school age children (Reijntjes et al., 2016), adolescents (Fanti & Kimonis, 2012), and adults (Baughman et al., 2012). However, other studies indicate this association is only true for males (Reijntjes et al., 2016), or find no significant association at all (van Geel et al., 2017).

In terms of the relative strength of the association between Dark Triad traits and bullying, Baughman and colleagues (2012) found that Psychopathy was most strongly related to bullying, followed by Machiavellianism, and Narcissism in a sample of adults. However, when van Geel et al. (2017) studied the Dark Triad traits in a slightly younger sample, Psychopathy and Machiavellianism predicted bullying, while Narcissism was not a significant predictor of bullying.

The preliminary studies on drama suggest that it is less focused on victimization of others, and is not characterized by a desire for power or dominance over others. While the use of threats and intimidation and a desire to control others were characteristics of bullying in Study 1 and Study 2, they were not central features of drama, suggesting that Narcissistic traits might be less common among those who engage in drama. Conversely, college students characterized drama as being “two-faced”, involving lying, secrets, betrayals, and the breaking of relationships. These characteristics are often involved in

the manipulation of others; therefore, Machiavellian traits could be a predictor in engagement in drama. Further exploring the role of these Dark Triad traits in the use of drama could be useful in predicting the tendency to engage in this behaviour.

Need for Drama as a Personality Dimension

While the Big Five taxonomy assesses the most common dimensions of personality, and the Dark Triad examines the more callous and anti-social dimensions of personality, additional personality constructs merit consideration. For example, Frankowski and colleagues (2016) were interested in exploring Need for Drama (NFD) as a unique personality trait. The authors defined Need for Drama (NFD) as a compound personality trait characterized by: (a) interpersonal manipulation, (b) impulsive outspokenness, and (c) persistent perceived victimhood. The authors described interpersonal manipulation as the encouragement of other to act in a manner that serves the goals of the manipulator. Impulsive outspokenness describes the impulsive, crude, and tactless propensity to share thoughts, opinions or ideas, regardless of the social consequences. Finally, persistent perceived victimhood was characterized by sustained feelings of persecution or victimization in everyday circumstances and interactions, which others would be more likely to perceive of as benign or non-threatening. Frankowski et al. (2016) proposed that Need for Drama could be a predictive trait in antisocial and maladaptive interpersonal interactions. However, research has yet to investigate NFD as a predictor of engagement in bullying and/or drama.

It is worth noting that Need for Drama as a personality trait is not the same as what I refer to as *being dramatic* or *engaging in drama*. The elements of Need for Drama as a trait or personality dimension described by Frankowski and colleagues (2016) might

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

overlap with what preliminary research suggests about the construct of drama as a type of behaviour and what was found in Studies 1 and 2, particularly in terms of the characteristics of those who engage in drama. However, the NFD trait and the definition of drama put forth from Studies 1 and 2 do not perfectly align. Interpersonal manipulation and impulsive outspokenness overlap with the conceptualization of drama as *involving exaggeration and overreaction*, and *lying and manipulation of others*. However, persistent perceived victimhood is unique to the trait of Need for Drama. Furthermore, elements of drama identified in the earlier studies such as the *highly emotional* and *attention-seeking* nature of the behaviour, as well as the specific *types of behaviours* involved (e.g., gossiping rumour spreading, backstabbing, and exclusion of others) are not captured in the Need for Drama trait. The extent of the association between drama as an aggressive behaviour, and the Need for Drama trait was investigated in Study 3.

Purpose and Hypotheses

Study 3 aimed to expand our limited understandings of drama, and further explore bullying in college students by examining how these behaviours are associated with personality dimensions, and how they fit into existing taxonomies of aggression. The first aim was to explore whether one or more types of aggression are useful in explaining engagement in drama, as it has been conceptualized as a form of social conflict and/or aggression. In view of the previous literature and preliminary findings that drama involves gossiping, rumour spreading, and manipulation of relationships, it was anticipated that drama would be most strongly predicted by use of relational aggression (Hypothesis 1A). Additionally, much of the work examining drama has explored it in the

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

context of online networks where it seems to be quite salient; therefore, it was also expected that drama would be associated with cyber aggression (Hypothesis 1B).

Finally, the association between bullying and drama was explored given Allen's work (2012, 2015) suggesting that drama is something that can evolve and escalate into bullying. The results of Studies 1 and 2 suggested that there were conceptual similarities in the characteristics or features of both drama and bullying, thus, it was anticipated that drama would be significantly associated with bullying (Hypothesis 1C).

The second aim of this study was to provide a better understanding of whether personality traits are associated with bullying and use of drama. The propensity to bully others seems to be strongly associated with certain personality traits, including low Agreeableness, low Conscientiousness, and Machiavellianism according to considerable research; therefore, similar results were anticipated in the present study (Hypothesis 2A). As for drama, this was the first study to explore the personality profiles of those who engage in drama, therefore the hypotheses were purely exploratory. It was expected that drama would be strongly associated with Neuroticism (Hypothesis 2B), as preliminary research suggests that drama involves considerable overreaction and excessive emotionality (Allen, 2012). It was also anticipated that drama would be positively associated with Extraversion (Hypothesis 2C) as those who engage in drama, do so as a means of seeking attention. Drama has been associated with lying, and the manipulation of others, traits that are associated with Machiavellianism; therefore, it was expected that this might also be a common trait among those who engage in drama (Hypothesis 2D). Finally, it was anticipated that those who engage in drama would be higher on the newly explored personality dimension, Need for Drama (Hypothesis 2E). Need for Drama has

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

never before been investigated as a trait that could predict perpetration of bullying, therefore there was no hypothesis regarding the anticipated association between bullying and NFD.

Method

Participants

A total of 127 undergraduate psychology students between the ages of 18 and 25 ($M_{age} = 20.21$, $SD = 3.02$; 64.6% female) participated in the study from a Canadian University in Ontario. The sample was primarily Caucasian (58.3% Caucasian, 20.5% Asian, 9.8% African, 6.8% Middle Eastern, 1.5% Hispanic, and 1.5% Native). In terms of socioeconomic status, 10.6% of the sample self-identified as being in the lowest third compared to the average Canadian, 15.9% self-identified as being in the top third, and 71.2% self-reported as middle-class; therefore, most of the participants were upper middle class (based on a self-report measure of SES).

Procedure

Undergraduate students in first- and second- year were recruited online to participate in the study. Participants provided consent to participate, and completed self-report questionnaires via Qualtrics consisting of the personality measures, and measures of various types of aggression through Qualtrics. Students were compensated with course credit for their time.

Measures

Participants completed surveys online. All surveys were self-report format and responses were anonymous. No identifying information was collected from participants aside from general demographic information.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Demographic information. First, participants completed a survey on age, gender, ethnicity, and socioeconomic status (Appendix A). This data was used to explore the diversity of the sample. Aside from age and gender, ethnicity and SES were not directly associated with any specific hypotheses.

Relational aggression. Participants were asked to identify the indirect, relational, and socially aggressive behaviours they engaged in, including ignoring, exclusion, gossip/rumours, and negative non-verbal body language used to inflict social harm. This measure was compiled from several sources: (a) a summary of behaviours defined as indirect, relational or social aggression in a review by Archer and Coyne (2005), (b) the Self-Report of Aggression and Social Behaviour Measure (Morales & Crick, 1999), (c) a social aggression measure designed by Reynolds and Repetti (2010), and (d) social aggression vignettes originally used by Galen and Underwood (1997) (Appendix G). The revised measure included 42 items that were relevant for college students. Participants were asked to rate the frequency of their engagement in the behaviours over the previous year on a scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*) on items such as, “I deliberately left others out of the group” and “I have given someone the ‘silent treatment’”. An average score was computed to reflect how often each participant used relationally aggressive behaviours over the last year, with higher scores indicating greater use of relational aggression.

Cyber aggression. The Cyberbullying and Online Aggression Survey by Patchin and Hinduja (2006) was used to measure engagement in cyber aggression (Appendix H). Specifically, the cyberbullying *offending* scale of the measure was used. This measure consisted of 5 items rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*), such as, “I

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

have sent someone a message (online or via text) to make them angry or to make fun of them”. Higher mean scores indicated more perpetration of cyberbullying.

Bullying. Perpetration of bullying was examined using the Forms of Bullying Scale – Perpetrator Version (FBS-P) by Shaw and colleagues (2013) (Appendix I). This measure consisted of 10 items rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 5 (*very often*), with higher mean scores indicating more perpetration of bullying.

Physical and verbal aggression. Physical and verbal aggression were examined using the Buss-Perry Aggression Questionnaire (Buss & Perry, 1992; Appendix J). The 14-item questionnaire asked participants to rank statements along a 7-point scale from 1 (*extremely uncharacteristic of me*) to 7 (*extremely characteristic of me*). Items explored use of physical aggression (e.g., I have threatened people I know) and use of verbal aggression (e.g., I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them). A total score was computed for each subscale based on a mean of all items, with higher scores reflecting greater engagement in these behaviours.

Drama. This behavioural measure was created for the purpose of this study. Items were derived using a prototype analysis of the construct of drama from Study 1 and Study 2 (Appendix K). The most frequently reported and most central features of the construct of drama were used (see Study 2, Table 5). Of the 26 attributes identified as the most prototypical of drama, only 18 reflected behaviours and/or characteristics of perpetrators of drama; 8 items were excluded because they were not clearly defined behaviours (e.g., occurs in school, occurs in social gatherings, bullying, immature, friendships, anger, social media harm, insecure). Participants rated the frequency of engaging in each item (e.g., How often do you start or spread rumours about others?

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

How often do you overreact about things?) on a 7-point scale from 1 (*never*) to 7 (*everyday*), and a total score was computed based on a mean of all items. Higher scores reflected a greater frequency of engaging in drama.

Given that this measure was developed for this study, the psychometric properties were analyzed. The measure was deemed to have content and convergent validity. The items were derived directly from participants in Study 1 and Study 2, and the measure was strongly associated with relational aggression ($r = .76, p < .001$), a construct with which drama has been most closely aligned. The measure was found to have excellent internal reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .93; all items had a corrected item total of more than .30), and excellent split half reliability (Spearman-Brown Coefficient = .94).

Proactive and reactive aggression. This measure was developed by Raine and colleagues (2006) based on other measures and theoretical perspectives of proactive and reactive aggression (Dodge & Coie, 1987, Brown et al., 1996; Barratt, 1991; Meloy, 1988; Vitiello et al., 1990) (Appendix L). Each item was rated as 1 (*never*), 2 (*sometimes*), or 3 (*often*) for frequency of occurrence. Proactive aggression items (e.g., vandalized something for fun) and reactive items (e.g., hit others to defend yourself) were summed and averaged to form proactive and reactive scales, with higher scores indicating greater frequency of the behaviours.

Need for drama. Need for drama was measured using a newly developed measure by Frankowski and colleagues (2016) (Appendix M). This measure examined need for drama as a maladaptive personality trait involving interpersonal manipulation, impulsive outspokenness, and persistent perceived victimhood. The Need for Drama (NFD) measure consisted of 12 items (e.g., I say or do things just to see how others react)

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

that participants rated on a 7 point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Items were summed and averaged to create a mean score, with higher scores indicating a greater need for drama.

BFI-2 personality measure. The BFI-2 is a measure of the Big Five personality domains defined as Extraversion, Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, Negative Emotionality (Neuroticism), and Open-Mindedness (Soto & John, 2017) (Appendix N). Participants rated each item on a 5-point Likert scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). Scores were computed by reverse scoring all negatively scored items and creating scale scores by averaging items in each personality domain, where higher scores reflected a greater degree of that trait.

Narcissism and Machiavellianism. Narcissism and Machiavellianism were measured using two-subcales from Jonason and Webster's (2010) Dark Triad scale (Appendix O). Items were rated on a 5-point scale from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 5 (*strongly agree*). A total score was computed based on a mean of all items on each subscale. Higher scores reflected stronger tendencies toward the trait.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics and psychometric properties were examined for each of the types of aggression and personality dimensions (Table 8). On average, participants reported engaging in bullying, drama, cyber aggression, relational aggression *sometimes* to *rarely*, while they reported engaging in both proactive and reactive aggressive behaviours between *sometimes* and *often*. Participants also reported that their physical aggression and verbal aggression were, on average, relatively *uncharacteristic* of their

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 8.

Descriptive Statistics of Various Forms of Aggression and Personality Traits

Types of Aggression	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	Cronbach's Alpha
Bullying	1.40	.59	1 to 5	.93
Drama	2.34	.84	1 to 7	.93
Relational Aggression	1.80	.58	1 to 5	.96
Physical Aggression	2.66	1.15	1 to 7	.81
Verbal Aggression	3.02	1.25	1 to 7	.86
Cyber Aggression	1.37	.58	1 to 5	.83
Proactive Aggression	1.20	.33	1 to 3	.93
Reactive Aggression	1.55	.37	1 to 3	.85
Need for Drama	3.06	1.00	1 to 7	.85
Extraversion	3.13	.63	1 to 5	.83
Agreeableness	3.58	.63	1 to 5	.82
Conscientiousness	3.38	.58	1 to 5	.77
Negative Emotionality	3.04	.75	1 to 5	.88
Openness	3.55	.64	1 to 5	.81
Narcissism	2.83	.97	1 to 5	.86
Machiavellianism	2.15	.99	1 to 5	.89

typical behaviours. While 31% of participants reported *never* engaging bullying (based on a mean score of 1), less than 2% of participants reported *never* engaging in drama.

Over 96% of participants engaged in at least *two* or more forms of drama at least *rarely* or *sometimes* in the previous year, nearly 95% of participants engaged in relational aggression, and only 24% of participants bullied others. These results imply that a substantial proportion of college students engage in drama and relational aggression (compared to bullying), even if they engage in these behaviours relatively infrequently.

Correlations

Associations between bullying, drama, and other types of aggression. One association of particular interest was between bullying and drama. These two behaviours

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

were significantly positively correlated ($r = .64, p < .001$). Both bullying and drama were also significantly and positively correlated with all other types of aggression examined, though the strengths of the associations varied (see Table 9).

Bullying was most strongly associated with relational aggression, cyber aggression, and proactive aggression, and was least associated with verbal aggression and reactive aggression. Drama was most strongly associated with relational aggression, verbal aggression, and reactive aggression, and was least associated with cyber aggression and physical aggression. Cyber-bullying and proactive aggression were more strongly associated with bullying than drama ($z = 3.54, p < .001$, and $z = 1.86, p < .05$, respectively), while verbal aggression and reactive aggression were more strongly associated with drama than bullying ($z = 3.25, p < .001$, and $z = 1.92, p < .05$, respectively).

Associations between bullying, drama, and personality. Zero-order correlations were calculated to explore the association between personality traits and engagement in bullying and drama (Table 10). Results were compared to a Bonferroni corrected significance level of $p < .005$ to account for the number of associations tested. Bullying was significantly and negatively correlated with Agreeableness, and significantly positively associated with Need for Drama, Machiavellianism, and Narcissism. Drama was significantly positively related with Neuroticism, Narcissism, and Machiavellianism. Drama was also strongly positively associated with Need for Drama. Greater engagement in drama was significantly associated with lower Agreeableness, lower Conscientiousness, and lower Extraversion. Interestingly,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 9.

Correlations Between Bullying, Drama, and Other Forms of Aggression

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.
1. Bullying	-						
2. Drama	.64**	-					
3. Relational Aggression	.78**	.76**	-				
4. Cyber Aggression	.75**	.48**	.59**	-			
5. Physical Aggression	.55**	.51**	.45**	.29**	-		
6. Verbal Aggression	.41**	.69**	.48**	.22**	.59**	-	
7. Proactive Aggression	.73**	.60**	.60**	.55**	.62**	.42**	-
8. Reactive Aggression	.50**	.66**	.60**	.26**	.66**	.62**	.64**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 10.

Correlations Between Bullying, Drama, and Personality Traits

Variable	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9.
1. Bullying	-								
2. Drama	.64**	-							
3. Need for Drama	.41**	.66**	-						
4. Extraversion	.00	-.21*	-.02	-					
5. Agreeableness	-.45**	-.49**	-.55**	.19*	-				
6. Conscientiousness	-.15	-.36**	-.32**	.29**	.45**	-			
7. Negative Emotionality	.09	.36**	.25**	-.42**	-.30**	-.31**	-		
8. Openness	-.17	-.10	-.15	.23*	.50**	.20*	.06	-	
9. Narcissism	.18*	.31**	.25**	.12	-.26**	-.14	.19*	-.21*	-
10. Machiavellianism	.54**	.54**	.53**	.01	-.51**	-.30**	.19*	-.24**	.46**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Extraversion, Conscientiousness, and Negative Emotionality (Neuroticism) were uniquely associated with engagement in drama, not bullying. The only personality dimensions significantly associated with both drama and bullying were Agreeableness, Need for Drama, Narcissism, and Machiavellianism. Of these associations, only Need for Drama was more strongly associated with drama ($z = 2.81, p < .01$) than with bullying.

Hierarchical Linear Regressions

Next, hierarchical regressions were conducted to further explore these associations. While the zero order correlations provided some interesting findings, the aim was to explore these associations further. First, the aim was to investigate whether one or more types of aggression were useful in explaining engagement in drama. Second, the aim was to explore whether one or more personality dimensions or traits were useful in explaining engagement in bullying or drama. Hierarchical linear regressions were used to test whether these forms of aggression or traits predict behaviour, above and beyond age and gender in order to help develop a profile of who is likely to engage in bullying or drama. In step one, age and gender were entered; step two included the personality dimensions (or forms of aggression, depending on the model tested), in order to understand which traits (or forms of aggression) were uniquely associated with bullying and drama. Semi-partial correlations were examined to identify the proportion of variance in the outcome variables uniquely associated with each predictor. The first model explored which forms of aggression were uniquely useful in explaining engagement in drama. The next two models examined personality dimensions as predictors of bullying and drama.

Drama and other forms of aggression. This first model examined the influence of age, gender, and various forms of aggression in the prediction of drama. The assumptions of linear regression were assessed using pairwise scatterplots, normal P-P plots, and the residual scatterplot; the results indicated the assumptions of linearity, normality, and homoscedasticity were met. Furthermore, there were no issues with multicollinearity (no tolerance values were below .10 or .20, and variance inflation factors (VIF) were all below the suggested cut-off of 10) (Field, 2009).

The overall model explained approximately 75% of the variance in drama (Table 11). Age and gender together were not meaningful predictors of drama in the first step of the model ($R^2 = 2.9\%$). However, the addition of other forms of aggression explained an added 72% of variance. Of the forms of aggression included in the model, only relational aggression and verbal aggression emerged as significant positive predictors of

Table 11.

Hierarchical Linear Regression for Aggression and Drama

Variable	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	Model R^2
<i>Step 1</i>				.03	.03
Age	.01	.03	.02		
Gender	-.30	.16	-.17		
<i>Step 2</i>				.72**	.75**
Age	.01	.01	.05		
Gender	.08	.10	.04		
Relational Aggression	.64	.13	.44**		
Physical Aggression	-.05	.05	-.07		
Verbal Aggression	.28	.05	.42**		
Cyber Aggression	.21	.11	.14		
Proactive Aggression	.05	.25	.02		
Reactive Aggression	.34	.19	.15		
Bullying	-.03	.17	-.02		

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

engagement in drama. Relational aggression uniquely explained nearly 18% of the variance (semi-partial correlation = .42), while verbal aggression uniquely explained an additional 26% (semi-partial correlation = .51).

Bullying and personality traits. The assumptions of linear regression were explored --- the assumptions of linearity and multicollinearity were met (according to pairwise scatterplots, tolerance and VIF values). However, the assumption of normality was violated, which also resulted in heteroscedasticity of the residuals. The responses for bullying were significantly positively skewed, which was expected --- most participants indicate that they engage in the behaviour very infrequently. In the study of aggressive behaviours, extreme scores represent important information about perceptions and behaviours. Given the purpose of the study, and the fact that attempts to normalize the bullying variable failed to lead to a more normal distribution, all subsequent analyses and results were based on untransformed data. Thus, given the violation of some of the assumptions, current findings should be interpreted with caution.

This model explored the predictive value of age, gender and personality on bullying in college students (Table 12), which explained approximately 37% of the variance in bullying. Being male was a significant predictor of bullying in Step 1. On Step 2, the addition of the personality dimensions added an additional 31% of variance explained to the model. Machiavellianism emerged as a significant positive predictor of bullying accounting for 13% of the variance in bullying (semi-partial correlation = .36), while Agreeableness was a significant negative predictor of bullying accounting for 3.5% of the variance in bullying (semi-partial correlation = -.19).

Table 12.

Hierarchical Linear Regression for Personality and Bullying

Variable	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	Model R^2
<i>Step 1</i>				.06*	.06*
Age	-.01	.02	-.04		
Gender	-.32	.11	-.25*		
<i>Step 2</i>				.31**	.37**
Age	-.00	.02	-.01		
Gender	-.14	.10	-.11		
Need for Drama	.08	.06	.13		
Extraversion	.01	.09	.01		
Agreeableness	-.22	.11	-.24*		
Conscientiousness	.07	.09	.07		
Negative Emotionality	-.03	.08	-.04		
Openness	.04	.09	.04		
Narcissism	-.08	.06	-.13		
Machiavellianism	.25	.06	.41**		

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Drama and personality traits. The assumptions of linear regression were assessed and indicated no issues with linearity, normality, heteroscedasticity, or multicollinearity. The final regression model explored the influence of age, gender, and personality on engagement in drama. The model explained approximately 56% of the variance in use of drama (Table 13). Age and gender were not significant predictors of engagement in drama for college students in this sample in the first step of the model. With the addition of the personality dimensions, this explained an added 53% of variance in drama. Need for Drama was a significant positive predictor of drama, uniquely accounting for 19% of the variance in drama (semi-partial correlation = .44), as well as Machiavellianism, which uniquely accounted for an additional 6% of the variance (semi-partial correlation = .24). Extraversion was a significant negative predictor, individually

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 13.

Hierarchical Linear Regression for Personality and Drama

Variable	B	SE B	β	ΔR^2	Model R^2
<i>Step 1</i>				.03	.03
Age	.01	.03	.02		
Gender	-.30	.16	-.17		
<i>Step 2</i>				.53**	.56**
Age	.01	.02	.05		
Gender	-.13	.12	-.07		
Need for Drama	.37	.07	.43**		
Extraversion	-.21	.10	-.16*		
Agreeableness	-.13	.13	-.10		
Conscientiousness	-.08	.11	-.06		
Negative Emotionality	.13	.09	.12		
Openness	.18	.11	.14		
Narcissism	.02	.07	.03		
Machiavellianism	.18	.07	.22*		

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

accounting for 3.6% of the variance in drama (semi-partial correlation = -.19).

Discussion

The aims of this study were twofold: (a) explore the association between drama and other forms of aggression in order to determine whether it is potentially an emergent form of aggression or a new form of social conflict worthy of further exploration; and (b) investigate personality traits as a concurrent correlate of bullying and drama, to better understand the traits of people who engage in these behaviours.

Bullying, Drama and Other Forms of Aggression

The primary aim of Study 3 was to expand our understandings of drama by exploring how drama fits into existing taxonomies of aggression. As anticipated (Hypothesis 1A), greater use of relational aggression was positively associated with

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

greater engagement in drama. Behaviours involved in drama include gossiping, spreading rumours, and talking behind others' backs, which are the most common behaviours in relational forms of bullying and relational aggression (Allen, 2012; Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Nelson et al., 2005). Drama is also motivated by a desire for excitement and pleasure, a common explanation for relational aggression (Pronk & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2010), and like relational aggression, it is focused on the manipulation of or damage to the relationships of others (Archer & Coyne, 2005). Some of the characteristics that make drama unique are that it is highly emotional, involves over-exaggeration and over-reaction, it is motivated by a desire for attention, and unlike bullying and relational aggression, drama does not appear to be focused on intent to cause harm or victimize others.

It was surprising to see that engagement with drama was not significantly predicted by cyber aggression (Hypothesis 1B). Much of the work that has explored drama has examined it in the context of online relationships and networking (e.g., Allen, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Regan & Sweet, 2015). Shepherd and Levy Paluck (2015) state that drama need not be restricted to online settings and may also take place in face-to-face social interactions as well. In fact, college students described school settings as a more central feature of drama, than online settings.

The results indicated partial support for the final hypotheses: greater engagement in drama was associated with greater perpetration of bullying (Hypothesis 1C). However, when all forms of aggression were considered, bullying was not a significant predictor of drama. What these findings suggest is that drama does fit in the taxonomy of aggression, though it seems to be most closely linked to relational and verbal forms of aggression.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

An interesting finding that was not expected was that verbal aggression was significantly positively associated with drama, and uniquely explained the most variance in engagement in drama compared to the other forms of aggression. The measure used to assess verbal aggression included items such as, “I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them”, “My friends say that I’m somewhat argumentative”, and “When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them”. These examples of verbal aggression emerged as common characteristics of drama described by college students in Studies 1 and 2 (e.g., disagreements, over-sharing, and arguments). Furthermore, these findings support Shepherd and Levy Paluck’s (2015) definition of drama as *talking behind the backs of other students or to their faces in a mean or rude way*. Thus, it seems that there is considerable overlap between drama and verbally aggressive behaviours, and a greater verbal component to drama than expected based on preliminary research.

In sum, although bullying was not a significant predictor of drama, both bullying and drama were associated with relational aggression, suggesting that the link between bullying and drama may be that both share *some* characteristics or features of relational aggression.

Bullying and Personality

The second aim of Study 3 was to provide a better understanding of the types of people who engage in bullying and drama by investigating the association between personality traits and engagement in bullying and drama. Consistent with past findings (Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias, 2015), individuals who scored lower on Agreeableness tended to report greater perpetration of bullying (Hypothesis 2A). As hypothesized (Hypothesis 2A), bullying was also significantly positively correlated with

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Machiavellianism, which supports previous research (Andreou, 2004; Baughman et al., 2012; Peeters et al., 2010; Sutton & Keogh, 2000; van Geel et al., 2017). Although considerable research suggests that bullies tend to be low on Conscientiousness (e.g., Book et al., 2012; Mitsopoulou & Giovazolias, 2015; Plopa et al., 2017), the evidence did not support this hypothesis. Finally, although Need for Drama was significantly positively associated with bullying, when all the traits were considered together in the regression analyses, Need for Drama was not a meaningful predictor of bullying.

In sum, the results suggest that there is *some* continuity in the traits that are associated with bullying across various stages of development. Although little research has explored the role of personality traits in the use of bullying among college students, many of the findings supported previous research. Specifically, perpetration of bullying in college is more likely among individuals lacking in compassion and respect for others (low Agreeableness), and those who are deceitful, manipulative, and exploitative (Machiavellianism).

Drama and Personality

While researchers have previously investigated the role of personality traits in the prediction of bullying, this study was the first to explore the traits of those who engage in drama. Drama has been characterized by excessive emotionality and over-reaction (Allen, 2012; 2015), traits that are associated with greater Neuroticism or Negative Emotionality. Although Neuroticism was positively correlated with engagement in drama, contrary to what was expected (Hypothesis 2B), Neuroticism did not meaningfully predict engagement in drama when all of the traits were considered together.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Also contrary to what was anticipated (Hypothesis 2C), *lower* Extraversion predicted engagement in drama. Earlier findings suggested that perpetrating drama might be motivated by a desire for attention from others (see Study 1 and Study 2; e.g., Allen, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2014). Given that extraverted individuals thrive in social interactions and often enjoy or are comfortable being the center of attention, this suggested that Extraversion might influence engagement in drama. However, surprisingly the inverse relationship was found. These findings suggest that engagement in drama is more strongly associated with individuals who are highly introspective and reserved. Perhaps, more reserved individuals choose drama as their means of social conflict because it is viewed as a normative, less harmful, and more *covert* form of “aggression”. Alternatively, individuals who engage in drama more frequently may not view themselves as outgoing and gregarious because they keep to a tight group of social contacts. Further research should explore these findings in more detail.

Similar to bullying, Machiavellianism was a significant positive predictor of drama (confirming Hypothesis 2D). Although previous conceptualizations of drama have not described drama in terms of lies and manipulation (e.g., Allen, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Regan & Sweet, 2015; Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015), lying and manipulation were reported by college students in the first two studies as central features or characteristics of drama.

Finally, Need for Drama significantly predicted engagement in drama. Recall that individuals high on this trait often like to get people worked up, do things to get a reaction, or “stir the pot” so to speak. Although NFD was highly correlated with drama, the association was not strong enough to suggest they are identical constructs; a point

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

supported by the fact NFD was not the only predictor of drama. While these traits relate to the characteristics of a person who is likely to engage in drama, they are not synonymous with the way drama has been conceptualized in this research. Thus, while NFD is useful in describing the type of people who engage in drama, the conceptualization of drama emerging from preliminary research and the initial studies (Study 1 and Study 2) is much more complex. In sum, the findings support the assertion that drama is indeed a form of aggression or interpersonal conflict, and not just a dimension of personality.

As hypothesized (Hypothesis 3A), drama and bullying were both associated with Machiavellianism. Machiavellianism was the only personality trait to significantly predict engagement in both drama and bullying, though it accounted for a larger proportion of variance in bullying. This adds credence to the notion that bullying often involves the calculated manipulation of others as means of achieving dominance or some personal goal (see Salmivalli, 2010; Sutton & Keogh, 2000; Volk et al., 2012), and suggests that this may also motivate engagement in drama.

The present results indicate that while several traits might uniquely contribute to different forms of aggression, Machiavellianism might be one of the strongest indicators of various types of aggression and social conflict. Beyond that, it seems that the personality profiles of those who engage in drama and those who engage in bullying remain distinct. Specifically, bullies are likely to be low on Agreeableness, while those who engage in drama are likely have a high need for drama, though they tend to be low on Extraversion. What is most notable is that personality traits explained a substantial proportion of the variance in the aggressive behaviours of college students. The

significant personality traits explained nearly 20% of the variance in bullying, and nearly 30% of the variance in drama. This confirms the importance of exploring personality traits in understanding both bullying and drama.

Implications and Conclusion

The findings have potential implications for researchers and practitioners. The present results indicate that while several traits might uniquely contribute to different forms of aggression, Machiavellianism might be one of the strongest indicators of various types of aggression and social conflict. Beyond that, it seems that the personality profiles of those who engage in drama and those who engage in bullying remain distinct. Targeted interventions could be developed to address maladaptive traits, like low Agreeableness or Machiavellianism. For example, cognitive-behavioural interventions targeting risky personality traits have been found to have beneficial effects on maladaptive behaviours in youth. For example, Conrod et al. (2000; 2006) designed personality-matched interventions designed to target specific personality traits (e.g., anxiety sensitivity, hopelessness, and sensation seeking) known to be risk factors for substance-related behaviours. These personality-matched interventions were associated with greater reductions in substance-dependence symptoms, compared to controls, up to 4 months post-intervention. Thus, the findings from this research could help identify individuals with personality traits that put them at the greatest risk for engaging in peer victimization like drama and bullying, and develop targeted interventions to prevent or reduce the risks of perpetrating in the future.

In conclusion, the study has added to the existing literature in a number of ways. The research indicates that drama is highly correlated with several forms of aggression,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

most notably relational and verbal aggression, and is a form of aggression or interpersonal conflict worthy of future research. Further, while more research has explored the role of personality in bullying, this study was the first exploration of the personality profiles of those who perpetrate drama. The findings indicated that personality traits, specifically Need for Drama and Machiavellianism, are strong predictors of engagement in drama among college students. The findings from the present study meaningfully contribute to the slowly growing body of research on drama as a new unique form of aggression, and shed light on the types of individuals who more likely to engage in this behaviour.

Study 4: Exploring the Value of the Prototype Willingness Model in Understanding Bullying and Drama

The research that follows examines the prototype willingness model (PWM) as a theoretical explanation for what motivates individuals to engage in aggressive or antisocial behaviours. The prototype willingness model is built on the idea that perceptions of prototypical actions or behaviours, *or* perceptions of prototypical actors or individuals who typically engage in those behaviours, can actually predict behaviour (Gerrard, Gibbons, Houlihan, Stock, & Pomery, 2008; Gerrard et al., 2005; Gibbons et al., 1998). The use of the term *prototype* refers to a different concept in the previous research than in the present study. In Studies 1 and 2, I refer to the *constructs* of drama and bullying as having a *prototype structure*, insofar that they are identified based on more or less characteristic features, elements, or criteria. In the present study, prototypes refer to prototypical *images* or perceptions of prototypical *people* who engage in aggression.

Study 4 aims to address the question of whether drama and bullying can be predicted based on attitudes, beliefs, and perceptions related to bullying and drama. Prior to explaining the prototype willingness model, it is important to first address some theoretical perspectives of behaviour and how these have been applied to the understanding of aggressive behaviours. I will discuss how the prototype willingness model can be used to extend and build upon what is already known about these behaviours, and explore how social-cognitive models, such as the PWM, can help us better understand drama as a form of aggression or interpersonal conflict.

Reasoned and Socially Reactive Theories of Behaviour

For a long time, researchers have viewed behaviour as primarily the result of planned and deliberative processes. Reasoned decision-making models include the theory of reasoned action (TRA; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980, 2005) and the theory of planned behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991), which focus on the idea that decision-making involves considering behavioural options and anticipating the associated risks or consequences. These theoretical frameworks are based on several determinants --- attitudes, subjective norms, and opportunities (or available resources) exerting their effects on behaviour through intentions. According to these theories, attitudes toward behaviour and subjective norms of the behaviour both influence behavioural intentions, which in turn impact behaviour.

Although the theory of planned behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980) has been extensively explored in social psychology and health research, it has rarely been applied to developmental aggression research. Rational (reasoned) and intentional explanations for cyberbullying and workplace bullying have been explored (e.g., Doane, Pearson, & Kelley, 2014; Hierman & Walrave, 2012; Ma, Wang, & Chien, 2017; Pabian & Vandebosch, 2014), though research on the intentional processes involved in traditional bullying has been somewhat limited. Only two articles to date have referenced both bullying and the theory of planned behaviour (i.e., Hawley & Williford, 2015; Heirman & Walrave, 2012).

More recently, there has been a growing interest in exploring theoretical perspectives that acknowledge unplanned or more spontaneous factors involved in behavioural decision-making. These perspectives recognize that the theory of reasoned

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

action cannot predict behaviours that are reactive or impulsive. For example, sometimes individuals find themselves in situations that facilitate engagement in certain behaviours. In the case of aggression, when opportunities for aggression present themselves, it might not necessarily be *intentions* that predict the likelihood of engaging in aggressive or anti-social behaviour, but more so *willingness* to engage in aggression. In other words, *willingness* to engage in behaviour is more of a *socially reactive* response to opportunities to act aggressively. Behavioural willingness can result from faulty cognitive reasoning, experiences with others who act aggressively, or when situations are conducive to aggressive acts. In these situations, implicit influences such as situational opportunity or reactivity influence behaviour.

The reasoned (intentional) and socially reactive (willingness) perspectives of behaviour may seem divergent, but some theories incorporate elements of the two. These are often called dual-processing theories (e.g., brain functions and behaviour theory, Carver & White, 1994; cognitive-experiential self theory, Epstein, 1985; fuzzy-trace theory, Reyna & Ellis, 1994). Dual processing models propose that cognition, decision-making, and behaviour is the result of two processes: one mode of processing and decision-making is based on deliberative reasoning, and the other mode is more experiential and affective. Simply put, one process is reason based, and one is socially reactive.

Most research on the theoretical explanations for bullying and aggression assumes that these behaviours are the result of proactive, planned, and deliberative processes, rather than more automatic or unconscious processes (e.g., Crick & Dodge, 1996; Pelligrini & Long, 2002; Price & Dodge, 1989). Certainly, many researcher

conceptualizations of bullying are based on definitions that require intentionality (Farrington, 1993; Olweus, 1993; Rigby, 2002; Smith & Sharp, 1994). However, according to research, few youth perceive bullying to involve intent to harm (Cuadrado-Gordillo, 2012; Everett & Price, 1995; Guerin & Hennessey, 2002; Madsen, 1996; Naylor et al., 2006; Vaillancourt et al., 2008), and researchers are starting to consider that there may be other goals that motivate bullying, not just intent (Salmivalli & Nieminen, 2002). Thus, there is a need for aggression researchers to consider more comprehensive models of decision making in aggressive behaviour; models that consider both intentional (explicit) motives as well as non-intentional (implicit) motives for the behaviour. A noteworthy dual processing theory that combines implicit and explicit motives for behaviour is the prototype willingness model (PWM; Gerrard et al., 2008).

The Prototype Willingness Model of Adolescent Risk Behaviour

The prototype willingness model (PWM) is a dual-processing model that has been used to explain decision-making in risky health behaviours, particularly among adolescents and young adults, where other rational behaviour theories have fallen short (Gibbons et al., 1998). The PWM attempts to maximize the predictive ability of theories of reasoned action and planned behaviour by incorporating a heuristic (or experiential) approach to behavioural decision-making. The prototype-willingness model proposes that many individuals do not always intend to engage in risky behaviours, but might be willing to do so if the opportunity arises or circumstances are conducive to it.

The PWM is based on several assumptions: (1) behaviours can be volitional, but may not be rational or intentional; (2) risk behaviours are often social events for adolescents (they rarely engage in these behaviours alone), and (3) these behaviours are

associated with a clear image or perception of the prototypical person who engages in the behaviour because of their social nature. Two hypothesized paths to risk behaviour are proposed in the prototype willingness model (Figure 2), with a route to intention (reasoned path) and one to willingness (socially reactive path).

Figure 2. *The Prototype Willingness Model* (Gerrard et al., 2008)

Behavioural expectations or intent. The first path of the PWM, the *reasoned path*, is based on expectancy-value theories of behaviour, such as the theory of reasoned action (TRA; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980), and the theory of planned behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991) mentioned previously. The rationale behind the reasoned path is that decisions to engage in certain behaviour are *intentional*, meaning that they are based on an analytical process involving consideration of behavioural options, consequences, and possible outcomes, and rational decisions about how to behave (Gibbons et al., 1998). In this model, *behavioural expectation* or *intent* is defined as an individual's perceived likelihood of actually performing behaviour.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

According to the PWM, behavioural intent is a function of an individual's attitudes and norms. Norms, or *subjective norms*, refer to perceptions of what others are doing, or what one perceives is common or normal among others. *Attitudes* refer to the favourability of behaving in a certain way (with more positive attitudes associated with greater likelihood of behaving in that way).

Statistical tests of the theory of reasoned action (TRA) and theory of planned behaviour (TPB) have confirmed the hypothesized theoretical relationships between attitudes, norms, intent, and behaviour. Several meta-analytic studies of the reasoned path of the PWM (TRA), across a wide range of contexts, have found that attitudes toward behaviour and subjective norms account for a large amount (66% to 78%) of the variance in intent, and that intent and behaviour are moderately to strongly correlated ($r = .45$ to $.68$; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1973; Albarracín, Johnson, Fishbein, & Muellerleile, 2001; Sheppard, Hartwick, & Warshaw, 1988; van den Putte, 1991). Though Ajzen and Fishbein (1973) suggest that attitudes and norms are comparable in terms of relative importance on behavioural intention, attitudes are generally a stronger predictor of behavioural intentions than norms (Ajzen, 1991; Albarracin et al., 2001; Armitage & Conner, 2001; Godin & Kok, 1996; O'Keefe, 2002; Hierman & Walrave, 2012; van den Putte, 1991; Zint, 2002). Limited research has explored the value of the TPB or TRA in the study of aggression, yet studies do suggest that intent to engage in aggression can be a significant predictor of aggressive behaviours, like cyberbullying (e.g., Pabian & Vandebosch, 2014).

Behavioural willingness. The second path, *social reaction*, is based on one's willingness to engage in risky or negative behaviour. The underlying premise of this

pathway is that it involves little pre-meditation and avoidance of potential negative outcomes (Gibbons, Gerrard, Ouellette, & Burzette, 1998), therefore an individual might engage in behaviour that they did not intend to or previously consider. In fact, *behavioural willingness* is defined as openness to risk opportunities, or the likelihood of reacting or behaving in a certain way given the right circumstances (Gerrard et al., 2005). Like behavioural intent, willingness is also influenced by attitudes, and subjective norms. However, willingness is also associated with *prototypical images*. Prototypical images are perceptions of what is typical of behaviour, or the type of person who typically engages in that behaviour. Images can be positive (e.g., of a philanthropist) or negative (e.g., an alcoholic). In general, individuals are less willing to engage in behaviour if they have a less favourable prototype images or perceptions of the behaviour or prototypical person who engages in the behaviour (Gibbons, Houlihan, & Gerrard, 2009).

The socially reactive pathway also proposes that willingness predicts behavioural intention. This path reflects the idea that, over time, some decision-making shifts from opportunistic decision-making to planned and intentional (reasoned) decision-making with both age and experience. The association between intent and behaviour has been shown to be relatively weak in adolescence; however, the influence of intentions on behaviour tends to increase with age (e.g., Albarracin et al., 2001; Branley & Covey, 2018). In other words, decision-making generally shifts from socially reactive processes to reasoned ones over time. Also, willingness may be a stronger predictor of behaviour when individuals have little experience with that behaviour, though intentions play a greater role in predicting behaviour as engagement in the behaviour becomes more habitual (e.g., Gibbons et al., 2009; Pomery, Gibbons, Reis-Bergan, & Gerrard, 2009).

The theoretical associations between attitudes, norms, social images, and behavioural willingness have been tested in a variety of contexts. Investigations into this path of the PWM across a wide range of contexts have found that attitudes toward behaviour, subjective norms, and prototype favourability account for a large amount of the variance (40 to 41%) in willingness (Gerrard, Gibbons, Reis-Bergan, Trudeau, Vane Lune, & Buunk, 2002; Gibbons et al., 1998). Furthermore, willingness and behaviour have been found to be moderately to strongly correlated ($r = .62$ to $.69$; Gibbons et al., 1998). In terms of the relative importance of the predictors of behavioural willingness, like the reasoned path, attitudes seem to be the strongest predictor of behavioural willingness, followed by norms, and prototype favourability (Gerrard et al., 2002; Gibbons et al., 1998). Furthermore, tests of the PWM suggest that willingness may be a stronger predictor of behaviour than behavioural intention, depending on age and experience with the behaviour (e.g., Elliott, McCartan, Brewster, Coyle, Emerson, & Gibson, 2017; Gibbons et al., 2009), though both concurrently predict later behaviour.

Applicability of the Prototype Willingness Model

The prototype willingness model of behaviour has been used to examine a wide range of health behaviours including risky sexual behaviours and pregnancy (Gibbons et al., 1998), smoking (Gerrard et al., 2005), alcohol use (Davies, Paltoglou, & Foxcroft, 2017; Todd & Mullan, 2011), eating behaviours (Dohnke, Steinhilber, & Fuchs, 2015), physical activity (Frater, Kuijer, & Kingham, 2017), speeding (Elliott et al., 2017), and drinking and driving (Rivis, Abraham, & Snook, 2011). Across all these studies the three antecedents (norms, attitudes, prototype images) have been found to significantly predict intent and willingness to behave, among adolescents. In other words, the model has been

tested in many contexts and across a variety of different areas of health and risk and seems to be highly applicable to a range of behaviours.

Though the PWM has traditionally been applied to understanding youth engagement in health-risk behaviours, more recently it has been applied to understanding risky *social* behaviours including sexting (Walrave, Ponnet, Van Ouytsel, Van Gool, Heirman, & Verbeek, 2015), and sharing information on social media (Van Gool, Van Ouytsel, Ponnet, & Walrave, 2015), as well as non-risky social behaviours including altruism (Hyde & White, 2009; 2010). In one notable study, Branley and Covey (2018) applied the prototype willingness model to the study of risky online behaviours, including cyberbullying. They found that the reactive pathway, including prototype favourability, was a strong predictor of engaging in risky behaviours and social interactions online. Other research has also explored *elements* of the PWM (i.e., attitudes, social norms, and prototype favourability, intent) in the study of cyberbullying (Barkoukis, Lazuras, Ourda, & Tsorbatzoudis, 2016; Pabian & Vandebosch, 2014), suggesting that the model could also be effective for understanding other forms of aggression as well.

Given the social nature of bullying and drama, insofar as these behaviours rarely occur in social isolation, and the fact that these behaviours are associated with clear social images, it was expected that the prototype willingness model would provide predictive utility in the explanation of aggressive behaviours, specifically bullying and drama. Study 4 provided the first examination of involvement in bullying and use of drama in social relationships from the perspective of the prototype willingness model, expanding on past work that has suggested that the factors involved in the PWM are associated with aggressive behaviour.

Norms, Attitudes and Social Images in Aggression

Though not explicitly guided by the prototype willingness model, research has found a relationship between the antecedent factors of the PWM (i.e., norms, attitudes, and social images), and bullying or aggressive behaviours. The reasoned path of the PWM certainly has clear connections to how researchers have thought about bullying in the past with respect to attitudes and beliefs in support of bullying (Huesmann & Guerra, 1997; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004), as well as the proactive and intentional nature of bullying (Crick & Dodge, 1999; Hawley, Card, & Little, 2007; Pelligrini & Long, 2002; Price & Dodge, 1989). In fact, the focus of some intervention and prevention programs targeting aggression in youth has been changing subjective norms and attitudes (e.g., Powell & Hawkins, 1996).

The socially reactive path of the PWM, and the addition of social images and behavioural willingness, is a relatively novel addition to the developmental aggression literature. Theoretical perspectives on the heuristic or affective factors involved in bullying have been explored less frequently than rational or intentional factors such as attitudes and norms. This is not surprising given most research on the theoretical explanations for bullying and aggression assumes that these behaviours are the result of proactive, planned, and deliberative processes, rather than more automatic or unconscious processes (e.g., Crick & Dodge, 1999; Hawley, Johnson, Mize, & McNamara, 2007; Pelligrini & Long, 2002; Price & Dodge, 1989). What follows is a review of how these precursors of the prototype willingness model have been associated with bullying and other forms of aggression.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Norms. An antecedent factor that is important in the prediction of behaviour is the perception of how normative the behaviour is among significant others (Fishbein & Ajzen, 1975). Norms, or *subjective norms*, refer to perceptions of what others are doing, or what one perceives is common, acceptable, or normal among others.

Normative beliefs about the acceptability of aggressive behaviours develop through social influences: observations of others being aggressive, experience engaging in aggressive behaviours, and direct tuition of aggressive behaviours from peers, parents, and others (Cialdini & Goldstein, 2004; Huesmann & Guerra, 1997). The more exposure an individual has to aggression through these means, the stronger his or her approval of aggression (normative beliefs) is likely to be. In general, younger children tend to have less stable normative beliefs than older children and adolescents. Normative beliefs regarding aggression become stronger with the increase in aggressive tendencies seen during the elementary school years (Crick, Bigbee, & Howes, 1996; Egan, Monson, & Perry, 1998; Henry et al., 2000; Huesmann & Guerra, 1997). They also tend to become more crystallized in adolescence and thus more resistant to change. Despite their predictive value, normative beliefs have been found to be only weakly or moderately associated with aggressive behaviour ($r = .11$ to $.36$) (e.g., Crick, Bigbee, & Howes, 1996; Henry et al., 2000; Huesmann & Guerra, 1997; Nelson et al., 2008; Werner & Hill, 2010; Werner & Nixon, 2005) across a range of types of aggression (e.g., verbal, relational, physical, overt).

Few studies have explored the association between subjective norms and bullying specifically. William and Guerra (2007) explored the association between norms and bullying in a large sample of elementary and high school students. Like studies of

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

aggression, the relationship between norms and behaviour was consistent across a range of bullying behaviours (i.e., verbal, physical, and cyber). Higher reported use of a variety of forms of bullying was significantly associated with stronger normative beliefs approving of bullying. These findings were later replicated in a follow-up longitudinal study (Gendron, Williams, & Guerra, 2011) where normative approval of bullying significantly predicted perpetration of bullying one year later.

Though research on the role of norms in bullying is scant, more studies have explored the association between subjective norms and relational aggression. Werner and colleagues (2005, 2010) examined the relationship between normative beliefs and perpetration of relational aggression among children and youth. Beliefs about the normality of relational aggression significantly predicted self-reported engagement in relationally aggressive behaviours. Subjective norms also predicted engagement in relational aggression one year later, suggesting that norms can predict future behaviour. Other researchers (i.e., Bailey & Ostrov, 2008; Linder, Werner, & Lyle, 2010; Nelson et al., 2008) have replicated these results in emerging adult samples. More positive beliefs about aggression (normative beliefs more accepting of these behaviours) have been associated with increased reports of engagement in relational aggression among emerging adults. Relational aggression has also been explored in the context of young adults' romantic relationships. Goldstein, Chesir-Teran, and McFaul (2008) found that 18 to 25 year olds who reported the greatest perpetration of relational aggression in their romantic relationships also believed that this type of aggression was most acceptable (normative).

Given the association between drama and relational aggression, normative beliefs likely also play a role in the use of drama. Research by Allen (2012, 2013) has suggests

that drama might be a commonly accepted aspect of students' social interactions at school. However, in a notable study by Shepherd and Levy Paluck (2015) exploring normative influences on drama as a form of peer conflict and harassment in high school, students did not support the use of drama-related behaviours in their school. Given the strong association between drama and relational aggression (Study 3), it seems likely that normative beliefs in support of drama would be associated with increased engagement in this behaviour. Yet, normative beliefs have yet to be explored in the context of drama as a form of aggression.

Attitudes. In the context of this study, *attitudes* refer to the favourability of behaving in a certain way. Attitudes have a basis in beliefs, but are also comprised of emotional and behavioural components (Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004). While norms refer to perceptions of what others are doing, or what one perceives is common or normal among others, attitudes tend to be a more general construct than normative beliefs involving more broad evaluations of a person, group, or issue. Attitudes toward behaviour are influenced by an individual's behavioural or normative beliefs, but also the norms and beliefs of the social or peer group (Ojala & Nesdale, 2004). Attitudes form when normative beliefs about certain behaviours are associated with specific affective, normative, or moral outcomes (Ajzen, 1991). For example, bullying might be a means of achieving power, social status, or a feeling of excitement, but it can also result in guilt, disapproval by peers or adults, or punishment from others. Unlike subjective norms regarding what is normal behaviour among others, attitudes refer to the *affective* perceptions of anticipated behavioural outcomes.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Research suggests that attitudes toward aggression and involvement in aggressive behaviours are concurrently associated (Boulton, Bucci, & Hawker, 1999; Hawley & Williford, 2015; Huesmann & Guerra, 1997; Rigby & Slee, 1991; Swearer & Cary, 2003). Interestingly, although most children condemn the use of bullying, or have a negative attitude toward bullying (Andreou, Vlachou, & Didaskalou, 2005; Boulton et al., 1999; Boulton et al., 2002; Menesini et al., 1997; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004; Whitney & Smith, 1993), this is not always reflected in their actual behaviours. In other words, although some children view bullying negatively they might still bully others. In fact, the association between attitudes and behaviour is generally low to modest ($r = .10$ to $.38$; e.g., Augoustinos & Walker, 1995; Boulton et al., 1999; Boulton et al., 2002; Salmivalli & Voeten, 2004).

A few studies have explored the attitudes of those who engage in bullying. Among elementary and high school students, having greater pro-bullying attitudes was associated with greater involvement in bullying (Andreou et al., 2005; Wiklund, Ruchkin, Koposov, & af Klinteberg, 2014). Boulton, Bucci, and Hawker (1999) examined bullying attitudes in a sample of 210 adolescents (ages 13 and 15). Students with the weakest anti-bullying attitudes tended to be most frequently nominated by their peers as bullies. A similar follow-up study found that while most youth express support for victims and endorse anti-bullying attitudes, those with the most favourable attitudes reported higher frequencies of bullying others (Boulton, Trueman, & Flemington, 2002).

What is currently missing is research on the attitudes of those who engage in more covert or indirect forms of aggression. Attitudes have not been explicitly studied in the context of drama. Preliminary research suggests that youth may have quite positive

attitudes toward drama, particularly when compared to attitudes regarding bullying. For example, in a study by boyd (2009) youth were less inclined to refer to current notions and operationalizations of the term “bullying” when describing peer conflict, yet were quite willing to discuss similar behaviours they described as “drama”. Similarly, Miller (2016) found that more than half of participants argued that they did not participate in bullying, and instead opted to refer to their experiences as drama. According to Allen (2012, 2013), when students were asked to discuss bullying in their school, they would either indicate that there was no bullying at their school, were silent, or provided only limited feedback. In contrast, when asked about drama in their school, youth were enthusiastic to talk about this, and discussed it as a central component of the social environment at their school. Given the willingness of students to report engagement in drama, attitudes regarding the acceptability of drama may be quite positive. Furthermore, these positive attitudes might be a good predictor of future engagement in drama.

Prototype images. The social reaction pathway of the PWM is mainly focused on the role of prototypical images. In this model, *prototypical images* refer to perceptions and favourability of the type of person who typically engages in behaviour. The premise of the social prototype is that individuals generally have an image of the type of people who typically engage in behaviours (e.g., the types of people who typically smoke cigarettes). In relation to the present study, this reflects the idea that individuals generally have a well-defined perception of the typical person who is aggressive or engages in bullying (or drama), and their favourability of this image is likely to influence their own aggressive behaviours.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Public notions and portrayals generally stereotype bullies as boorish, socially maladjusted, and marginalized members of the peer group (Vaillancourt, Hymel, & McDougall, 2003). However, peer aggression research suggests that these public stereotypes may be inaccurate among children and youth. In fact, research examining children and youth perceptions of those who bully indicates that peers tend to view bullies quite favourably. Peers have reported that bullies are more socially skilled relative to others (Bjorkqvist et al., 2001; Collins & Bell, 1996; Sutton et al., 1999), have larger friendship groups and more reciprocated friendships (Huttunen, Salmivalli, & Lagerspetz, 1996; Mouttapa, Valente, Gallaher, Rohrbach, & Unger, 2004), hold higher social status and popularity in social networks (Caravita, Di Blasio, & Salmivalli, 2009; Juvonen, Graham, & Schuster, 2003; Oliver, Hoover, & Hazler, 1994; Pellegrini, Bartini, & Brooks, 1999), and tend to be nearly as well-liked and popular as well-adjusted peers (Espelage & Holt, 2001; Olweus, 1978; Thunfors & Cornell, 2008). Collectively, in terms of prototype favourability, these findings suggest that views of bullies might not be fully negative. When perceptions of prototypical bullies are positive or favourable, this can directly influence one's likelihood or willingness to bully others (Carroll, Baglioni, Houghton, & Bramston, 1999; Nathan, Houghton, Tan, & Carroll, 2011).

In a study by Vaillancourt and colleagues (2003), peers generally disliked bullies; however, bullies were also viewed as popular and socially powerful (see also Rodkin & Berger, 2008). This suggests that social images of prototypically aggressive individuals might be simultaneously positive and negative. Some peers may dislike bullies and other aggressive youth (particularly peers who are targets of bullying), but these individuals may also be popular, esteemed, and accepted among other peers (Farmer, Estell, Bishop,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

O'Neal, & Cairns, 2003; Thunfors & Cornell, 2008). Despite having unfavourable perceptions of peers who bully others, children and youth might still hold positive images of them as brave, strong, and confident (Olweus, 1978).

According to PWM research, more favourable images of prototypical individuals who engage in risky or negative behaviours are associated with greater willingness to engage in those behaviours (e.g., Gerrard et al., 2002; Gibbons & Gerrard, 1995; Gibbons, Gerrard, & Lane, 2003), particularly if the circumstances are conducive to risky behaviours. The model assumes that social factors, such as prototypical images of others, correlate with attitudes and beliefs regarding social behaviours. Thus, having more positive perceptions of prototypical individuals who bullying or engage in drama could influence the likelihood and willingness to engage in these behaviours. For example, in the case of bullying, if the prototypical image of a bully is someone who is powerful and popular, then this might be an appealing image to someone, and they might be more willing to engage in bullying themselves.

Purpose and Hypotheses

The aim of Study 4 was to examine the prototype willingness model (PWM) as a theoretical explanation for what motivates individuals to engage in aggression, and address the question of whether drama and bullying can be predicted by both reasoned and socially reactive social-cognitive factors.

The hypotheses and analytic methods were based on the theoretical model and statistical approaches used by Gibbons et al. (1998) to assess adolescents' engagement in risky behaviours. The following associations were hypothesized: (a) more positive attitudes towards bullying or engaging in drama would be associated with greater intent

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

and willingness to engage in these behaviours (Hypothesis 1); (b) more favourable subjective norms for engaging in bullying or drama would be associated with greater intent *and* willingness to perpetrate these behaviours (Hypothesis 2); (c) greater intent to act aggressively would be associated with higher engagement in bullying/drama (Hypothesis 3); (d) greater willingness to engage in bullying or drama would be associated with greater intent to bully others or engage in drama (Hypothesis 4); (e) greater willingness to engage in bullying or drama would be associated with higher engagement in these behaviours (Hypothesis 5); and (f) more positive images of prototypical bullies or social dramatists would be associated with greater willingness to bully others or engage in drama (Hypothesis 6).

Method

Participants

A total of 298 first- and second- year undergraduate students in psychology were recruited to take part in this study from a Canadian university in Ontario. Of these, 261 participants were retained for the analyses ($M_{\text{age}} = 19.12$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 1.71$; range = 17 to 28; 70% female). In terms of demographics, 60% of participants were Caucasian (18% Asian, 12% African American, 3% Hispanic, 6% Other), though the sample was quite diverse in socioeconomic status ($M_{\text{SES}} = 59.97$, $SD = 17.79$, range 0 to 100 based on self-report measure of socioeconomic status).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from undergraduate courses and completed surveys online. All surveys were self-report format and responses were anonymous. No identifying information was collected from participants aside from the demographic

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

information described below. Students were compensated with course credit for their participation.

Materials

Using self-report questionnaires, participants were asked about: (a) current bullying of others or use of drama; (b) *prototypes* of bullies and those who engage in drama; (c) *attitudes* and *beliefs* about bullying others and creating drama; (d) *subjective norms* regarding their perceptions of the prevalence of drama and bullying among their close friends and among their peers, as well as perceptions of friends' and peers' reactions to their potential use of these behaviours; (e) *intent* or expectation to bully others or create drama in the future; and (f) *willingness* to bully others or create drama if the opportunity arose.

Demographic information. First, participants completed a survey on age, gender, ethnicity and socioeconomic status (Appendix A). This data was collected in order to explore the diversity of the sample, though there were no planned analyses or hypotheses related to these variables.

Engagement in bullying and drama. Participants reported current use of bullying and drama behaviours. The Use of Bullying or Drama measure from Study 2 was used (Appendix E). Questions consisted of 2 items, "How often do you typically bully others?", and "How often do you create drama?", as well as 10 items derived from the most frequently reported behaviours related to drama and bullying listed in Study 1. Participants responded to each question by rating how often they engaged in these behaviours on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*everyday*). Mean scores were computed for

current use of bullying and drama, with higher scores reflecting greater engagement in these behaviours.

Prototypical images. Participants were asked to think of a prototypical individual who engages in bullying (or drama), as defined by the traits that one associates with the typical person who engages in that type of behavior. This measure was directly adapted from the measures used by PWM researchers in previous studies of the model (e.g., Gibbons & Gerrard, 1997). Participants were asked to “think about the type of person your age who bullies others frequently”, and then indicate how well a list of adjectives described their image of the prototypical individual (Appendix P). The same measure was used to examine prototypes of those who use drama (Appendix Q). The adjectives used were derived from work by Gibbons, et al. (1998), and Gerrard et al. (2002) on perceptions of adolescents who engage in risk behaviours. These adjectives were: intelligent/smart, confused, dull/boring, popular, immature, considerate, self-confident, independent, self-centered, careless, unattractive, and cool/sophisticated. Responses were made from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*) regarding how well these adjectives characterized prototypical individuals. Negative items were reverse scored and mean scores were computed for bullying and drama prototype images, with higher scores reflecting more favourable or positive images.

Subjective norms. Subjective norms were examined using a modified version of the Normative Beliefs About Aggression Scale (NOBAGS) (Huesmann & Guerra, 1997). The original measure was modified to examine the most frequently reported forms of bullying and drama reported by participants in Study 1 and also used items from the Engagement in Antisocial Behaviours measure described above (Appendix R). The

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

retaliation subscale was removed for the purposes of this study. Participants were asked to report their acceptability of certain behaviours on a 4-point scale from 1 (*it's really wrong*) to 4 (*it's perfectly OK*). An example of an item on the measure was, "In general, it is OK to lie to others". Negatively worded items were reverse scored, and total scores were computed based on a mean of all 6 items, with higher scores reflecting greater acceptance about the normality of bullying and drama. Previous work with the NOBAGS measure has demonstrated an internal consistency of .80 (Huesmann & Guerra, 1997).

Bullying and drama attitudes. Attitudes and beliefs about bullying others or creating drama was measured using the attitudes measure of the Bully Survey (Swearer, 2005; Swearer, Turner, Givens, & Pollack, 2008). The Bullying Attitudinal Scale is one of four parts of the Bully Survey. This is a 14-item measure that assessed attitudes towards bullying (Appendix S). The scale was reduced to 8 items, removing items that would be relevant to children only, or school settings. Items such as, "Most people who get bullied ask for it" were scored on a 5-point Likert-type scale from 1 (*totally false*) to 5 (*totally true*). Negatively worded items were reversed, and mean scores were computed, where higher scores indicated more pro-bullying attitudes. Item 2 ("bullies are popular") was dropped as it was negatively correlated with all other bullying attitude items and had a corrected item total correlation less than .30, resulting in only 7 items being used for the final measure. The same measure was used to examine attitudes towards engaging in drama (Appendix T), and was modified to reflect involvement in drama rather than participation in bullying.

Behavioural expectations (intent). Participant expectations about their own future use of drama and bullying were assessed. For each construct participants were

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

asked: “Do you think you will bully others (or create social drama) in the future?”.

Participants responded on a 7-point scale from 1 (*I definitely will not*) to 7 (*I definitely will*) (Appendix U). Higher scores reflected a greater likelihood or intent to engage in the behaviour in the future.

Behavioural willingness. Willingness to act in anti-social (bullying or drama) ways was assessed by describing a hypothetical vignette involving drama or bullying (Appendix V). Participants were asked, “Suppose you were with some friends and one of them started bullying someone else. How likely is it that you would join in the behaviour?” The same question was asked regarding a friend starting drama with others. Participants were asked how likely they would be to join in on a 7-point scale from 1 (*not at all likely*) to 7 (*very likely*). Higher scores reflected a greater willingness to engage in that behaviour.

Results

Descriptive Statistics for Bullying

Descriptive statistics and correlations between the variables for the bullying model are presented in Table 14. In terms of the social cognitive predictors, means of the variables indicated that on average, students viewed bullying as moderately wrong in terms of normative beliefs, and had relatively negative attitudes toward bullying. College students had generally indifferent views (prototypical images) of typical bullies – across the range of positive and negative traits of a typical bully, on average, bullies were viewed as prototypically average (somewhere between prototypically favourable or positive, and prototypically unfavourable or negative).

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 14.

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Path Analyses of Bullying Model

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	α	1	2	3	4	5
1. Bullying Norms	1.57	0.49	1 to 4	.66	---				
2. Bullying Attitudes	1.81	0.56	1 to 5	.67	.45**	---			
3. Prototype Images	3.24	0.83	1 to 7	.75	.17**	.25**	---		
4. Bullying Expectations	1.66	1.20	1 to 7	n/a	.33**	.38**	.18**	---	
5. Bullying Willingness	1.51	1.02	1 to 7	n/a	.36**	.42**	.20**	.74**	---
6. Bullying	1.72	0.78	1 to 7	.86	.39**	.45**	.17**	.44**	.46**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$, α = Cronbach's alpha

In terms of the reasoned and socially reactive predictors of bullying, on average, students reported that they would be unlikely to engage in bullying in the future, and unwilling to bully others if given the opportunity. On average, students reported infrequent use of bullying behaviours. Though the mean was relatively low ($M = 1.72$) on the bullying scale (range 1 to 7), the majority of the sample reported at least *some* experience bullying others, even if it was infrequent. Only 24% of participants reported that they had *never* bullied others, though only 52% of the college sample engaged in at least *two* bullying behaviours occasionally.

Descriptive Statistics for Drama

Descriptive statistics and correlations between the variables for the drama model are presented in Table 15. On average, participants viewed drama as moderately wrong according to the measure of normative beliefs, though college students viewed drama slightly more normatively than bullying. Contrasting attitudes toward bullying, students had relatively neutral attitudes toward drama. However, like bullying, prototypical

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 15.

Means, Standard Deviations and Correlations for Path Analyses of Drama Model

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	α	1	2	3	4	5
1. Drama Norms	1.91	0.47	1 to 4	.57	---				
2. Drama Attitudes	2.22	0.66	1 to 5	.75	.41**	---			
3. Prototype Images	3.59	0.76	1 to 7	.70	.14*	.33**	---		
4. Drama Expectations	2.45	1.63	1 to 7	n/a	.37**	.30**	.22**	---	
5. Drama Willingness	2.15	1.43	1 to 7	n/a	.41**	.34**	.17**	.67**	---
6. Drama	2.26	0.91	1 to 7	.80	.40**	.33**	.06	.48**	.47**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$, α = Cronbach's alpha

images of typical social dramatists were relatively indifferent --- social dramatists were viewed as prototypically average (somewhere between prototypically favourable or positive, and prototypically unfavourable or negative), though they were perceived somewhat more favourably than prototypical bullies.

When exploring the reasoned and socially reactive predictors of drama, students reported that they would generally be unlikely to engage in drama in the future, but were indifferent about their willingness to engage in drama (on average, they were neither willing nor unwilling to engage in drama given the opportunity). Finally, students reported relatively infrequent use of current drama behaviours, though the reported frequency was slightly higher than the frequency of bullying others. While 25.9% of participants reported that they had never bullied others (based on a mean score of 1), only 3.6% of participants reported that they had *never* engaged in drama. Over 83% of participants engaged in at least two drama behaviours occasionally, compared to only 52% of the sample for bullying.

Path Analysis

Path analysis was used to test the application of the prototype willingness model in bullying and drama behaviours. SPSS AMOS was used to assess the fit of the model and the significance of the paths in order to determine the relationships between the constructs. All variables were mean centered. Maximum likelihood methods were used to estimate the parameters of the model. Model fit was evaluated using Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio, the normed Chi-Square ($\chi^2/df \leq 2$; Chi-Square to degrees of freedom ratio), the Comparative Fit Index (CFI; cutoff criterion $> .90$ or $.95$, Hu & Bentler, 1999), the Standardized Root Mean Square Residual (SRMR; cutoff criterion $< .08$; Bentler, 1990) and the Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA; cutoff criterion $< .06$ or $.08$; Hu & Bentler, 1999; MacCallum et al., 1996; Steiger & Lind, 1980).

Path Analysis: Bullying

The results of the test of the model fit were mixed ($\chi^2(4) = 33.49, p < .001$; χ^2/df ratio = 8.37; CFI = .93; SRMR = .07; RMSEA = .17 (90% CI = (.12, .22))). Some of the model fit criteria, including the Chi-Square Likelihood Ratio, normed Chi-Square, and RMSEA, indicated a poor fit between the model and the observed data. In contrast, the CFI was .93, and the SRMR was .07, both of which indicated adequate model fit.

To explore potential areas of model misfit, standardized residual covariances were examined and indicated potential areas of misfit with standardized residual covariances > 2.58 , primarily with attitudes and bullying, and norms with bullying. These variables do not have a direct path according to the PWM. Furthermore, several of the variables were non-normal (e.g., current use of bullying, norms, attitudes, and expectations for bullying), therefore multivariate non-normality might have impacted the model fit. Finally,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

modification indices were examined and suggested no additional parameters that would improve the model fit. Given the mixed results according to the model fit indices, model path coefficients were not interpreted. However, standardized parameter estimates are depicted in Figure 3, standardized and unstandardized estimates are shown in Table 16, and tests of the direct and indirect effects can be found in Appendix W.

Figure 3. *Standardized Results for the Path Analysis Model for Bullying*
 $(\chi^2(4) = 33.49, p < .001; \chi^2/df = 8.37; CFI = .93; SRMR = .07; RMSEA = .17).$
 $*p < .05, ** p < .001$

Table 16.

Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Path Analysis of Bullying Model

Path To	Path From	β	<i>B</i>	SE	R^2
Bully Willingness	Bullying Norm	.21	.43**	.13	.22
	Bullying Attitudes	.30	.54**	.12	
	Bullying Prototype	.09	.11	.07	
Bully Expectation	Bullying Norm	.04	.11	.12	.55
	Bullying Attitudes	.06	.14	.11	
	Bully Willingness	.70	.82**	.05	
Bullying	Bully Willingness	.29	.24**	.07	.24
	Bully Expectation	.23	.16*	.06	

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$

Path Analysis: Drama

As with the bullying model, the results of the test of the model fit were mixed. Some of the model fit criteria indicated a poor fit between the model and the observed data ($\chi^2(4) = 26.63, p < .001$; χ^2/df ratio = 6.66; RMSEA = .14 (90% CI = (.10, .20))), while others indicated adequate model fit (CFI = .94; SRMR = .05). To identify potential areas of model misfit, standardized residual covariances were examined. Potential areas of misfit were identified between drama and attitudes, as well as drama and norms (with standardized residual covariances > 2.58). Again, these variables were not hypothesized to have a direct association according to the PWM, but instead were indirectly associated through willingness and intent. As with the bullying model, several of the variables were non-normal, therefore multivariate non-normality might have impacted the model fit. Finally, modification indices were examined and suggested no additional parameters that would improve the model fit.

Given the mixed results according to the model fit indices, model path coefficients and direct and indirect effects were not interpreted. Instead, discussion of the results is limited to the correlational findings. Nonetheless, standardized parameter estimates are depicted in Figure 4, standardized and unstandardized estimates are shown in Table 17, and tests of the direct and indirect effects can be found in Appendix X.

Discussion

The aim of Study 4 was to examine common predictors of aggressive behaviours through the use of the prototype willingness model (PWM). The goal was to use this theory as a social cognitive model of what might motivate engagement in bullying and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Figure 4. *Standardized Results for the Path Analysis Model for Drama*
 $(\chi^2(4) = 26.63, p < .001; \chi^2/df = 6.66; CFI = .94; SRMR = .05; RMSEA = .14).$
 $*p < .05, **p < .001$

Table 17.

Standardized and Unstandardized Coefficients for Path Analysis of Drama Model

Path To	Path From	β	<i>B</i>	SE	R^2
Drama Willingness	Drama Norm	.33	1.00**	.19	.21
	Drama Attitudes	.18	.40*	.14	
	Drama Prototype	.07	.13	.11	
Drama Expectation	Drama Norm	.11	.37*	.19	.46
	Drama Attitudes	.05	.13	.13	
	Drama Willingness	.61	.69**	.06	
Drama	Drama Willingness	.26	.17**	.05	.27
	Drama Expectation	.31	.17**	.04	

* $p < .01$, ** $p < .001$

drama among college students. Further, the purpose was to address the question of whether drama and bullying can be predicted by both reasoned *and* socially reactive factors.

Bullying and the Prototype Willingness Model

The prototype willingness model was used to explore how a comprehensive social-cognitive model could be used to understand engagement in bullying. Overall, the model was not a good fit for understanding the bullying behaviours of college students. Although the model parameter estimates could not be interpreted as a result of the poor model fit, the associations between the variables in the model still provide a good idea of which social-cognitive factors may be associated with bullying and drama. Therefore, the interpretation and discussion of the results is limited here to the correlations between the model variables.

The findings of the present study suggest that norms and attitudes were both significantly associated with intent to engage in bullying, though these associations were small. Furthermore, intent to engage in bullying was significantly correlated with bullying behaviour. These findings support the associations suggested by both the theory of planned behaviour (TPB; Ajzen, 1991), and the theory of reasoned action (TRA; Ajzen & Fishbein, 1980, 2005) on which the reasoned path of the PWM are based. Several meta-analytic studies have indicated that attitudes toward behaviour and subjective norms account for a large proportion of the variance in behavioural intent (Ajzen & Fishbein, 1973; Albarracin et al., 2001; Sheppard et al., 1988; van den Putte, 1991). Although the association between intent and bullying was significant, the association was small to moderate. Recently, researchers have begun removing intent as a criterion of bullying in their definitions (e.g., Gladden et al., 2014; Volk et al., 2014), as they are starting to acknowledge that there may be other goals that motivate bullying, not just intent (e.g., see Pikas, 1989; Salmivalli & Nieminen, 2002).

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

An important and meaningful addition to the bullying literature was the exploration of this non-intentional component of bullying through behavioural willingness. Norms and attitudes had a small to moderate significant association with willingness to bully others. There was a large significant association between willingness to bully and intent to bully others, and willingness also had a moderate significant association with college students reported bullying behaviours. Previous research on non-intentional motives for bullying has generally been limited to studies of reactive bullying which is an angry, defensive response to frustration or provocation (Crick & Dodge, 1996). While proactive forms of bullying reflect deliberative intent to harm others, reactive bullying is not intentional, but more spontaneous and socially responsive in that it occurs *in reaction* to being targeted (Camodeca, Goossens, Terwogt, & Schuengel, 2002; Kochenderfer & Ladd, 1997; Pelligrini et al., 1999; Pulkkinen, 1996; Salmivalli & Neiminen, 2002; Schwartz, McFayden-Ketchum, Dodge, Pettit, & Bates, 1998). While research on proactive versus reactive aggression is meaningful, it still assumes that implicit (or non-intentional) motives for behaviour have to be instigated by prior bullying victimization. This study is the first to explore *willingness* to engage in bullying given the right circumstances, and provided evidence that bullying among college students is not always intentional.

College students might not always intend to bully others, but instead might initiate or participate in bullying if the right circumstances are present. Future qualitative research could shed light on what specific circumstances or social factors might increase the likelihood of engaging in bullying. For example, previous research has shown that bullying is more likely when individuals have peers who participate in bullying and other

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

aggressive behaviours (Haselager, Hartup, van Lieshout, & Riksen-Walraven, 1998; Kupersmidt, DeRosier, & Patterson, 1995; Mouttapa et al., 2004). In other words, having peers who are engaging in bullying might create circumstances in which individuals would also be willing to bully others.

Prototypical images of bullies were significantly correlated with willingness to bully others, and also with college students' reported engagement in bullying, though these associations were quite small. Children and youth tend to be quite pre-occupied with the social images, popularity, and social standing of others, including peers who bully (e.g., Caravita et al., 2009; Espelage & Holt, 2001; Juvonen et al., 2003; Olweus, 1978; Thunfors & Cornell, 2008), but college students in this study did not have overly favourable or unfavourable images of bullies (they had generally indifferent views). Gibbons, Houlihan, and Gerrard (2009) have suggested that socially reactive factors seem to play less of a role in the understanding of bullying in older samples. Thus, while social images might predict the aggressive behaviours of children or adolescents, social images might not be influential in the bullying of college students.

Drama and the Prototype Willingness Model

The prototype willingness model was also used to explore whether common social-cognitive predictors could explain engagement in drama. Most of the literature on drama to date is based on theoretical conceptualizations of the behaviour (e.g., Regan & Sweet, 2015), or qualitative and ethnographic studies of other behaviours that indirectly stumble upon drama (e.g., Allen, 2012; Marwick & boyd, 2014). This study was the first to explore potential motives for engaging in drama using a social-cognitive model of behaviour, with limited support for the PWM as an explanation of drama behaviours.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Norms had a small but significant correlation with intent to engage in drama, as well as willingness to engage in drama. In her qualitative work, Allen (2012, 2013) suggested that drama could be a more commonly accepted (normative) type of conflict than bullying among adolescents. Indeed, the findings of the present study indicate that college students view drama as relatively normative. Though a direct association was not explored between norms and drama in the prototype willingness model, normative beliefs were significantly associated with engagement in drama. The findings of this study are the first to provide evidence that (a) drama is a normative behaviour, and (b) norms regarding drama are associated with the likelihood of engaging in drama.

Research has not previously explored the influence of attitudes on drama or relational forms of aggression. Early research suggested that youth might have positive or favourable attitudes regarding drama (e.g., Allen, 2012, 2013; boyd, 2009; Miller, 2016). The findings supported preliminary research on the association between attitudes and drama --- attitudes regarding the acceptability of drama were significantly positively correlated with both intent and willingness to engage in drama, and had a moderate significant correlation with college students reported engagement in drama. In other words, the evidence indicated that more positive attitudes are associated with greater engagement in drama.

Prototypical images of those who engage in drama were significantly correlated with both intent and willingness to engage in drama. However, prototypical images were not significantly correlated with college students' reported engagement in drama (though images were significantly associated with bullying). The role of social images has never been explored in more covert forms of aggression like drama and relational aggression.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Although research has suggested that social factors play a role in indirect or relational forms of aggression (e.g., Delveaux & Daniels, 2000; Owens et al., 2000; Reynolds & Repetti, 2010) and drama (Regan & Sweet, 2015), the results suggest that social images may not be a meaningful factor for explaining college students' engagement in drama. As with the bullying variables, college students' prototypical images for those who engage in drama were generally neutral (not overly positive or negative).

Finally, both willingness and intent had a moderate significant association with college students' reported engagement in drama, and willingness to engage in drama was strongly associated with intent to engage in drama. These findings reflect the first exploration of the decision-making factors that contribute to engagement in drama. The present findings suggest that drama may be an intentional aggressive behaviour, providing concrete evidence that drama could be classified as a form of aggression. Like bullying, these findings also support that idea that drama may not *always* be intentional, but may also arise in situations that are socially conducive to the behaviour. Drama by nature is a reciprocal social behaviour that serves as a form of entertainment and pleasure for those involved, and to entice and attract the attention of others (Ito, 2008; Marwick & boyd, 2014; Regan & Sweet, 2015). Therefore, it is not surprising that socially reactive factors, like willingness, may help explain why some individuals engage in drama.

Overall Findings

The prototype willingness model has been effectively applied to the study of adolescent health risk behaviours (Davies et al., 2017; Dohnke et al., 2015; Frater et al., 2017; Gerrard et al., 2005; Gibbons et al., 1998; Ravis et al., 2011; Todd & Mullan, 2011). Despite the value of this model for understanding the risky health behaviours of

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

adolescents, it seems that the model was a poor fit to the data when predicting anti-social or aggressive behaviours, including drama and bullying.

Although prototypical images were significantly and positively correlated with the majority of the variables in the PWM model, these correlations were generally quite small. This might have been due to the generally neutral prototypical images of typical bullies and social dramatists --- on average, the prototype ratings suggest participants viewed the prototypes as somewhere between favourable and unfavourable.

Alternatively, while there seem to be clearer ideas of what bullying looks like during childhood and adolescence (Cook et al., 2010), the small or non-significant role of prototypical images in the understanding of aggression might be due to the fact that aggressive behaviours look different in emerging adulthood, and also tend to be more covert and hidden (Underwood, Galen, & Paquette, 2001). Thus, the aggressive behaviours of college students may be harder to define, and more difficult to associate with prototypical types of people who engage in these behaviours.

Both behavioural intent (expectations) and behavioural willingness were both significantly correlated with bullying and drama. In both models, the associations between intent and behaviour, and willingness and behaviour, were similar in strength. Previous work suggests that the strength of the association between willingness and intent changes with age; decision-making generally shifts from socially reactive processes to more reasoned ones over time (Gibbons, Houlihan, & Gerrard, 2009). Willingness is generally more influential on behaviour earlier in life, while the influence of intentions on behaviour tends to be greater in later adolescence (e.g., Ajzen & Fishbein, 2005; Albarracin et al., 2001; Branley & Covey, 2018; Gibbons, Houlihan, & Gerrard, 2009;

Pomery et al., 2009). Although there were no significant differences between intent and willingness in this study with college students, it would be interesting to explore the utility of the prototype willingness model, and the strength of the associations between PWM variables, in the study of aggression in child or early adolescent samples. Intent (expectations) might be a better predictor of aggression later in life, while willingness might be useful for exploring bullying and drama in childhood and early adolescence.

Limitations

A serious limitation of this study was that theoretically motivated alternative models could not be considered in the face of the mixed results regarding the model fit. Previous studies have primarily focused solely on whether to include pathways from both intent and willingness to the outcome or behaviour of interest (e.g., Frater, Kuijer, & Kingham, 2017), as the primary model specification included in studies of the PWM. Research has not provided much guidance on model alternatives or what other factors might be involved in the PWM. Furthermore, most of the measures used in this study were specifically designed for the PWM (i.e., measures of prototype images, intent, and willingness), which also limited the ability to test alternative models, such as other derivations of the theory of reasoned action (TRA) or theory of planned behaviour (TPB). A next step for future research might be to investigate alternative frameworks (e.g., sequential models of intent and willingness mediation) or models of other social-cognitive predictors of aggression (e.g., perceived control, prototype similarity, social norms of others) (Elliott, McCartan, Brewster, Coyle, Emerson, & Gibson, 2016; Hammer & Vogel, 2013; Van Gool et al., 2015).

Implications and Conclusion

This study has important implications for theory and practice. By showing that attitudes and norms are associated with bullying, this confirms that anti-bullying interventions that attempt to change underlying attitudes and beliefs could be beneficial. In fact, the focus of some intervention and prevention programs addressing youth aggression has been on changing subjective norms and attitudes (e.g., Powell & Hawkins, 1996). As these constructs are based on subjective feelings and beliefs, they tend to be difficult to change. Therefore, the most effective interventions should take place in childhood and early adolescence before attitudes and norms being to crystallize.

In sum, social-cognitive factors like attitudes and norms are important motivators of aggressive behaviours. Furthermore, bullying and drama may not always be intentional as many researchers have theorized; engagement in these behaviours can also arise when situations are conducive, or opportunities for bullying or drama arise. Most importantly, the findings from this study provide further evidence to support the claim that drama may indeed be a form of aggression.

Study 5: Bullying, Drama and Mental Health and Well-being

Study 5 builds on the earlier studies by exploring the consequences of engaging in bullying and drama during emerging adulthood. Specifically, the aim of the study was to explore how drama, and bullying to a lesser extent, is associated with psychological adjustment and well-being in a college sample. Bullying and other forms of aggression can present a serious concern to health and well-being, particularly when these behaviours are persistent. Furthermore, bullying and other forms of aggression can have a significant impact on physical, social, and psychological development (Olweus, 1993).

While some conflict among peers is normal as children and youth navigate their way through social relationships in their school years, we know that bullying and other forms of aggression sometimes continue into emerging adulthood and adulthood, though we know far less about the impact of engaging in these behaviours in the later stages of development. Like victims, perpetrators of bullying are at risk for many negative psychological outcomes, and prospective studies indicate that the effects of bullying on adjustment can indeed be long lasting. Involvement in bullying in childhood and adolescence has been associated with poorer health, mental health, and psychosocial adjustment outcomes later in adulthood (Haavisto et al., 2004; Sigurdson, Wallander, & Sund, 2014). However, much of the available literature on bullying and mental health is focused on children and adolescence; therefore, this should be kept in mind in the following review of the available research on this association. Currently, the psychosocial adjustment of those who engage in bullying and similar forms of aggression in college is not well understood. Therefore, the aim of this study was to better

understand how engagement in bullying and drama during college is associated with mental health and well-being.

Bullying and Externalizing Problems

A number of studies suggest that bullying is strongly associated with externalizing behaviour problems. Studies exploring the patterns of psychopathology associated with involvement in bullying indicate that bullies generally display higher frequencies of conduct problems, including aggressive and oppositional behaviour, disruptive behaviour, fighting and aggression, poorer social and school adjustment, and school disengagement (Boulton & Smith, 1994; Forero, McLellan, Rissel, & Bauman, 1999; Juvonen et al., 2003; Kokkinos & Panayiotou, 2004). Bullies are also more likely to display symptoms of hyperactivity (restlessness, poor concentration, fidgeting) and are more prone to diagnoses of attention deficit hyperactivity disorder (ADHD) (Kumpulainen et al., 1998). Similar results have also been found internationally, including in Italy, Netherlands, South Africa and Finland: bullying is associated with greater delinquency (Menesini, Modena & Tani, 2009) and aggression (Menesini et al., 2009; Veenstra et al., 2005), as well as violence and risk taking (Liang, Flisher, & Lombard, 2007), and substance use (Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpelä, Rantanen, & Rimpelä, 2000; Kumpulainen, Rasanen, & Puura, 2001; Liang et al., 2007).

In terms of studies that explore the longitudinal behavioural consequences of bullying others, Kumpulainen and Rasanen (2000; Kumpulainen, Rasanen, & Hettonen, 1999) conducted a study of the psychiatric symptoms and deviance; children and pre-adolescents (age 8 and 15) who bullied others scored higher on externalizing and hyperactivity than controls, were more likely to exhibit these problems at follow-up (4

and 7 years later), and were more likely to be deviant later on as adolescents. Sigurdson, Wallander, and Sund (2014) also prospectively examined the associations between bullying at age 14 and 15 and health and psychosocial adjustment later on at 26 to 27 years of age and found that bullying in adolescence was associated with greater unemployment, and an increased risk of substance use. In a systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective longitudinal studies of bullying and adjustment in later life, being a bully increased the risk of violence and aggression later in life by two-thirds (Ttofi, Farrington, & Losel, 2012).

In sum, consistent evidence suggests that bullies are prone to behavioural problems including aggression, deviance, hyperactivity, and substance abuse, and may also be at risk for social and school adjustment problems. However, we know very little about bullying and externalizing in college, as most of these studies have focus on childhood and adolescence and the impact of early bullying later on in adolescence or adulthood.

Bullying and Internalizing Problems

Externalizing problems are certainly common amongst bullies, though considerable evidence suggests that perpetrators of bullying are also at risk for internalizing problems. Indeed, perpetration of bullying has been associated with anxiety and depression (Glew, Fan, Katon, Rivara, & Kernic, 2005; Haynie et al., 2001; Kaltiala-Heino, Rimpelä, Marttunen, Rimpelä, & Rantanen, 1999; Kaltiala-Heino et al., 2000; Klomek, Marrocco, Kleinman, Schonfeld, & Gould, 2007; Kumpulainen et al., 2001; Roland, 2002; Salmon, James, & Smith, 1998; Undheim & Sund, 2010), sadness (Glew et al., 2005), loneliness (Buelga, Musitu, Murgui, & Pons, 2008), suicidal ideation and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

suicide attempts (Kaltiala-Heino et al., 1999; Klomek et al., 2007; Roland, 2002).

Bullying has also been strongly associated with referral to psychosocial services, though bullies and victims are reportedly referred to psychosocial services at the same rate (Sourander, Helstelä, Helenius, & Piha, 2000).

Other research over longer periods of time has also suggested an association between bullying in childhood and problems with mental health into adulthood. Several prospective and longitudinal studies indicate that perpetration of bullying in childhood or early adolescence predicts internalizing problems like depression and anxiety in early adulthood (Haavisto et al., 2004; Moore et al., 2014; Sourander et al., 2007). Early bullying experiences have also predicted the development of internalizing problems in shorter-term longitudinal and prospective studies (e.g., Kim et al., 2006; Turner et al., 2014).

In contrast, some research suggests that there is not a strong association between perpetration of bullying and internalizing problems like anxiety and depression (Camodeca & Goossens, 2005; Heikkilä et al., 2013; Menesini et al., 2009). This weak or non-existent association has also been found in longitudinal studies (Copeland, Wolke, Angold, & Costello, 2013; Ozdemir & Stattin, 2011; Wolke, Copeland, Angold, & Costello, 2013). For example, Sigurdson, Wallander, and Sund (2014) prospectively examined the associations between bullying at age 14 and 15 and health and psychosocial adjustment later on at 26 to 27 years of age in a sample of 2464 participants from Norway. Bullies were no more likely to report poorer health and mental health (depressive disorders, suicidality, anxiety disorders) in adulthood than their peers. Thus,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

this suggests a potentially weak or absent association between bullying and internalizing problems.

In rare cases, some findings indicate that bullies may be much better off than others when it comes to their mental health and well-being. Juvonen, Graham, and Shuster (2003) examined a range of adjustment and mental health problems in 1985 middle school youth using a multi-informant method. Bullies seemed to have superior mental health, in some cases, even less depression and anxiety than their uninvolved peers. Contrary to the findings of several other studies, the authors suggest that preadolescent bullies are in fact emotionally and psychologically strong. In a more recent study, Kowalski and Limber (2013) conducted an anonymous survey with students in grades 6 through 12. According to the authors, bullies reported the lowest levels of anxiety of those involved in bullying. Bullies also reported significantly less depressive symptoms than victims, bully-victims, and even uninvolved peers. However, bullies reported significantly greater suicidal ideation than uninvolved peers.

In terms of the internalizing and externalizing problems associated with bullying, it seems that perpetrators are certainly at risk for externalizing problems, while the association between bullying and internalizing problems is somewhat less definitive in both the cross-sectional and longitudinal research, though much evidence suggests a positive association. Again, much of this research has been conducted with children and adolescence, and thus we know very little about bullying in the college environment, a period of developmental changes in individuals that prompt changes in relationships (Hartup & Stevens, 1997). Relationships are quite different at this stage than earlier in

life, suggesting that the nature and consequences of bullying in peer relationships may also change over time.

Subjective Well-being

In addition to internalizing and externalizing problems, participation in aggressive behaviours may also increase the risk of having a reduced outlook on life and poorer well-being. Subjective well-being involves an affective and cognitive evaluation of optimal human functioning (see Diener, Emmons, Larsen, & Griffin, 1985; Keyes, Shmotkin, & Ryff, 2002). The affective component typically reflects the presence of positive affect, and the absence or minimization of negative affect. The cognitive component involves subjective judgements or evaluations of satisfaction with one's quality of life. Thus, according to Diener (2000), subjective well-being can be viewed as a composite evaluation of general life satisfaction, high positive affect, low levels of negative affect, and subjective happiness.

A few notable studies have explored how perpetration of bullying is associated with reduced well-being (e.g., McGuckin, Lewis, & Cummins, 2010). Perpetration of bullying has been associated with greater unhappiness (Jankauskiene, Kardelis, Sukys, & Kardeliene, 2008; Navarro, Ruiz-Oliva, Larranaga, & Yubero, 2015; Rigby & Slee, 1993; Slee, 1995), and lower satisfaction with life and quality of life (Flaspohler, Elfstrom, Vanderzee, Sink, & Birchmeier, 2009; Navarro et al., 2015).

The present study seems to be the first to explore the association between bullying and subjective well-being using all four indicators (life satisfaction, subjective happiness, positive affect, and negative affect). Furthermore, as with the literature on bullying and psychological adjustment, the research on the association between aggression and well-

being has focused primarily on children and adolescents. This study was the first to explore how bullying, and more notably, drama, is associated with subjective well-being in a college-age sample.

Drama, Mental Health and Well-being

Despite considerable research on internalizing and externalizing problems associated with bullying, and some preliminary findings regarding the relationship between bullying and subjective well-being, research on how these factors are associated with drama has not yet been explored. However, some research indicates that indirect and direct relational forms of aggression, may be even more harmful than physical or verbal forms of aggression in terms of the degree to which they make someone feel sad or hurt (Coyne, Archer, & Eslea, 2006). Insofar as drama has been most strongly associated with relational aggression, an exploration of the potential association between drama and mental health is limited to the existing literature on these outcomes for those involved in relational forms of aggression.

Indeed, perpetration of relational forms of aggression has been associated with many internalizing problems including loneliness, depression, and anxiety (Kawabata, 2016; Kawabata, Crick, & Hamaguchi, 2010; Murray-Close, Ostrov, & Crick, 2007). Whereas more direct aggression is a stronger predictor of externalizing problems, relational aggression has been found to be a stronger predictor of internalizing problems (Kawabata et al., 2010; Storch & Masia-Warner, 2004).

Like bullies, perpetrators of relational forms of aggression such as drama, may also be at risk for externalizing problems. A cross sectional study of 185 7th grade

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

students found that perpetrators of relational aggression reported greater externalizing behaviours than uninvolved youth (Williams, Fredland, Han, Campbell, & Kub, 2009).

When researchers have explored the concurrent associations between relational aggression and internalizing and externalizing problems, it seems that the results in terms of internalizing problems are less conclusive compared to the results regarding externalizing problems. Prinstein, Boergers, and Vernberg (2001) explored the social psychological adjustment of 566 high school students in grades 9 to 12. While engagement in relational aggression did not predict internalizing problems such as depression, loneliness, and self-esteem, it did significantly predict externalizing symptoms. Similarly, Crick, Ostrov, and Werner (2006) conducted a longitudinal study examining the physically and relationally aggressive behaviours of children between 3rd and 4th grade. Involvement in relational aggression only predicted externalizing problems (later aggression and delinquency), and did not meaningfully predict internalizing difficulties. Similar results have been found in emerging adult samples. While relational aggression predicted some negative psychosocial outcomes in emerging adults (like self-harm, thrill-seeking, and emotional instability), it did not significantly predict depressive symptoms (Storch, Werner, & Storch, 2003; Werner & Crick, 1999).

Although the findings are less consistent in terms of the association between internalizing problems and relational forms of aggression, Storch and colleagues (2004) found that relational aggression was positively associated with internalizing problems, including anxiety, loneliness, and depression, and was also positively associated with externalizing problems such as alcohol and drug use. Despite some of the inconsistencies in the existing relational aggression literature, it was expected that drama would be

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

associated with greater internalizing problems, externalizing problems, and reduced well-being.

Purpose

The aim of Study 5 was to explore the psychological correlates of bullying and drama in a college. While inconsistencies remain in the literature, it seems that bullies may be at the greatest risk for externalizing problems, with considerable evidence suggesting an increased risk for internalizing problems and poorer subjective well-being. Collectively, these negative effects have been found in childhood and adolescence in cross-sectional studies, and into emerging adulthood in longitudinal research. However, there remain gaps in the literature with respect to understanding how bullying *during college* is associated with mental health and well-being. Furthermore, and more importantly, no research to date has explored how drama might be associated with adjustment and well-being. Extracting from the literature on bullying and relational aggression, it was expected that drama would be associated with internalizing problems, externalizing problems, and poorer well-being. Specifically, it was hypothesized that:

- (a) Bullying and drama would be positively associated with internalizing problems.

Indicators of internalizing problems included depression, anxiety, stress, loneliness, and emotional problems. In particular, it was anticipated that drama would be more strongly associated with internalizing problems, given that drama is more related to relational aggression.

- (b) Bullying and drama would be positively associated with externalizing problems (collectively referred to as difficulties). Externalizing problems included peer problems, hyperactivity, and conduct problems.

(c) Bullying and drama would be negatively associated with subjective well-being.

Past research has really only explored life satisfaction and subjective happiness as indicators of subjective well-being. However, this construct has also been conceptualized to include positive and negative affect (Diener, 2000). The present study was the first to explore the association with subjective well-being using all four indicators (life satisfaction, subjective happiness, positive affect, negative affect).

Methods

Participants

A total of 298 students in first- and second- year psychology courses were recruited to participate in the study from a Canadian university in Ontario. Of the overall sample, 250 completed all of the measures in full ($M_{\text{age}} = 19.52$, $SD_{\text{age}} = 3.38$, range 17 to 28; 70% female) and were retained for the main analyses. Most participants (63%) were Caucasian (14% Asian, 4% African American, 2% Hispanic, 9% Other), and the sample was quite diverse in socioeconomic status ($M_{\text{SES}} = 60.64$, $SD = 17.51$, range 0 to 100 based on self-report measure of socioeconomic status).

Procedure

Participants were recruited from first- and second-year undergraduate courses. Students completed surveys online and were compensated for their participation with course credit.

Materials

Participants completed the self-report surveys online and all responses were anonymous. No identifying information was collected from participants aside from the demographic information below.

Demographic information. Participants completed a survey on age, gender, ethnicity and socioeconomic status (Appendix A). No specific hypotheses were associated with these variables, though age and gender were included in the main analyses. SES and ethnicity were used only to explore the diversity of the sample.

Engagement in bullying and drama. Participants reported their engagement in bullying and drama. The same measure from Study 2 and 4 was used (Appendix E). Questions consisted of 2 items, “How often do you typically bully others?”, and “How often do you create drama?”, as well as 10 items derived from the most frequently reported behaviours related to drama (5 items) and bullying (5 items) listed in Study 1. Participants responded to each question by rating how often they engaged in these behaviours on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*everyday*). Mean scores were computed for each of the constructs (6 items each for bullying and drama), with higher scores reflecting greater engagement in the behaviour.

Life satisfaction. This brief measure of general well-being (Diener et al., 1985) consisted of a 5-item scale designed to measure cognitive evaluations of life satisfaction (Appendix Y). Participants indicated how much they agreed or disagreed with each of the 5 items using a 7-point scale that ranges from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 7 (*strongly agree*). Items were summed, with higher scores reflecting greater life satisfaction.

Subjective happiness. The Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS) was a brief 4-item measure of global subjective happiness or well-being (Lyubomirsky & Lepper, 1999) (Appendix Z). Participants rated each question on a 7-point scale that was unique to each question. The measure was scored by reverse coding item 4 and computing the mean of all 4 items, with higher scores indicating greater happiness.

Positive and negative affect. The Positive and Negative Affect Schedule was a 20-item brief measure of positive and negative affect (Watson et al., 1988). Respondents rated the extent to which they experienced various emotions in the previous month on a 5-point scale from 1 (*very slightly or not at all*) to 5 (*very much*) (Appendix AA). Scores were computed based on a mean of all subscale items; higher scores indicated greater positive or negative affect.

Strengths and difficulties. The Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ) was a brief behavioural screening questionnaire to assess mental well-being through various psychosocial problems and strengths (Goodman, Meltzer, & Bailey, 1998; Appendix BB). Items were rated on a scale from 1 (*not true*) to 3 (*certainly true*). These items assessed 5 subscales of positive and negative psychological attributes, each containing 5 items. The psychological attributes were categorized into the following 5 scales: emotional problems (e.g., I worry a lot, I am often unhappy, I have many fears), conduct problems (e.g., I get very angry, I fight a lot, I take things that are not mine), hyperactivity (e.g., I am restless, I am easily distracted, I am constantly fidgeting), peer problems (e.g., I am usually on my own, other people pick on me), and pro-social tendencies (e.g., I usually share with others, I am helpful, I often volunteer). The pro-

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

social tendencies subscale was not used in the present study. Subscale items were summed and higher scores reflected greater difficulties.

Loneliness. Loneliness was assessed using the UCLA Loneliness Scale – Version 3 (Russell, 1996; Russell, Peplau, & Ferguson, 1978). This was a 10-item measure used to examine subjective feelings of loneliness and social isolation (Appendix CC). Participants rated each item on a 4-point scale from 1 (*I never feel this way*) to 4 (*I often feel this way*). A total score was computed by summing the items, whereby higher scores reflected greater loneliness.

Depression, anxiety and stress. The Depression, Anxiety and Stress Scale (DASS) was a 21 item self-report measure that was used to assess the severity of symptoms related to depression, anxiety, and stress (Lovibond & Lovibond, 1995) (Appendix DD). Participants were asked to report on their symptoms over the last month. Responses ranged from 1 (*did not apply to me*) to 4 (*applied to me very much*) and scores were calculated based on the sum of items for each of the 3 subscales. Higher scores indicated greater severity of symptoms.

Results

Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics for the bullying, drama and the well-being variables are presented in Table 18. On average, students reported relatively infrequent use of bullying behaviours and engagement in drama (though drama was slightly more frequently reported than bullying). While over 84% of participants engaged in at least *two* drama behaviours more than *not at all*, only 50% of the college sample engaged in bullying.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 18.

Descriptive Statistics for Bullying, Drama, Mental Health and Well-Being Variables (N = 250)

Variable	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	Range	α
1. Bullying	1.65	.78	1 to 7	.84
2. Drama	2.23	.89	1 to 7	.80
3. Subjective Happiness	4.61	1.21	1 to 7	.86
4. Life Satisfaction	23.33	6.02	5 to 35	.88
5. Positive Affect	3.28	.72	1 to 5	.88
6. Negative Affect	2.41	.79	1 to 5	.88
7. Loneliness	23.11	6.96	10 to 40	.92
8. Depression	12.98	4.66	7 to 28	.88
9. Anxiety	12.89	4.34	7 to 28	.81
10. Stress	14.36	4.10	7 to 28	.81
11. Emotional Problems	10.09	2.13	5 to 15	.74
12. Peer Problems	7.67	1.76	5 to 15	.56
13. Hyperactivity	9.54	2.02	5 to 15	.60
14. Conduct Problems	7.01	1.68	5 to 15	.57

Mean subjective happiness and life satisfaction scores in the sample were quite high. Positive affect, loneliness, and stress were on the moderate to high end of the response scales, while negative affect, depression, anxiety, peer problems and conduct problems were on the moderate to low end of the scales. On average, participants reported modest difficulties with emotional problems and hyperactivity (near midpoint on the scale).

The pattern of associations was examined (Table 19) between bullying, drama, and the indicators of mental health and well-being. Bullying was significantly associated with all indicators of mental health and well-being, with the exception of loneliness and emotional problems. Drama was not significantly associated with positive indicators of subjective well-being (subjective happiness, life satisfaction, positive affect), or

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 19.

Correlations for All Variables in Bullying and Drama Path Analyses Models (N = 250)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
1. Bullying	---												
2. Drama	.68**	---											
3. Subjective Happiness	-.12*	-.11	---										
4. Life Satisfaction	-.13*	-.03	.58**	---									
5. Positive Affect	-.13*	-.11	.49**	.47**	---								
6. Negative Affect	.21**	.23**	-.37**	-.25**	-.01	---							
7. Loneliness	.08	.19**	-.55**	-.39**	-.39**	.44**	---						
8. Depression	.19**	.20**	-.57**	-.48**	-.41**	.46**	.56**	---					
9. Anxiety	.17**	.19**	-.34**	-.28**	-.22**	.55**	.46**	.61**	---				
10. Stress	.15*	.25**	-.34**	-.30**	-.23**	.53**	.46**	.65**	.70**	---			
11. Emotional Problems	-.05	.08	-.34**	-.20**	-.12	.46**	.36**	.31**	.40**	.42**	---		
12. Peer Problems	.17**	.13*	-.43**	-.33**	-.26**	.23**	.41**	.39**	.29**	.29**	.06	---	
13. Hyperactivity	.20**	.20**	-.25**	-.26**	-.14*	.31**	.29**	.32**	.33**	.37**	.30**	.18**	---
14. Conduct Problems	.40**	.30**	-.24**	-.22**	-.10	.28**	.24**	.27**	.25**	.32**	.08	.26**	.30**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

emotional problems, but was significantly associated with all other indicators of mental health and well-being. There were no significant differences in the strength or direction of the correlations for bullying and drama.

Multiple Regression Analyses

To explore the associations for bullying and drama with mental health and well-being, analyses were conducted using bullying and drama as continuous variables.

Associations between mental health and well-being outcomes and the aggressive behaviours were tested using multiple regression models. Age, gender, and aggressive behaviours were used as predictors of each of the psychosocial outcomes. Semi-partial correlations were examined to indicate the unique association between bullying/drama and mental health and well-being.

Multiple Regressions for Bullying

Bullying predicting internalizing problems. The results of the regressions are presented in Table 20. The model for depression was significant ($R^2 = .05$, $F(3, 246) = 4.55$, $p < .01$). Bullying was positively associated with depression and accounted for 4% of the variance in depression (semi-partial correlation = .21). The model for anxiety was also significant ($R^2 = .08$, $F(3, 246) = 7.18$, $p < .001$); bullying was positively associated with anxiety and accounted for nearly 4% of the variance in anxiety (semi-partial correlation = .21). Bullying was positively associated with stress ($R^2 = .06$, $F(3, 246) = 5.56$, $p < .001$) and accounted for nearly 4% of the variance in stress (semi-partial correlation = .19). The model for loneliness was also significant ($R^2 = .05$, $F(3, 246) = 4.63$, $p < .01$); however, bullying was not significantly associated with loneliness, though there was a significant association for gender; women were more likely to report greater

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Table 20.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Bullying as Predictors of Internalizing Problems

Predictor Variable	B	SE B	β	R^2
<i>Depression</i>				
Age	-.03	.09	-.02	.05*
Gender	1.25	.62	.13*	
Bullying	1.29	.38	.21**	
<i>Anxiety</i>				
Age	-.09	.08	-.07	.08**
Gender	1.93	.57	.21**	
Bullying	1.17	.35	.21**	
<i>Stress</i>				
Age	.00	.08	.00	.06**
Gender	1.80	.54	.21**	
Bullying	1.00	.34	.19*	
<i>Loneliness</i>				
Age	-.17	.13	-.09	.05*
Gender	2.84	.92	.20*	
Bullying	1.04	.57	.12	
<i>Emotional Problems</i>				
Age	-.10	.04	-.16*	.09**
Gender	1.09	.28	.25**	
Bullying	-.04	.17	-.02	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

loneliness than males. Finally, the model for emotional problems was significant ($R^2 = .09$, $F(3, 246) = 8.51$, $p < .001$). Again, bullying was not significantly associated with emotional problems. However, age and gender were --- younger participants were more likely to report greater emotional problems, as were females. Across all of the regression models, women were more likely to report greater depression, anxiety, and stress, loneliness, and emotional problems than males.

Bullying predicting externalizing problems. The results of the regressions are presented in Table 21. The model for peer problems was significant ($R^2 = .07$, $F(3, 246)$

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

= 5.75, $p < .001$). Bullying was positively associated with peer problems and accounted for over 3% of the variance in peer problems (semi-partial correlation = .18). Younger students and females were significantly more likely to have peer problems. Bullying was positively associated with hyperactivity ($R^2 = .08$, $F(3, 246) = 7.34$, $p < .001$) and accounted for nearly 4% of the variance in hyperactivity (semi-partial correlation = .19). Younger participants were significantly more likely to report hyperactivity. Finally, bullying was significantly positively associated with conduct problems ($R^2 = .16$, $F(3, 246) = 16.09$, $p < .001$), accounting for 16% of the variance in conduct problems (semi-partial correlation = .40).

Table 21.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Bullying as Predictors of Externalizing Problems

Predictor Variable	B	SE B	β	R^2
<i>Peer Problems</i>				
Age	-.07	.03	-.13*	.07**
Gender	.52	.23	.14*	
Bullying	.42	.14	.18*	
<i>Hyperactivity</i>				
Age	-.12	.04	-.20**	.08**
Gender	.13	.26	.03	
Bullying	.50	.16	.19*	
<i>Conduct Problems</i>				
Age	.01	.03	.03	.16**
Gender	.13	.21	.04	
Bullying	.89	.13	.41**	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Bullying predicting subjective well-being. The results of the regressions are presented in Table 22. Bullying was negatively associated with subjective happiness ($R^2 = .04$, $F(3, 246) = 3.07$, $p < .05$) and accounted for 2% of the variance in subjective

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

happiness (semi-partial correlation = $-.14$). The model for negative affect was also significant ($R^2 = .07$, $F(3, 246) = 6.30$, $p < .001$). Bullying was positively associated with negative affect and accounted for nearly 6% of the variance in negative affect (semi-partial correlation = $.24$), and females were significantly more likely than males to report negative affect. The models for life satisfaction ($R^2 = .03$, $F(3, 246) = 2.61$, $p = .05$) and positive affect ($R^2 = .02$, $F(3, 246) = 1.59$, $p = .19$) were not significant.

Table 22.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Bullying as Predictors of Subjective Well-Being

Predictor Variable	B	SE B	β	R^2
<i>Subjective Happiness</i>				
Age	.03	.02	.07	.04*
Gender	-.31	.16	-.12	
Bullying	-.22	.10	-.14*	
<i>Life satisfaction</i>				
Age	.14	.11	.08	.03
Gender	-1.10	.81	-.09	
Bullying	-1.09	.50	-.14*	
<i>Positive Affect</i>				
Age	.01	.01	.04	.02
Gender	-.05	.10	-.03	
Bullying	-.12	.06	-.13*	
<i>Negative Affect</i>				
Age	-.01	.01	-.05	.07**
Gender	.26	.10	.16*	
Bullying	.24	.06	.24**	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Multiple Regressions for Drama

Drama predicting internalizing problems. The results of the regressions are presented in Table 23. Drama was positively associated with depression ($R^2 = .05$, $F(3, 246) = 4.22$, $p < .01$) and accounted for 4% of the variance in depression (semi-partial

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

correlation = .20). Drama was also positively associated with anxiety ($R^2 = .07$, $F(3, 246) = 6.50$, $p < .001$; 4% variance explained), stress ($R^2 = .10$, $F(3, 246) = 8.64$, $p < .001$; 7% variance explained), and loneliness ($R^2 = .08$, $F(3, 246) = 6.87$, $p < .001$; 4% variance explained).

Table 23.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Drama as Predictors of Internalizing Problems

Predictor Variable	B	SE B	β	R^2
<i>Depression</i>				
Age	-.02	.09	-.01	.05*
Gender	.93	.61	.10	
Drama	1.06	.33	.20*	
<i>Anxiety</i>				
Age	-.08	.08	-.07	.07**
Gender	1.63	.56	.18*	
Drama	.92	.30	.19*	
<i>Stress</i>				
Age	.03	.08	.02	.10**
Gender	1.59	.52	.19*	
Drama	1.20	.28	.26**	
<i>Loneliness</i>				
Age	-.14	.13	-.07	.08**
Gender	2.66	.89	.18*	
Drama	1.52	.49	.19*	
<i>Emotional Problems</i>				
Age	-.10	.04	-.15	.10**
Gender	1.13	.27	.25**	
Drama	.16	.15	.07	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Drama was *not* significantly associated with emotional problems, though the overall model was significant ($R^2 = .10$, $F(3, 246) = 8.94$, $p < .001$). As with the bullying models, females were significantly more likely to report greater anxiety, stress,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

loneliness, and emotional problems than males, though there were no gender differences in depression.

Drama predicting externalizing problems. The results of the regressions are presented in Table 24. The model for peer problems was significant ($R^2 = .05$, $F(3, 246) = 4.10$, $p < .01$). Drama was not significantly associated with peer problems; however, younger students were more likely to have peer problems than older students. In contrast, drama was positively associated with hyperactivity ($R^2 = .08$, $F(3, 246) = 6.79$, $p < .001$; 3% variance explained) and conduct problems significant ($R^2 = .09$, $F(3, 246) = 8.21$, $p < .001$; 9% variance explained). Younger students were significantly more likely to have peer problems and report symptoms of hyperactivity than older students.

Table 24.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Drama as Predictors of Externalizing Problems

Predictor Variable	B	SE B	β	R^2
<i>Peer Problems</i>				
Age	-.07	.03	-.13*	.05*
Gender	.40	.23	.11	
Drama	.24	.13	.12	
<i>Hyperactivity</i>				
Age	-.11	.04	-.19*	.08**
Gender	.00	.26	.00	
Drama	.40	.14	.18*	
<i>Conduct Problems</i>				
Age	.02	.03	.03	.09**
Gender	-.11	.21	-.03	
Drama	.57	.12	.30**	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Drama predicting subjective well-being. The results of the regressions are presented in Table 25. The models for subjective happiness ($R^2 = .03$, $F(3, 246) = 2.24$, p

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

= .09), life satisfaction ($R^2 = .01$, $F(3, 246) = 1.06$, $p = .37$), positive affect ($R^2 = .01$, $F(3, 246) = 1.11$, $p = .35$) were not significant. However, the model for negative affect was significant ($R^2 = .07$, $F(3, 246) = 6.23$, $p < .001$). Drama was positively associated with negative affect, explaining 5% of the variance in the reported negative affect of college participants.

Table 25.

Multiple Regression Analysis for Age, Gender, and Drama as Predictors of Subjective Well-Being

Predictor Variable	B	SE B	β	R^2
<i>Subjective Happiness</i>				
Age	.02	.02	.07	.03
Gender	-.25	.16	-.10	
Drama	-.14	.09	-.10	
<i>Life satisfaction</i>				
Age	.15	.11	.09	.01
Gender	-.75	.80	-.06	
Drama	-.17	.43	-.02	
<i>Positive Affect</i>				
Age	.01	.01	.04	.01
Gender	-.02	.10	-.01	
Drama	-.08	.05	-.10	
<i>Negative Affect</i>				
Age	-.01	.02	-.04	.07**
Gender	.20	.10	.12	
Drama	.21	.06	.23**	

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .001$

Discussion

The purpose of Study 5 was to explore the psychological correlates of bullying in a college sample; and second, to empirically explore whether drama was associated with mental health and well-being.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Bullying, Mental Health and Well-Being

Perpetration of bullying among college students was associated with internalizing problems including depressive symptoms, anxiety, and stress (but not loneliness or emotional problems), externalizing problems including peer problems, hyperactivity, and conduct problems, and subjective well-being, including greater negative affect, and reduced positive affect, subjective happiness, and life satisfaction. The findings of the present study support the associations found in many studies in the child and adolescent literature (Klomek et al., 2007; Salmon et al., 1998; Kaltiala-Heino, Fröjd, & Marttunen, 2010; Glew et al., 2005). This study was the first to explore internalizing factors, externalizing factors, and indicators of subjective well-being in a single study. The findings show the range of factors that can be impacted by bullying in college. Thus, bullying others is not only a concern for children and adolescents, but college students who bully others may be at risk for a multitude of mental health problems as well.

Although the nature of relationships among college students are quite different than earlier in life, our results indicated that perpetration of bullying at this later stage of development seems to have similar associations with mental health and well-being to those found in children and youth who bully others. Even though reported rates of bullying among college students were low compared to child and adolescent bullying, these experiences were still associated with negative mental health and well-being.

Drama, Mental Health, and Well-Being

Though researchers have started to explore drama, no studies to date have explored how engagement in drama is related to emotional and psychological problems. The current results indicated that drama was associated with negative mental health and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

well-being. Although bullying was associated with all facets of subjective well-being, individuals who perpetrated drama were only more likely to experience greater negative affect. However, engagement in drama was significantly associated with greater internalizing problems (depression, anxiety, stress, and loneliness, but not emotional problems). Further, those who engaged in drama were also more likely to report greater symptoms of hyperactivity and conduct problems, though they did not seem to have problems with their peers.

Whereas more direct aggression, such as bullying, tends to be a stronger predictor of externalizing problems, relational aggression has been found to be a stronger predictor of internalizing problems (Kawabata et al., 2010; Storch & Masia-Warner, 2004). Given the strong association between drama and relational aggression, it was hypothesized that engagement in drama would predict internalizing problems. Indeed, engagement in drama was associated with greater internalizing problems, including depression, anxiety, stress, and loneliness. These findings support the aggression research, specifically findings from the relational aggression and bullying literature, that perpetration of these behaviours is associated with internalizing problems (Murray-Close et al., 2007), including anxiety (Salmon et al., 1998; Storch et al., 2004), sadness (Glew et al., 2005), depression (Glew et al., 2005; Kawabata, 2016; Salmon et al., 1998; Storch et al., 2004), and loneliness (Storch et al., 2004).

Finally, in the sample of college students, engagement in drama was associated with greater emotional problems, peer problems, hyperactivity, and conduct problems. The results support the theoretical associations discussed in peer-victimization research on bullying and relational aggression. In line with this research, perpetration of drama is

associated with emotional problems (e.g., Storch et al., 2003; Werner & Crick, 1999), peer problems (e.g., Juvonen et al., 2003), hyperactivity (e.g., Farrington & Baldry, 2010) and conduct problems (e.g., Kokkinos & Panayiotou, 2004). While the findings from these previous studies are informative, the present study was among the first to explore all these constructs together.

Preliminary research has suggested that drama may be a normative behaviour in adolescence and commonly accepted by youth (Allan, 2012, 2013; boyd, 2009). Indeed, the earlier studies found that drama is a well-understood, easily defined construct among college students. Moreover, more than 85% of participants engaged in drama. While this might suggest that drama is a normative behaviour among college-age individuals, it is unclear from this research whether engaging in drama (even if infrequently) is an indicator of how normative it is, or how frequently it actually occurs among those who engage in drama on a more frequent basis. Despite this evidence, the results of the present study indicate that drama, like bullying and other forms of aggression, is associated with numerous mental health problems and reduced well-being. Thus, drama seems to be a common anti-social behaviour in college that warrants further investigation, and should not be considered a harmless component of social interactions.

Implications and Conclusion

The findings of the present study have a number of important implications for aggression research. Bullying seems to remain a salient behaviour among college students, even if bullying occurs generally infrequently. Further, bullying in college presents continued concerns for problems with mental health and well-being. More

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

importantly, drama is a well-recognized behaviour among college students with equally harmful effects on the psychological adjustment of those who engage in it.

Drama is only just starting to be explored. It is imperative that programs be developed for college students to promote well-being and mental health, and reduce bullying. By the same token, interventions should be developed to intervene in drama as it seems to be having the same negative effects on well-being.

While preliminary research suggests that drama may be more normatively accepted by youth in their social interactions than more direct forms of aggression like bullying, engagement in drama may hold similar maladaptive associations with well-being to bullying. Collectively, the findings indicate that drama is indeed a harmful form of aggression worthy of further exploration.

General Discussion

Across the studies, the findings have supported the notion that in order to move the field forward in its understanding of bullying and similar forms of aggression among college students, an investigation into the construct of drama is necessary. Emerging adulthood reflects a distinct period of time in which young adults are faced with new educational environments and changing social contexts. Compared to research in primary and secondary schools and in the workplace, little is known about how bullying and similar forms of aggression manifest in college, though bullying remains a continued issue into adulthood (Jennifer et al., 2003; Vartia, 2001), with a substantial prevalence of bullying occurring in workplace settings (Ortega et al., 2009), and consequences for well-being (e.g., Lereya et al., 2015; Ttofi et al., 2012). Thus, exploring what bullying looks like between the end of high school and when adults begin to enter the workforce is useful for understanding bullying in this unique developmental stage.

These studies emerged from research suggesting that current definitions of bullying might not adequately reflect how those who engage in it understand the behaviour (Elinoff et al, 2004; Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2001), and in particular how bullying manifests in college. Furthermore, preliminary findings have recently identified drama as a commonly understood form of conflict that emerges in social interactions. The current series of studies reflects the most thorough and comprehensive study of drama to date, and also meaningfully contributes to literature on bullying by filling in some of the gaps in the literature regarding bullying among college students.

The central elements of drama as described by participants in the earlier studies were used to create a working conceptualization of drama on which subsequent studies

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

were based. *Drama involves highly emotional interactions that take place in existing relationships or friendships. Like relational aggression and verbal aggression, it involves gossiping, rumour spreading, backstabbing, and the exclusion or isolation of others. However, while relational aggression can be more covert or hidden in nature, what makes drama unique is that drama is quite overt, it is highly emotional and attention-seeking, and it involves considerable exaggeration, overreaction, as well as lying and manipulation of others. Moreover, drama can have significant consequences for the mental health and well-being of those involved.*

Studies 1 and 2 were among the first investigations into how bullying is perceived among college students, and they were the first to explore the characteristics of drama. The findings with respect to bullying shed light on the fact that college students' perceptions of bullying do not necessarily coincide with the thematic categories often associated with researcher definitions of bullying: intent, repetition, and imbalance of power. Furthermore, the results indicated that drama seems to be a well-understood concept for college students. More importantly, many of the characteristic features of drama seem to also be associated with bullying and relational aggression, suggesting that drama might be a concerning form of peer aggression worthy of further exploration. While there was some conceptual overlap for college students, the characteristics of drama and bullying were not synonymous in that the characteristics rated as most typical for one behaviour were not the most typical for the other.

The aim of Study 3 was to understand the types of people who engage in drama and bullying by exploring the personality traits of those involved. The results indicated that while several traits might uniquely contribute to different forms of aggression,

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Machiavellianism is one of the strongest indicators both bullying and drama. Beyond that, it seems that the personality traits of those who engage in drama and those who engage in bullying are quite distinct. Specifically, college students who reported bullying others more frequently tended to be lower on Agreeableness, while those who engaged in drama more frequently were characterized by a greater Need for Drama. This research advanced our understanding of the complexities of these behaviours and provided insights into individual traits that can predict engagement in these behaviours.

Study 4 examined the predictors of bullying and drama, by attempting to apply a well-known model of the social cognitive predictors of behaviour. Although the prototype willingness model (PWM) was not a good fit for explaining engagement in bullying and drama, the results shed light on several potential predictors. For example, both behavioural intent *and* behavioural willingness were associated with aggressive behaviours. In other words, bullying and drama may not always be intentional as many researchers have theorized; engagement in these behaviours can also arise when situations are conducive, or opportunities to do so appear. The results also indicated social cognitive factors like attitudes and norms are important correlates of aggressive behaviours, including drama.

Substantial research has established that bullying in childhood has long-term consequences for health and well-being (e.g., Kumpulainen & Rasanen, 2000; Kumpulainen et al, 1999; Sourander et al., 2007). Study 5 indicated that engagement in bullying during college continues to be associated with both internalizing and externalizing problems. Furthermore, as anticipated, engagement in drama significantly predicted mental health problems and reduced well-being. Specifically, drama was

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

associated with internalizing problems (including depression, anxiety, stress, and loneliness), externalizing problems (including hyperactivity and conduct problems), and negative affectivity.

Some additional novel findings emerged from the research. First, the results confirmed that bullying and drama are largely correlated, and that drama has a moderate to strong association with several other forms of aggression --- relational aggression in particular. These findings help to more firmly place drama in the realm of aggressive behaviours, and suggest that drama is a form of aggression or peer victimization worthy of further investigation.

Second, this work shed light on the frequency with which college students engage in these aggressive behaviours. In Study 1, 85% of college students engaged in at least two behaviours once or more in the previous month. In subsequent studies (Studies 2, 3, 4, and 5), 24 to 52% of college students reported engaging in bullying. Previous research has indicated that bullying in post-secondary school is quite rare with only 3% to 30% of college students involved in bullying (Chapell et al., 2004; Chen & Huang, 2015; Lappalainen et al., 2011; Marraccini et al., 2018; NUS, 2008). Although the *proportion* of students reporting *some* engagement in these behaviours across studies 3, 4 and 5 was considerably higher than previous studies have suggested, the general *frequency* of engaging in these behaviours was quite low. These findings provide further evidence for the need to investigate bullying in college settings.

More importantly, 75 to 96% of college students engaged in social drama, a substantially larger proportion than were identified as bullies. Again, while reported engagement in drama was generally infrequent, these results suggest that drama might be

a more normative form of aggression for college students than bullying.

Strengths

The findings from this study should be considered in light of various strengths and limitations. First, the most notable strength of this study was the mixed method approach. This research explored qualitative conceptualizations of bullying and drama, and quantitatively explored the predictors and consequences of these behaviours.

A second strength related to the methodology was the way in which drama and bullying were measured. A common approach in bullying research is to present subjects with a definition of the behaviour, and then ask them questions related to the definition. However, it has been suggested that this method produces unreliable self-reports due to participants feeling uncomfortable identifying their own behaviour as bullying, particularly if they have difficulty aligning their actions with the various elements of the definition (e.g., the types of behaviours described) (Bosworth, Espelage, & Simon, 1999). Furthermore, bullying might look quite different in college than it does in childhood or adolescence, and most definitions of bullying do not address developmental differences in definitions. Volk, Veenstra, and Espelage (2017) have advocated for bottom-up methods whereby researchers explore bullying using definitions put forth by their participants. In line with this and other recent research methodologies attempting to overcome some of the common limitations in bullying research (e.g., Byrne et al., 2016; Cuadrado-Gordillo, 2012), Studies 1 and 2 used a free-response method to help develop a better, participant-driven, or “bottom-up” understanding of what bullying or drama is according to lay perspectives, as opposed to providing college students with definitions or statements to which they could agree or disagree. This bottom-up method helped to

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

identify conceptualizations of bullying and drama according to college students, produced descriptions of bullying and drama that were relevant to college students, and provided a foundation on which the subsequent studies could continue to explore. The specific behaviours used in the measures of bullying and drama were derived from the central characteristics identified by college students in Studies 1 and 2. Therefore, this method ensured that the behaviours measured were the best reflection of what bullying and drama looked like for college students participating in this research. The definitions of bullying and drama used in the subsequent studies were based on the conceptualizations of these behaviours derived from the participants in the prototype analysis. While this measurement strategy was considered a strength of this research, this method should be complemented by work exploring whether this method or strategy yields similar or different findings from researcher-developed measures.

A third strength of this research was the focus on bullying and drama in a college population. Most research has explored bullying in childhood and adolescence. The present study shed light on the predictors and consequences of engaging in bullying and drama in college. While the findings with respect to drama were consistent with the bullying literature, further research should explore the degree to which the association between drama and problems with mental health and well-being are generalizable child and adolescent populations, or older adults. Drama has yet to be extensively studied in these groups, and therefore it will be important to replicate the present study in other developmental samples to confirm drama as an important form of aggression.

Limitations

Most of the limitations can be generalized across each of the studies. First, was the use of self-report measures. Biased responses, particularly related to social desirability, can be a problem for self-reporting of aggressive behaviours and mental health, and might have resulted in some underreporting of aggression or of undesirable traits or attitudes. Given that all measures were self-report, shared method variance might have also impacted the results of the studies. Using other methods to gather data on aggressive behaviours, such as observations, can be quite difficult in college settings as aggression tends to be less frequent in general, but also the forms of aggression become more covert and subtle (Underwood, Galen, & Paquette, 2001). Alternative sources of information, such as multi-method, or multi-informant approaches could be used to reinforce the findings (sources could include peers, dorm managers, romantic partners, etc.) (e.g., Green et al., 2013; Griffin & Gross, 2004; Volk et al., 2017); however, evidence suggests that there is currently poor-to-moderate correspondence between self-report, other-report, and observations of bullying (Cornell & Brockenbrough, 2004; Pellegrini, 2001). Therefore, for the purposes of these studies, self-reports were the most viable option for measuring the traits, norms, attitudes, and behaviours of college students.

Second, the present studies were solely based on cross-sectional data, and therefore causal conclusions could not be drawn. For example, while it is apparent that aggression and well-being variables are associated, researchers have been unclear as to whether psychosocial difficulties precede bullying and victimization, or whether involvement in these behaviours contributes to later problems with mental health and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

well-being. Further, though norms and attitudes in support of aggressive behaviours might precede engagement in bullying and aggression, it is also possible that engaging in these behaviours impacts norms and attitudes. It would be beneficial for future research to replicate these studies using longitudinal methods in order to establish causal links about the predictors and consequences of these behaviours, which could help develop more targeted interventions to prevent or reduce the risks associated with these behaviours.

Third, this research is limited by a focus solely on the perpetration of drama and bullying. While considerable research has investigated the impact of bullying on victims, little is known about victims of drama. The results of Study 1 and Study 2 suggested that drama might be less focused on victimization than bullying or other forms of aggression. This was based solely on the *lack* of evidence from participants that victimization is a characteristic of drama; therefore, it could be determined whether victimization is or is not a characteristic of drama. Future research should focus on the victims of drama, the extent to which they can be readily identified, and the impact of bullying on their physical, social, and mental health and well-being.

Finally, the participants in this study consisted of a relatively homogeneous sample of convenience. Therefore, it is unclear whether the findings from these studies would generalize to other populations, or even other samples of college students. Accordingly, future research should continue to explore drama in other settings, cultures, age groups, etc. For example, the college context can already be stressful, triggering problems with depression, anxiety, and negative psychological well-being (Hasin et al., 2007; Statistics Canada, 2013); therefore, it could be important to replicate the findings

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

of Study 5 in other settings and among younger populations to better explore the impact of drama on mental health and well-being.

The exploration of gender differences in each of the studies was also somewhat limited to descriptive findings as the gender distributions were highly skewed by a much larger proportion of females than males. Gender differences have been found across various forms of aggression (e.g., Salmivalli & Kaukiainen, 2004). For example, some research suggests that boys engage in more bullying than females (Scheithauer, Hayer, Petermann, & Jugert, 2006), while other research has found that indirect forms of bullying and aggression may be more common among females, while more direct forms occur more frequently among males (Carbone-Lopez, Esbensen, & Brick, 2010). With respect to drama, much of the research to date (e.g., Regan & Sweet, 2015; Shepherd & Levy Paluck, 2015), and even evidence gathered from Study 1 and Study 2 in their characterization of drama, suggests that there is a gendered *perception* of drama -- drama is most commonly associated with the behaviour of females, or “drama queens”.

However, there is no evidence in the present studies or in previous research to date that indicates a true gender difference in the perpetration of drama. While perhaps some aspects of drama might be more typical of females, there may be aspects of drama that are not gendered. Both “drama queens” and “drama kings” may need to be the center of attention, have a desire for conflict, and a need to create a spectacle. Future research should further investigate the role of gender in drama. Specifically, the present studies could be replicated using samples with a more even gender distribution in order to explore gender differences. Another interesting avenue might be to conduct some of the follow-up analyses used in prototype analyses exploring implicit perceptions of drama

(e.g., through recognition/recall tasks, memory tasks, or reaction time tasks). This might shed light on implicit gendered perceptions of drama. Future investigations into drama might also help identify whether interventions should target perceptions of drama or the individuals who are engaging in the behaviour. Better understanding the role of gender could have considerable implications for what prevention and intervention efforts look like, and who they target.

Future Research Directions

Although these studies provided empirical evidence of the significant associations between bullying/drama and the significant predictors and consequences among college students, future research is needed on several fronts. First, research should consider how to incorporate the current findings in order to identify who to intervene upon, and what factors should be the target of intervention. For example, Study 3 shed light on the personality traits of individuals who are more likely to bully others and engage in drama. Specifically, Machiavellian traits could be the target of interventions as they are associated with greater perpetration of multiple forms of aggression. Study 4 also identified the importance of attitudes and norms, which are amenable to intervention efforts. Further, interventions could teach individuals how to avoid situations in which aggression is likely to occur, or how to abstain from perpetrating aggression when circumstances are conducive to being aggressive, as these circumstances increase the likelihood of perpetrating bullying and drama.

Second, additional research could explore mental health education initiatives and school policies that may help ameliorate the impact of bullying and drama on college students, given the impact of these behaviours on mental health and well-being (Study 5).

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

This is needed to explore what kind of supports, resources, or interventions would be effective for intervening on drama and bullying in college, and how to foster healthy peer relationships in emerging adulthood. Colleges and universities often offer a variety of services and programs that prioritize the mental health and well-being of students (e.g., websites, peer support programs, community partnerships, campaigns, counseling, and specialized services), but these rarely focus on the development of fundamental social skills and positive social interactions.

Third, we know that bullying starts in childhood and continues through to adulthood (Curwen, McNichol, & Sharpe, 2011; Rospenda, Richman, Wolff, & Burke, 2013; Sanchez et al., 2016; Einarsen, 1999; Jennifer, Cowie, & Ananiadou, 2003; Ortega, Hogg, Pejtersen, & Olson, 2009; Rayner & Hoel, 1997; Vartia, 2001). Future longitudinal research should explore drama across a range of developmental periods to identify when it emerges, and how it manifests and evolves across development. Though the present research found that drama is a salient behaviour for college students, it is likely even more salient in middle school and high school. Research in the area of relational aggression has found a declining trajectory starting around late childhood (age 9) and decreasing through to 18 years of age (Ehrenreich, Beron, Brinkley, & Underwood, 2014). It is anticipated that drama might have a similar trajectory. Prospective, longitudinal research from elementary school, through high school, and college would be ideal to address this question.

A first important step would be to fully develop a measure of drama that would be appropriate for use with youth. Despite the strong psychometric evidence for the measure of drama developed and used in Study 3, 4 and 5, further evidence could be

gathered to support the reliability and validity of this measure, as well as to test the factor structure of the measure using Principal Component Analysis (PCA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). Furthermore, while some of the items developed for the current research might be applicable for youth, it would be important to develop survey items that are relevant and appropriate for a younger sample. Thus, replicating the prototype analysis with a youth sample, or developing a measure through grounded theory methods would be ideal. Once the measure is developed, it should be piloted and psychometrically analysed. Children and youth can be reliable respondents if the measures are clear and meaningful to them, and the vocabulary is simple and appropriate.

Fourth, students have described drama as something distinct from bullying, but something that could evolve and escalate into bullying (Allen, 2012, 2015). As such, it would be beneficial for prospective or longitudinal research to explore (a) whether drama can escalate into bullying, or (b) whether early bullying behaviours later manifest into drama. As Allen (2013) has suggested, it could be that drama, like these other forms of aggression, develops at some point in childhood and continues through adolescence and into adulthood. Given the association between drama and indirect relational forms of aggression, it may be that drama follows a similar developmental trajectory --- emerging in adolescence as more direct forms of aggression and bullying (physical and verbal) are replaced (Bjorkqvist, Lagerspetz, & Kaukiainen, 1992; Tremblay, 2000).

Fifth, given the cultural variation in how people define bullying (e.g., Craig, Henderson, & Murphy, 2000; Kalliotis, 2000; Rios-Ellis, Bellamy, & Shojic, 2000), research should investigate whether similar differences occur for the construct of drama. The extent to which the findings of these studies may be generalizable to other groups

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

(beyond the convenience sample of college students used) is unknown. Drama has generally been used as more of a slang term, thus it may vary geographically and among other demographic groups. It would be interesting to investigate whether drama is a relevant construct in other cultures or social groups, or whether it is viewed differently in other cultures or social classes.

Sixth, future research should more clearly delineate how drama differs from relational aggression (and even verbal aggression). Although there are certainly similarities in terms of the *behaviours* involved in these forms of aggression, the current findings suggest that what makes drama conceptually distinct from relational aggression may be that it is *highly emotional* and involves *overreaction* and *exaggeration*.

Furthermore, although the results suggested that there is less of a focus on victimization in the context of drama, these findings are speculative at this point given the available evidence. This research did not empirically demonstrate that these specific features are unique to drama compared to relational aggression, and in fact, 72% of the variance in drama was accounted for by relational and verbal aggression, suggesting that there may be substantial overlap among these variables. Distinguishing drama from relational aggression remains an important avenue for future research to investigate.

Seventh, future research should investigate what motivates use of or engagement in drama. The preliminary evidence indicates a strong association between drama and relational aggression; therefore, the relational aggression literature could provide some guidance on what these motives may be. For example, according to Delveaux and Daniels (2000), a desire for revenge and control over others motivates use of these behaviours. Furthermore, individuals may also engage in relational aggression to avoid

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

getting in trouble, as it is more covert and easier to conceal the harm it causes to others.

Owens and colleagues (2000b) have also found that youth engage in relational aggression to alleviate boredom and create excitement, to seek attention, all of which were identified as central characteristics of drama in the prototype analysis of Study 1 and Study 2.

Other motives may also include a desire to be included and accepted by others (Reynolds & Repetti, 2010), as well as power and social dominance (Pronk & Zimmer-Gembeck, 2010). Future research should explore these and other potential motives for drama.

Finally, aggressive behaviours such as bullying or drama may occur in a variety of relational contexts in college, including peer relationships, romantic relationships, workplace relationships, and sibling or parent relationships. The relational context in which drama or bullying took place was not explored in this research; however, this might be an interesting avenue for future research to investigate. Different relational contexts might have an impact on the ways in which individuals interact with each other, particularly at the dyadic versus group level. Furthermore, drama might manifest differently in different relational contexts (e.g., between siblings, friends, romantic partners).

Related to this, an important avenue for future research might be studying the social dynamic factors that impact drama and bullying. Factors including the presence of prosocial family members or peers, parental discipline and punitive consequences for anti-social behaviours, learning appropriate conflict management strategies from others, peer involvement in negative or anti-social behaviours (e.g., Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2000). Understanding these social contextual factors and could help focus

prevention efforts by identifying factors beyond the individual that may be contributing to the use of aggressive behaviours like bullying and drama.

Implications

Taken together, these studies provide innovative ideas for next steps in research on bullying and drama among college students. Bullying and drama appear to co-occur with other forms of aggression in college, therefore it is critical that prevention programs attend to these various forms. This research indicates that drama is a unique and relevant form of aggression that merits further research and discussion. As such, it will be important for prevention programs to address drama as a new form of aggression, especially in light of the findings that engagement in drama is harmful to mental health and well-being.

In the consideration of prevention programs, practitioners should take into account that aggressive behaviours manifest differently at different ages, and the factors that are associated with aggression also change over time, and that the mental health consequences can be long-lasting. Therefore, perhaps one of the best ways to address these behaviours could be for prevention strategies to focus on training in prosocial interactions and positive social experiences. Aggression and prosocial behaviour characterize opposite ends of the behavioural spectrum. As such, an important factor in the control and prevention of aggression is education on non-aggressive (or pro-social) behaviours and learning of social competence skills (Eron & Huesmann, 1984; Kokko, Tremblay, Lacourse, Nagin, & Vitaro, 2006; Romano, Tremblay, Boulerice, & Swisher, 2005). These strategies would be most impactful if education is implemented early on in

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

childhood and adolescence so that potential later aggression in emerging adulthood and adulthood will be diminished.

Effective intervention would require sufficient knowledge of drama, followed by education and knowledge dissemination. Adequate training would be needed on how to identify drama, and how to effectively respond in these scenarios, particularly given the findings that individuals are often willing to engage in drama if opportunities to engage are present. Many programs that address bullying and aggression currently focus on those who have been victimized, but the present study emphasizes the importance of including perpetrators. The results of the present studies could be important and useful in the design of programs and interventions to help professionals, practitioners, and peers develop strategies for handling situations involving drama in college settings.

This research also has implications for counselors and mental health services on campus. Evidence suggests that mental health problems appear to be increasing among college students in both frequency and severity (Hunt & Eisenberg, 2010), and according to Statistics Canada (2013), college students already have the highest rate of mood and anxiety disorders across all age groups. The current studies demonstrated that bullying and drama continue to be a problem in college, therefore colleges and universities should take this into account when designing transitions to college programs and mental health and counselling services for first year students. The college context can already be stressful, triggering problems with depression, anxiety, and negative psychological well-being (Hasin et al., 2007), and relational stressors (like bullying) are more likely to exacerbate these problems (Blanco et al., 2008). Although drama might be seemingly innocuous, engagement in drama is strongly associated with mental health problems and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

negatively impacts well-being (Study 5). Therefore, campus counselling services should be aware of the prevalence of bullying and drama, and the negative impact it can have on factors including academic achievement, social relationships and sense of belonging, and health and well-being --- all of which are associated with student success.

Post-secondary institutions, student unions, and organizations should also play an active role in setting clear expectations and social norms about appropriate behaviour on campus, particularly given the findings that norms can significantly impact the likelihood of engaging in aggressive behaviours (Study 4). These groups could help to promote a positive social climate that condemns aggressive behaviours (like exclusion and bullying), helps students make friends, and offers opportunities to integrate into the university peer community through social events. The results indicated that individuals are more willing to engage in aggression when the environment is conducive or opportunities arise (Study 4), thus creating positive social climates could be a good way to reduce the likelihood of these behaviours occurring.

The findings also have implications for developmental researchers and those working in the school contexts. The results suggested that there is discord between what college students experience, and what researchers deem as central components of bullying. Many researchers rely on definitions that often conflict with lay perspectives, which becomes particularly problematic when research findings are being used to develop targeted interventions for bullying and victimization. It is important that aggression researchers acknowledge that their conceptualizations of aggressive behaviours might not align with the population they are studying, and use definitions or characteristics of aggressive behaviours that are relevant to participants. By utilizing an

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

operationalized definition of bullying or drama that is grounded in the lay perspective, researchers could have a clearer indication of how these forms of peer conflict and aggression are conceptualized, particularly for emerging adults who have been largely understudied. This methodology could also be useful for future research to explore lay perspectives of drama and bullying in childhood and adolescence. Given that some definitions of bullying have been utilized for decades, it is possible that the landscape of peer interactions has changed since research began examining bullying and other forms of peer victimization in the 1970's. Utilizing a lay perspective could help revitalize current notions of these behaviours, and be useful in updating and modernizing the well-established definitions commonly used in the majority of aggression research.

Conclusion

In conclusion, the studies meaningfully contribute to the small but growing body of research on drama as a new unique form of peer victimization and more firmly establishes drama in the existing taxonomy of aggressive behaviours. The findings helped to develop a clearer definition of drama, derived directly from students, and these studies to move beyond theoretical explorations of drama by exploring the predictors and consequences of engaging in this behaviour. The focus on bullying and drama in the college context provided a greater understanding of aggressive social and interpersonal behaviours during the transition from adolescence to adulthood, and in the time between school and the workplace.

The research also extends the bullying literature by (a) demonstrating that college students conceptualizations of bullying do not map onto researcher definitions and that drama is a well-understood construct for college students, (b) by demonstrating an

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

association between bullying and drama, and drama and other forms of aggression in particular, (c) by demystifying the assumption that some forms of aggression are not always intentional, and (d) demonstrating the consequences of bullying and drama in college on mental health and well-being. Taken together, the articles form a coherent substantial body of work on bullying and drama in the college context, and represent a significant advancement for aggression and developmental researchers. In summary, these studies enhance the literature on the field of aggression, provide innovative ideas for future research on bullying and drama, and can be used to inform prevention and intervention efforts. Better understanding of the nature of drama among young adults will further our knowledge and understanding of these behaviours, and in turn, lead to action and creation of ways to assist individuals as they learn to positively interact with others and become socially responsible individuals.

References

- Ajzen, I. (1991). The theory of planned behavior. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 50(2), 179–211. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978\(91\)90020-T](https://doi.org/10.1016/0749-5978(91)90020-T)
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1973). Attitudinal and normative variables as predictors of specific behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27(1), 41-57. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/h0034440>
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (1980). *Understanding attitudes and predicting social behavior*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Ajzen, I., & Fishbein, M. (2005). The influence of attitudes on behavior. In D. Albarracín, B. T. Johnson, & M. P. Zanna (Eds.), *The handbook of attitudes* (pp. 173–221). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Albarracín, D., Johnson, B. T., Fishbein, M., & Muellerleile, P. A. (2001). Theories of reasoned action and planned behavior as models of condom use: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(1), 142-161. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.127.1.142
- Allen, K. P. (2012). Off the radar and ubiquitous: Text messaging and its relationship to ‘drama’ and cyberbullying in an affluent, academically rigorous US high school. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 15(1), 99-117. doi: 10.1080/13676261.2011.630994
- Allen, K. P. (2013): Understanding bullying in an affluent, academically rigorous U.S. high school: A grounded theory analysis. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 23(4), 413-436. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10911359.2013.771523>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Allen, K. P. (2015). "We don't have bullying, but we have drama": Understandings of bullying and related constructs within the social milieu of a U.S. high school. *Journal of Human Behavior in the Social Environment*, 25(3), 159-181.
doi:10.1080/10911359.2014.893857
- Allport, G. (1961). *Pattern and growth in personality*. New York: Holt, Rinehart, & Winston.
- Andreou, E. (2004). Bully/victim problems and their association with Machiavellianism and self-efficacy in Greek primary school children. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 74(Pt 2), 297–309. doi: 10.1348/000709904773839897
- Andreou, E., Vlachou, A., & Didaskalou, E. (2005). The roles of self-efficacy, peer interactions and attitudes in bully-victim incidents: Implications for intervention policy-practices. *School Psychology International*, 26(5), 545-562.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034305060789>
- Ang, R. P., Ong, E. Y. L., Lim, J. C. Y., & Lim, E. W. (2010). From narcissistic exploitativeness to bullying behavior: The mediating role of approval-of-aggression beliefs: Mediating role of approval-of-aggression beliefs. *Social Development*, 19(4), 721-735. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9507.2009.00557.x
- Archer, J., & Coyne, S. M. (2005). An integrated review of indirect, relational, and social aggression. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 9(3), 212-230.
doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr0903_2
- Armitage, C. J. & Conner, M. (2001). Efficacy of the theory of planned behavior: a meta-analytic review. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 40(4), 471–499.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/014466601164939>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Arnett, J. J. (2000). Emerging adulthood: A theory of development from the late teens through the twenties. *American Psychologist*, 55(5), 469-480.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.55.5.469>
- Arnett, J. J. (2007). Emerging adulthood: What is it, and what is it good for? *Child Development Perspectives*, 1(2), 68-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1750-8606.2007.00016.x>
- Arnett, J. J., & Tanner, J. L. (2006). *Emerging adults in America: Coming of age in the 21st century*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Arora, C. M. J. (1996). Defining bullying: Towards a clearer general understanding and more effective intervention strategies. *School Psychology International*, 17(4), 317-329. doi: 10.1177/0143034396174002
- Arora, C. M. J., & Thompson, D. A. (1987). Defining bullying for a secondary school. *Educational & Child Psychology*, 4, 110-120.
- Augoustinos, M., & Walker, I. (1995). *Social cognition. An integrated introduction*. London: Sage.
- Bailey, C. A., & Ostrov, J. M. (2008). Differentiating forms and functions of aggression in emerging adults: Associations with hostile attribution biases and normative beliefs. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37(6), 713-722. doi: 10.1007/s10964-007-9211-5
- Barkoukis, V., Lazuras, L., Ourda, D., & Tsorbatzoudis, H. (2016). Tackling psychosocial risk factors for adolescent cyberbullying: Evidence from a school-based intervention. *Aggressive Behavior*, 42(2), 114-122. doi:10.1002/ab.21625

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Barratt, E. S. (1991). Measuring and predicting aggression within the context of a personality theory. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry*, 3, S35–S39.
- Baughman, H. M., Dearing, S., Giammarco, E., & Vernon, P. A. (2012). Relationship between bullying behaviours and the Dark Triad: A study with adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(5), 571–575. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2011.11.020
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238–246.
- Bjorkqvist, K. (1994). Sex differences in physical, verbal, and indirect aggression: A review of recent research. *Sex Roles*, 30(3-4), 177–188.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01420988>
- Björkqvist, K., Ekman, K., & Lagerspetz, K. (1982). Bullies and victims: Their ego picture, ideal ego picture and normative ego picture. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 23(1), 307–313. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9450.1982.tb00445.x>
- Björkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K. M. J., & Kaukiainen, A. (1992). Do girls manipulate and boys fight? Developmental trends in regard to direct and indirect aggression. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 18(2), 117–127. [https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337\(1992\)18:2<117::AID-AB2480180205>3.0.CO;2-3](https://doi.org/10.1002/1098-2337(1992)18:2<117::AID-AB2480180205>3.0.CO;2-3)
- Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., Lagerspetz, K. M., Landau, S. F., Caprara, G. V., & Fraczek, A. (2001). Aggression, victimization and sociometric status: Findings from Finland, Israel, Italy and Poland. In J. M. Ramirez & D. S. Richardson (Eds.) *Cross-cultural approaches to research on aggression and reconciliation* (pp. 111–119). Hauppauge, NY: Nova Science Publishers.
- Blanco, C., Okuda, M., Wright, C., Hasin, D. S., Grant, B. F., Liu, S. M., & Olfson, M.

- (2008). Mental health of college students and their non-college-attending peers: Results from the National Epidemiologic Study on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 65(12), 1429-1437. doi: 10.1001/archpsyc.65.12.1429.
- Bollmer, J. M., Harris, M. J., & Milich, R. (2006). Reactions to bullying and peer victimization: Narratives, physiological arousal, and personality. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40, 803–828. doi:10.1016/j.jrp.2005.09.003
- Book, A. S., Volk, A. A., & Hosker, A. (2012). Adolescent bullying and personality: An adaptive approach. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 52(2), 218-223. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2011.10.028
- Bosworth, K., Espelage, D. L., & Simon, T. R. (1999). Factors associated with bullying behavior in middle school students. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 19(3), 341-362. 10.1177/0272431699019003003
- Boulton, M. J., Bucci, E., & Hawker, D. D. S. (1999). Swedish and English secondary school pupils' attitudes towards, and conceptions of, bullying: Concurrent links with bully/victim involvement. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 40(4), 277-284. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9450.404127>
- Boulton, M., Lloyd, J., Down, J., & Marx, H. (2012). Predicting undergraduates' self-reported engagement in traditional and cyberbullying from attitudes. *Cyberpsychology, Behavior, and Social Networking*, 15(3), 141-147. doi: 10.1089/cyber.2011.0369
- Boulton, M. J., & Smith, P. K. (1994). Bully/victim problems in middle-school children: Stability, self-perceived competence, peer perceptions, and peer acceptance.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 12(3), 315–329.

<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.2044-835X.1994.tb00637.x>

- 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
- boyd, d. (2009). Friendship. In I. Mizuko (Ed.), *Hanging out, messing around, and geeking out: Kids living and learning in new media* (pp. 100-136). Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Branley, D. B., & Covey, J. (2018). Risky behaviour via social media: The role of reasoned and social reactive pathways. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 78, 183-191. doi: 10.1016/j.chb.2017.09.036
- Brown, K., Atkins, M. S., Osborne, M. L., & Milnamow, M. (1996). A revised teacher rating scale for reactive and proactive aggression. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 24, 473–480.
- Buelga, S., Musitu, G., Murgui, S., & Pons, J. (2008). Reputation, loneliness, satisfaction with life and aggressive behavior in adolescence. *The Spanish Journal of Psychology*, 11(1), 192–200.
- Buss, A. H., & Briggs, S. R. (1984). Drama and the self in social interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(6), 1310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.47.6.1310>
- Buss, A. H., & Perry, M. P. (1992). The aggression questionnaire. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 63(3), 452-459.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Byrne, H., Dooley, B., Fitzgerald, A., & Dolphin, L. (2016). Adolescents' definitions of bullying: The contribution of age, gender, and experience of bullying. *European Journal of Psychological Education, 31*, 403-418.

doi: 10.1007/s10212-015-0271-8

Camodeca, M., & Goossens, F. A. (2005). Aggression, social cognitions, anger and sadness in bullies and victims. *Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 46*(2), 186-197. doi: 10.1111/j.1469-7610.2004.00347.x

Camodeca, M., Goossens, F. A., Terwogt, M. M., & Schuengek, C. (2002). Bullying and victimization among school-age children: Stability and links to proactive and reactive aggression. *Social Development, 11*(3), 332-345. doi: 10.1111/1467-9507.00203

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

Carbone-Lopez, K., Esbensen, F. A., & Brick, B. T. (2010). Correlates and consequences of peer victimization: Gender differences in direct and indirect forms of bullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice, 8*(4), 332-350. Doi: 10.1177/1541204010362954

Carroll, A., Baglioni, A. J., Houghton, S., & Bramston, P. (1999). At- risk and not at-risk primary school children: An examination of goal orientations and social reputations. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 69*(3), 377-392.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000709999157789>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Carver, C. S., & White, T. L. (1994). Behavioral inhibition, behavioral activation, and affective responses to impending reward and punishment: The BIS/BAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67(2), 319–333.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.67.2.319>
- Chabrol, H., Van Leeuwen, N., Rodgers, R., & Séjourné, N. (2009). Contributions of psychopathic, narcissistic, Machiavellian, and sadistic personality traits to juvenile delinquency. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 47(7), 734-739.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2009.06.020>
- Chapell, M., Casey, D., De la Cruz, C., Ferrell, J., Forman, J., Lipkin, R., ... Whittaker, S. (2004). Bullying in college by students and teachers. *Adolescence*, 39(153), 53-64.
- Chen, Y., & Huang, J. (2015). Precollege and in-college bullying experiences and health-related quality of life among college students. *Pediatrics*, 135(1), 18-25. doi: 10.1542/peds.2014-1798
- Cialdini, R. B., & Goldstein, N. J. (2004). Social influence: Compliance and conformity. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 55, 591–621.
<https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.psych.55.090902.142015>
- Cohen, J., & Brooks, R. (2018). The Construction of School Bullying as a Social Problem. In A. Trevino (Ed.), *The Cambridge Handbook of Social Problems* (pp.237-252). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
doi:10.1017/9781108550710.015

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Coie, J. D., & Dodge, K. A. (1998). Aggression and antisocial behavior. In W. Damon & N. Eisenberg (Eds.), *Handbook of child psychology: Social, emotional, and personality development* (pp. 779–862). Toronto, ON: Wiley.
- Coleyshaw, L. (2010). The power of paradigms: a discussion of the absence of bullying research in the context of the university student experience. *Research in Post-Compulsory Education*, 15(4), 377-386. doi: 10.1080/13596748.2010.526799
- Collins, K., & Bell, R. (1996). Peer perceptions of aggression and bullying behaviour in primary schools in Northern Ireland. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 794(1), 336-338.
- Conrod, P. J., Stewart, S. H., Comeau, N., & Maclean, A. M. (2006). Efficacy of cognitive-behavioral interventions targeting personality risk factors for youth alcohol misuse. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 35(4), 550-563. doi:10.1207/s15374424jccp3504_6
- Conrod, P. J., Stewart, S. H., Pihl, R. O., Côté, S., Fontaine, V., & Dongier, M. (2000). Efficacy of brief coping skills interventions that match different personality profiles of female substance abusers. *Psychology of Addictive Behaviors*, 14(3), 231–242. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0893-164X.14.3.231>
- Cook, C. R., Williams, K. R., Guerra, N. G., Kim, T. E., & Sadek, S. (2010). Predictors of bullying and victimization in childhood and adolescence: A meta-analytic investigation. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 25(2), 65-83. doi: 10.1037/a00201149

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Copeland, W. E., Wolke, D., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2013). Adult psychiatric outcomes of bullying and being bullied by peers in childhood and adolescence. *JAMA Psychiatry*, 70(4), 419–426. doi: 10.1001/jamapsychiatry.2013.504.
- Costa, P. T., Jr., & McCrae, R. R. (1997). Longitudinal study of adult personality. In R. Hogan, J. Johnson, & S. Briggs (Eds.), *Handbook of personality psychology* (pp. 269–292). San Diego, CA: Academic.
- Cornell, D. G., & Brockenbrough, K. (2004). Identification of bullies and victims: A comparison of methods. *Journal of School Violence*, 3(2-3), 63-87.
https://doi.org/10.1300/J202v03n02_05
- Coyne, S. M., Archer, J., & Eslea, M. (2006). “We're not friends anymore! Unless...”: The frequency and harmfulness of indirect, relational, and social aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(4), 294-307.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ab.20126>
- Coyne, S., Linder, J., Nelson, D., & Gentile, D. (2012). “Frenemies, fraitors, and mean-em-aitors”: Priming effects of viewing physical and relational aggression in the media on women. *Aggressive Behavior*, 38(2), 141-149. doi: 10.1002/ab.21410.
- Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. G. (2000). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. *School Psychology International*, 21(1), 5-21.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034300211001>
- 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.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/082957359801300205>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Crawshaw, L. (2009). Workplace bullying? Mobbing? Harassment? Distraction by a thousand definitions. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 61(3), 263-267. doi:10.1037/a0016590
- Crick, N. R., Bigbee, M. A., & Howes, C. (1996). Gender differences in children's normative beliefs about aggression: How do I hurt thee? Let me count the ways. *Child Development*, 67(3), 1003-1014. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.1996.tb01779.x
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1996). Social information-processing mechanisms on reactive and proactive aggression. *Child Development*, 67(3), 993-1002. doi: 10.2307/1131875
- Crick, N. R., & Dodge, K. A. (1999). Superiority in the eye of the beholder: A comment on Sutton, Smith and Swettenham. *Social Development*, 8(1), 128-131. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00084>
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1995). Relational aggression, gender, and social-psychological adjustment. *Child Development*, 66(3), 710-722. doi: 10.2307/1131945
- Crick, N. R., & Grotpeter, J. K. (1996). Children's treatment by peers: Victims of relational and overt aggression. *Development and Psychopathology*, 8(2), 367-380. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579400007148>
- Crick, N. R., Ostrov, J. M., & Kawabata, Y. (2007). Relational aggression and gender: An overview. In D. J. Flannery, A. T. Vazsonyi, & I. D. Waldman (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of violent behavior and aggression* (pp. 245-259). New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Crick, N. R., Ostrov, J. M., & Werner, N. E. (2006). A longitudinal study of relational aggression, physical aggression, and children's social-psychological adjustment. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 34(2), 127-138.
- Cuadrado-Gordillo, I. (2012). Repetition, power imbalance, and intentionality: do these criteria conform to teenagers' perception of bullying? A role-based analysis. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 27(10), 1889–1910.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260511431436>
- Curwen, T., McNichol, J. S., & Sharpe, G. W. (2011). The progression of bullying from Elementary School to University. *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(13), 47-54.
- Davies, E. L., Paltoglou, A. E., & Foxcroft, D. R. (2017). Implicit alcohol attitudes predict drinking behaviour over and above intentions and willingness in young adults but willingness is more important in adolescents: Implications for the Prototype Willingness Model. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 22(2), 238-253. doi: 10.1111/bjhp.12225
- deLara, E. W. (2012). Why adolescents don't disclose incidents of bullying and harassment. *Journal of School Violence*, 11(4), 288–305.
doi: 10.1080/15388220.2012.705931
- Delveaux, K. D., & Daniels, T. (2000). Children's social cognitions: Physically and relationally aggressive strategies and children's goals in peer conflict situations. *Merrill-Palmer Quarterly*, 46(4), 672-692.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Diener, E. (2000). Subjective well-being: The science of happiness and a proposal for a national index. *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 34-43. doi: 10.1037//0003-066X.55.1.34
- Diener, E., Emmons, R., Larsen, R. J., & Griffin, S. (1985). The Satisfaction With Life Scale. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 49(1), 71–75.
https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327752jpa4901_13
- Doane, A. N., Pearson, M. R., & Kelley, M. L. (2014). Predictors of cyberbullying perpetration among college students: An application of the theory of reasoned action. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 36, 154-162.
doi:10.1016/j.chb.2014.03.051
- Dodge, K. A., & Coie, J. D. (1987). Social information processing factors in reactive and proactive aggression in children's peer groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53(6), 1146-1158. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.53.6.1146>
- Dohnke, B., Steinhilber, A., & Fuchs, T. (2015). Adolescents' eating behaviour in general and in the peer context: Testing the prototype-willingness model. *Psychology & Health*, 30(4), 381-399.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08870446.2014.974604>
- Egan, S. K., Monson, T. C., & Perry, D. G. (1998). Social-cognitive influences on change in aggression over time. *Developmental Psychology*, 34(5), 996-1006.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.34.5.996>
- Ehrenreich, S. E., Beron, K. J., Brinkley, D. Y., & Underwood, M. K. (2014). Family predictors of continuity and change in social and physical aggression from ages 9 to 18. *Aggressive Behavior*, 40(5), 421-439. doi: 10.1002/ab.21535

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Einarsen, S. (1999). The nature and causes of bullying at work. *International Journal of Manpower*, 20, 6–27.

Elinoff, M. J., Chafouleas, S. M., & Sassu, K. A. (2004). Bullying: Considerations for defining and intervening in school settings. *Psychology in the Schools*, 41(8), 887-897. doi: 10.1002/pits.20045

Elliott, M. A., McCartan, R., Brewster, S. E., Coyle, D., Emerson, L., & Gibson, K. (2017). An application of the prototype willingness model to drivers' speeding behaviour. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 47, 735-747.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2268>

Epstein, S. (1985). The implications of cognitive–experiential self theory for research in social psychology and personality. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 15(3), 283–310. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1468-5914.1985.tb00057.x>

Ehrler, D. J., Evans, J. G., & McGhee, R. L. (1999). Extending the Big-Five theory into childhood: A preliminary investigation into the relationship between Big-Five personality traits and behavior problems in children. *Psychology in the Schools*, 36(6), 451-458. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1520-6807\(199911\)36:6<451::AID-PITS1>3.0.CO;2-E](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1520-6807(199911)36:6<451::AID-PITS1>3.0.CO;2-E)

Eron, L., & Huesmann, L. (1984). The relation of prosocial behavior to the development of aggression and psychopathology. *Aggressive Behavior*, 10, 201–211. doi: 10.1002/1098-2337(1984)10:3201::AIDAB24801003043.0.CO;2-S

Espelage, D. L., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T. R. (2000). Examining the social context of bullying behaviors in early adolescence. *Journal of Counseling &*

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Development, 78(3), 326-333. <https://doi.org/10.1002/j.1556-6676.2000.tb01914.x>

Espelage, D. L., Bosworth, K., & Simon, T. R. (2001). Short-term stability and prospective correlates of bullying in middle-school students: An examination of potential demographic, psychosocial, and environmental influences. *Violence and Victims*, 16(4), 411-426.

Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2001). Bullying and victimization during early adolescence: Peer influences and psychosocial correlates. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2(2-3), 123-142. doi: 10.1300/J135v02n02_08

Espelage, D. L., & Holt, M. K. (2012). Understanding and preventing bullying and sexual harassment in school. In K. R. Harris, S. Graham, T. Urdan, S. Graham, J. M. Royer, & M. Zeidner (Eds.), *APA handbooks in psychology. APA educational psychology handbook, Vol. 2. Individual differences and cultural and contextual factors* (pp. 391-416). Washington, DC, US: American Psychological Association. doi:10.1037/13274-016

Espelage, S. M., & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? *School Psychology Review*, 32(3), 365-383.

Everett, S. A., & Price, J. H. (1995). Students' perceptions of violence in the public schools: The MetLife Survey. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 17(6), 345-352. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1054-139X\(94\)00185-H](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/1054-139X(94)00185-H)

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Fanti, K. A., & Henrich, C. C. (2015). Effects of self-esteem and narcissism on bullying and victimization during early adolescence. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 35(1), 5-29. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431613519498>
- Fanti, K. A., & Kimonis, E. R. (2012). Bullying and victimization: The role of conduct problems and psychopathic traits. *Journal of Research on Adolescence*, 22(4), 617–631. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1532-7795.2012.00809.x>
- Farmer, T. W., Estell, D. B., Bishop, J. L., O’Neal, K. K., & Cairns, B. D. (2003). Rejected bullies or popular leaders? The social relationals of aggressive subtypes of rural African American early adolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(6), 992-1004. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.39.6.992
- Farrington, D. P. (1993). Understanding and preventing bullying. *Crime and Justice*, 17, 381-458. <https://doi.org/10.1086/449217>
- Farrington, D. P., & Baldry, A. C. (2010). Individual risk factors for school bullying. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 2(1), 4-16. <https://doi.org/10.5042/jacpr.2010.0001>
- Fehr, B. (1988). Prototype analysis of the concepts of love and commitment. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 55(4), 557-579. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.55.4.557>
- Fehr, B., & Russell, J. A. (1984). Concept of emotion viewed from a prototype perspective. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 113(3), 464-486. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0096-3445.113.3.464>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Feshbach, N. (1969). Sex differences in children's modes of aggressive responses toward outsiders. *Merrill Palmer Quarterly*, 15(3), 249-258.

<https://www.jstor.org/stable/23082522>

Field, A. (2009). *Discovering statistics using SPSS*. Sage publications.

Fine, G. A., & Rosnow, R. L. (1978). Gossip, gossipers, gossiping. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 4(1), 161-168. doi:10.1177/014616727800400135.

Fishbein, M., & Ajzen, I. (1975). *Belief, Attitude, Intention, and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Research*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley. Retrieved from <http://people.umass.edu/aizen/f&a1975.html> August 12, 2017.

Flaspohler, P. D., Elfstrom, J. L., Vanderzee, K. L., Sink, H. E., & Birchmeier, Z. (2009).

Stand by me: the effects of peer and teacher support in mitigating the impact of bullying on quality of life. *Psychology in the Schools*, 46(7), 636-649.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/pits.20404>

Forero, R., McLellan, L., Rissel, C., & Bauman, A. (1999). Bullying behaviour and psychosocial health among school students in New South Wales, Australia: Cross sectional survey. *British Medical Journal*, 319(7206), 344-348.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.319.7206.344>

Frankowski, S. Lupo, A. K., Smith, B. A., Dane'El, M., Ramos, C., & Morera, A. F.

(2016). Developing and testing a scale to measure Need for Drama. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 89, 192-201.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2015.10.009>

Frater, J., Kuijer, R., & Kingham, S. (2017). Why adolescents don't bicycle to school:

Does the prototype/willingness model augment the theory of planned behaviour to

explain intentions? *Transportation Research Part F*, 46, 250-259.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.trf.2017.03.005>

Frisén, A., Holmqvist, K., & Oscarsson, D. (2008). 13 year-olds' perception of bullying: definitions, reasons for victimisation and experience of adults' response.

Educational Studies, 34(2), 105–117. doi:10.1080/0305569070181114919.

Galen, B. R., & Underwood, M. K. (1997). A developmental investigation of social aggression among children. *Developmental Psychology*, 33(4), 589-600.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.33.4.589>

Gendron, B. P., Williams, K. R. , & Guerra, N. G. (2011). An analysis of bullying among students within schools: Estimating the effects of individual normative beliefs, self-esteem, and school climate. *Journal of School Violence*, 10(2), 150-164. doi:

10.1080/15388220.2010.539166

Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., Houlihan, A. E., Stock, M. L., & Pomery, E. A. (2008). A dual-process approach to health risk decision making: The prototype willingness model. *Developmental Review*, 28(1), 29-61.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2007.10.001>

Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., Reis-Bergan, M., Trudeau, L., Vane Lune, L. S., & Buunk, B. (2002). Inhibitory effects of drinker and nondrinker prototypes on adolescent alcohol consumption. *Health Psychology*, 21(6), 601-609. doi: 10.1037//0278-6133.21.6.601

Gerrard, M., Gibbons, F. X., Stock, M. L., Vande Lune, L. S., & Cleveland, M. J. (2005). Images of smokers and willingness to smoke among African American pre-adolescents: An application of the prototype/willingness model of adolescent

health risk behaviour to smoking initiation. *Journal of Pediatric Psychology*, 30(4), 305-318. doi: 10.1093/jpepsy/jsi026

Gibbons, F. X., & Gerrard, M. (1995). Predicting young adults' health risk behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69(3), 505-517. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.69.3.505

Gibbons, F. X., & Gerrard, M. (1997). Health images and their effects on health behaviour. In B. P. Buunk & F. X. Gibbons (Eds.), *Health, coping, and social comparison* (pp. 63-94). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Gibbons, F. X., Gerrard, M., Blanton, H., & Russell, D. W. (1998). Reasoned action and social reaction: Willingness and intention as independent predictors of health risk. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 74(5), 1164-1180. doi: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.74.5.1164>

Gibbons, F. X., Gerrard, M., & Lane, D. J. (2003). A social reaction model of adolescent health risk. In J. Suls & K. A. Wallston (Eds.), *Blackwell series in health psychology and behavioral medicine. Social psychological foundations of health and illness* (pp. 107-136). Malden: Blackwell Publishing. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/9780470753552.ch5>

Gibbons, F. X., Gerrard, M., Ouellette, J. A., & Burzette, R. (1998). Cognitive antecedents to adolescent health risk: Discriminating between behavioral intention and behavioral willingness. *Psychology and Health*, 13(2), 319-339. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08870449808406754>

Gibbons, F. X., Houlihan, A. E., & Gerrard, M. (2009). Reason and reaction: The utility of a dual-focus dual-processing perspective on promotion and prevention of

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

adolescent health risk behaviour. *British Journal of Health Psychology*, 14(2), 231-248. doi:10.1348/135910708X376640

Gibson, D., & Fiber, A. (2013). *No more (friend) drama: How to stay out of a BFF battle*. In Teen Vogue. Retrieved from <http://www.teenvogue.com/advice/friendship-advice/2013-12/friend-drama> on December 3, 2014.

Gladden, R. M., Vivolo-Kantor, A. M., Hamburger, M. E., & Lumpkin, C. D. (2014). *Bullying surveillance among youths: uniform definitions for public health and recommended data elements, version 1.0*. Atlanta, GA: National Center for Injury Prevention and Control, Centers for Disease Control and Prevention and US Department of Education.

Glew, G. M., Fan, M., Katon, W., Rivara, F. P., & Kernic, M. A. (2005). Bullying, psychosocial adjustment, and academic performance in elementary school. *Archives of Pediatrics and Adolescent Medicine*, 159(11), 1026–1031. doi:10.1001/archpedi.159.11.1026

Godin, G., & Kok, G. (1996). The theory of planned behavior: A review of its applications to health-related behaviors. *American Journal of Health Promotion*, 11(2), 87–98. doi:10.4278/0890-1171-11.2.87

Goffman, E. (1959). *The presentation of self in everyday life*. Oxford, England: Doubleday.

Goldstein, S. E., Chesir-Teran, D., & McFaul, A. (2008). Profiles and correlates of relational aggression in young adults' romantic relationships. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37(3), 251-265. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10964-007-9255-6>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Goodman, R., Meltzer, H., & Bailey, V. (1998). The Strengths and Difficulties Questionnaire: A pilot study on the validity of the self-report version. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 7(3), 125-130.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s007870050057>
- Green, J., Flexi, E. D., Sharkey, J. D., Furling, M. J., & Kras, J. E. (2013). Identifying bully victims: Definitional versus behavioral approaches. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(2), 651–657. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0031248>
- Griffin, R. S., & Gross, A. M. (2004). Childhood bullying: Current empirical findings and future directions for research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9(4), 379–400. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789\(03\)00033-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1359-1789(03)00033-8)
- Grigg, D. W. (2012). Definitional constructs of cyber-bullying and cyber-aggression from a triangulatory overview: A preliminary study into elements of cyber-bullying. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 4(4), 202-215.
[doi:http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1108/17596591211270699](http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1108/17596591211270699)
- Guerin, S., & Hennessy, E. (2002). Pupils' definitions of bullying. *European Journal of Psychology of Education*, 17(3), 249–261. doi:10.1007/BF03173535.
- Haavisto, A., Sourander, A., Multimaki, P., Parkkola, K., Santalahti, P., Helenius, H., ... Almqvist, F. (2004). Factors associated with depressive symptoms among 18-year-old boys: A prospective 10-year follow-up study. *Journal of Affective Disorders*, 83(2-3), 143-154. doi: 10.1016/j.jad.2004.06.008
- Hammer, J. H., & Vogel, D. L. (2013). Assessing the utility of the willingness/prototype model in predicting help-seeking decisions. *Journal of Counseling*

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Psychology, 60(1), 83-97.

doi:<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1037/a0030449>

Harasymchuk, C., & Fehr, B. (2012). A prototype analysis of relational boredom. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 30(5), 627-646. doi: 10.1177/0265407512464483

Hare, A. P., & Blumberg, H. H. (1988). *Dramaturgical Analysis Of Social Interaction*. Praeger Publishers.

Hartup, W. W., & Stevens, N. (1997). Friendships and adaptation in the life course. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121(3), 355-370. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.121.3.355>

Haselager, G. J., Hartup, W. W., Lieshout, C. F., & Riksen- Walraven, J. M. A. (1998). Similarities between friends and nonfriends in middle childhood. *Child Development*, 69(4), 1198-1208.

Hasin, D. S., Stinson, F. S., Ogburn, E., & Grant, B. F. (2007). Prevalence, correlates, disability, and comorbidity of DSM-IV alcohol abuse and dependence in the United States – results from the National Epidemiologic Survey on Alcohol and Related Conditions. *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 64(7), 830-842.

Hawley, P. H., Card, N. A., & Little, T. D. (2007). The allure of a mean friend: Relationship quality and processes of aggressive adolescents with prosocial skills. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 31(2), 22–32. doi: 10.1177/0165025407074630

Hawley, P. H., Johnson, S. E., Mize, J. A., & McNamara, K. A. (2007). Physical attractiveness in preschoolers: Relationships with power, status, aggression and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

social skills. *Journal of School Psychology*, 45(5), 499-521.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jsp.2007.04.001>

Hawley, P. H., Stump, K. N., & Ratliff, J. (2011). Sidestepping the jingle fallacy. In D. L. Espelage, & S. M. Swearer (Eds.), *Bullying in North American schools* (pp. 101–116). (2nd ed.). NY: Routledge.

Hawley, P. H., & Williford, A. (2015). Articulating the theory of bullying intervention programs: Views from social psychology, social work, and organizational science. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 37, 3-15.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2014.11.006>

Haynie, D. L., Nansel, T., Eitel, P., Crump, A. D., Saylor, K., Yu, K., & Simons-Morton, B. (2001). Bullies, victims, and bully/victims: Distinct groups of at-risk youth. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 21(1), 29-49.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431601021001002>

Heikkilä, H. K., Väänänen, J., Helminen, M., Fröjd, S., Marttunen, M., & Kaltiala-Heino, R. (2013). Involvement in bullying and suicidal ideation in middle adolescence: A 2-year follow-up study. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry*, 22(2), 95-102.

<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-012-0327-0>

Heirman, W., & Walrave, M. (2012). Predicting adolescent perpetration in cyberbullying: An application of the theory of planned behavior. *Psicothema*, 24(4), 614-620.

Henry, D., Guerra, N., Huesmann, R., Tolan, P., VanAcker, R., & Eron, L. (2000).

Normative influences on aggression in urban elementary school classrooms.

American Journal of Community Psychology, 28(1), 59-81. doi:

10.1023/A:1005142429725

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Hepper, E. G., Ritchie, T. D., Sedikides, C., & Wildschut, T. (2011). Odyssey's end: Lay conceptions of nostalgia reflect its original Homeric meaning. *Emotion, 12*(1), 102–119. doi:10.1037/a0025167
- Hinduja, S. (2013). Advice to teen girls about bullying and drama. Cyberbullying Research Center. Retrieved from <http://cyberbullying.us/advice-to-teen-girls-about-bullying-and-drama/> on December 3, 2014.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternative. *Structural Equation Modeling, 6*(1), 1-55. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>
- Huesmann, L. R., & Guerra, N. G. (1997). Children's normative beliefs about aggression and aggressive behaviour. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 72*(2), 408-419. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.72.2.408
- Hunt, J., & Eisenberg, D. (2010). Mental health problems and help-seeking behaviour among college students. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 46*(1), 3-10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2009.08.008>
- Huttunen, A., Salmivalli, C., & Lagerspetz, K. M. (1996). Friendship networks and bullying in schools. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 794*(1), 355-359. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1749-6632.1996.tb32541.x>
- Hyde, M. K., & White, K. M. (2009). To be a donor or not to be? Applying an extended theory of planned behavior to predict posthumous organ donation intentions. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(4), 880-900. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00464.x

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Hyde, M. K., & White, K. M. (2010). Exploring donation decisions: Beliefs and preferences for organ donation in Australia. *Death Studies*, 34(2), 172-185. doi: 10.1080/07481180903492604
- Ito, M. (2008). Introduction. In K. Varnelis (Ed.), *Networked publics* (pp.1-14). Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.
- Jankauskiene, R., Kardelis, K., Sukys, S., & Kardeliene, L. (2008). Associations between school bullying and psychosocial factors. *Social Behavior and Personality: An International Journal*, 36(2), 145–162. doi: <https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.2008.36.2.145>
- Jennifer, D., Cowie, H., & Ananiadou, K. (2003). Perceptions and experience of workplace bullying in five different working populations. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 29(6), 489-496. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.10055>
- Jimerson, S. R., Swearer, S. M., & Espelage, D. L. (2010). *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective*. New York: Routledge/Taylor & Francis Group.
- Jonason, P. K., & Webster, G. D. (2010). The dirty dozen: A concise measure of the dark triad. *Psychological Assessment*, 22(2), 420-432. doi: 10.1037/a0019265.
- Juvonen, J., Graham, S., & Schuster, M.A. (2003). Bullying among young adolescents: The strong, the weak, and the troubled. *Pediatrics*, 112(6), 1231-1237. doi: 10.1542/peds.112.6.1231
- Kalliotis, P. (2000). Bullying as a special case of aggression: Procedures for cross-cultural assessment. *Psychology in the Schools*, 21(1), 47-64. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034300211004>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Fröjd, S. & Marttunen, M. (2010). Involvement in bullying and depression in a 2-year follow-up in middle adolescence. *European Child & Adolescent Psychiatry, 19*(1), 45-55. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00787-009-0039-2>
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpela, M., Marttunen, M., Rimpela, A., & Rantanen, P. (1999). Bullying, depression, and suicidal ideation in Finnish adolescents: School survey. *British Medical Journal, 319*(7206), 348-351. doi: 10.1136/bmj.319.7206.348
- Kaltiala-Heino, R., Rimpelä, M., Rantanen, P., & Rimpelä, A. (2000). Bullying at school—An indicator of adolescents at risk for mental disorders. *Journal of Adolescence, 23*(6), 661– 674. doi:10.1006/jado.2000.0351
- Kawabata, Y. (2016). Relational aggression, depressive symptoms, and interdependence among school-age children. *Personality and Individual Differences, 99*, 11-15. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.04.073
- Kawabata, Y., Crick, N. R., & Hamaguchi, Y. (2010). Forms of aggression, social-psychological adjustment, and peer victimization in a Japanese sample: The moderating role of positive and negative friendship quality. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 38*(4), 471-484. doi: 10.1007/s10802-010-9386-1
- Kearns, J. N., & Fincham, F. D. (2004). A prototype analysis of forgiveness. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 30*(7), 838-855. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167204264237>
- Kerig, P. K., & Stellwagen, K. K. (2010). Roles of callous–unemotional traits, narcissism, and Machiavellianism in childhood aggression. *Journal of*

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 32(3), 343–352.

doi:10.1007/s10862-009-9168-7

Keyes, C. L. M., Shmotkin, D., & Ryff, C. D. (2002). Optimizing well-being: The empirical encounter of two traditions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 82(6), 1007–1022. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.82.6.1007>

Kim, Y. S., Leventhal, B. L., Koh, Y. J., Hubbard, A., & Boyce, W. T. (2006). School bullying and youth violence – Causes or consequences of psychopathologic behavior? *Archives of General Psychiatry*, 63(9), 1035–1041.

doi:10.1001/archpsyc.63.9.1035

Klomek, A. B., Marrocco, F., Kleinman, M., Schonfeld, I. S., & Gould, M. S. (2007).

Bullying, depression, and suicidality in adolescents. *Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry*, 46(1), 40-49. doi:

10.1097/01.chi.0000242237.84925.18

Kochenderfer, B. J., & Ladd, G. W. (1997). Victimized children's responses to peers' aggression: Behaviours associated with reduced versus continued victimization. *Development and Psychopathology*, 9(1), 59-73.

Kodžopeljić, J., Smederevac, S., Mitrović, D., Dinić, B., & Čolović, P. (2014). School bullying in adolescence and personality traits: A person-centered approach. *Journal of interpersonal violence*, 29(4), 736-757.

doi:10.1177/0886260513505216

Kokkinos, C. M., & Panayiotou, G. (2004). Predicting bullying and victimization among early adolescents: Associations with disruptive behavior disorders. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30(6), 520-533. doi: 10.1002/ab.20055

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Kokko, K., Tremblay, R., Lacourse, E., Nagin, D., & Vitaro, F. (2006). Trajectories of prosocial behavior and physical aggression in middle childhood: Links to adolescent school dropout and physical violence. *Journal of Research on Adolescence, 16*(3), 403-428. doi:10.1111/j.1532-7795.2006.00500.x
- Kowalski, R. M., & Limber, S. P. (2013). Psychological, physical, and academic correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*(1), S13-S20. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2012.09.018>
- Kumpulainen, K., & Räsänen, E. (2000). Children involved in bullying at elementary school age: Their psychiatric symptoms and deviance in adolescence. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 24*(12), 1567-1577. doi:10.1016/S0145-2134(00)00210-6
- Kumpulainen, K., Räsänen, E., & Hettonen, I. (1999). Children involved in bullying: Psychological disturbance and the persistence of the involvement. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 23*(12), 1253-1262. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134\(99\)00098-8](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0145-2134(99)00098-8)
- Kumpulainen, K., Räsänen, E., Henttonen, I., Almqvist, F., Kresanov, K., Linna, S., . . . Tamminen, T. (1998). Bullying and psychiatric symptoms among elementary school-age children. *Child Abuse & Neglect, 22*(7), 705-717. doi: 10.1016/S0145-2134(98)00049-0
- Kumpulainen, K., Rasanen, E., & Puura, K. (2001). Psychiatric disorders and the use of mental health services among children involved in bullying. *Aggressive Behavior, 27*(2), 102-110. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.3>
- Kupersmidt, J. B., DeRosier, M. E., & Patterson, C. P. (1995). Similarity as the basis for children's friendships: The roles of sociometric status, aggressive and withdrawn behaviour, academic achievement and demographic characteristics. *Journal of*

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Social and Personal Relationships, 12(3), 439-452.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407595123007>

- Lappalainen, C., Meriläinen, M., Puhakka, H., & Sinkkonen, H-M. (2011). Bullying among university students – does it exist? *Finnish Journal of Youth Research*, 29(2), 64-80.
- Lereya, S. T., Copeland, W. E., Costello, E. J., & Wolke, D. (2015). Adult mental health consequences of peer bullying and maltreatment in childhood: Two cohorts in two countries. *Lancet Psychiatry*, 2(6), 524–531. doi:10.1016/S2215-0366 (15)00165-0. PMID: 26360448.
- Levine, I. S. (2010). Handling a teenage daughter's friendship dramas. Psychology Today. Retrieved from <http://www.psychologytoday.com/blog/the-friendship-doctor/201010/handling-teenage-daughters-friendship-dramas> on December 3, 2014.
- Liang, H., Flisher, A. J., & Lombard, C. J. (2007). Bullying, violence, and risk behaviour in South African school students. *Child Abuse Neglect*, 31(2), 161-171. doi: 10.1016/j.chiabu.2006.08.007
- Linder, J. R., Werner, N. E., & Lyle, K. A. (2010). Automatic and controlled social information processing and relational aggression in young adults. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 49(7), 778-783.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2010.06.029>.
- Livingstone, S. (2014). Developing social media literacy: How children learn to interpret risky opportunities on social network sites. *Communications. The European*

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Journal of Communication Research, 39(3), 283–303. doi: 10.1515/commun-2014-0113

Lovibond, S. H., & Lovibond, P. F. (1995). *Manual for the depression anxiety stress scales*. Psychology foundation monograph. Sydney, Australia: School of Psychology, University of New South Wales.

Lyubomirsky, S., & Lepper, H. (1999). A measure of subjective happiness: Preliminary reliability and construct validation. *Social Indicators Research*, 46(2), 137-155. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006824100041>

Ma, S., Wang, H., & Chien, T. (2017). Hospital nurses attitudes, negative perceptions, and negative acts regarding workplace bullying. *Annals of General Psychiatry*, 16(1), doi:10.1186/s12991-017-0156-0

MacCallum, R. C., Browne, M. W., & Sugawara, H. M. (1996). Power analysis and determination of sample size for covariance structure modeling. *Psychological Methods*, 1(2), 130-149.

Madsen, K. C. (1996). Differing perceptions of bullying and their practical implications. *Educational and Child Psychology*, 13(2), 14-22.

Marraccini, M. E., Brick, L. A. D., & Weyandt, L. L. (2018). Instructor and peer bullying in college students: Distinct typologies based on Latent Class Analysis. *Journal of American College Health*. doi: 10.1080/07448481.2018.1454926

Marwick, A. E., & boyd, d. (2011). *The drama! Teen conflict, gossip, and bullying in networked publics*. A Decade in Internet Time: Symposium on the Dynamics of the Internet and Society, September 2011.

Marwick, A. & boyd, d. (2014). “It’s just drama”: Teen perspectives on conflict and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

aggression in a networked era. *Journal of Youth Studies*, 17(9), 1187-1204.

Mathisen, G., Einarsen, S., & Mykletun, R. (2011). The relationship between supervisor personality, supervisors' perceived stress and workplace bullying. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 99(4), 637– 651. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0674-z>

Maunder, R. E., Harrop, A., & Tattersall, A. J. (2010). Pupil and staff perceptions of bullying in secondary schools: Comparing behavioural definitions and their perceived seriousness. *Educational Research*, 52(3), 263-282, doi: 10.1080/00131881.2010.504062

McGuckin, C., Lewis, C. A., & Cummins, P. K. (2010). Experiences of school bullying, psychological well-being and stress in Northern Ireland: Data from the 2004 Young Life and Times Survey. *The Irish Journal of Psychology*, 31(1-2), 53-61. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03033910.2010.10446322>

Meloy, J. R. (1998). *The Psychopathic Mind: Origins, Dynamics, and Treatment*. Northvale: Jason Aronson.

Menesini, E., Camodeca, M., & Nocentini, A. (2010). Bullying among siblings: The role of personality and relational variables. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 28(4), 921-939. doi: 10.1348/026151009X479402

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 schools. *Aggressive Behavior*, 23(4), 245-257. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2337\(1997\)23:4<245::AID-AB3>3.0.CO;2-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1997)23:4<245::AID-AB3>3.0.CO;2-J)

J

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Menesini, E., Fonzi, A., & Smith, P. K. (2002). Attribution of meanings to terms related to bullying: A comparison between educator's and learner's perspectives in Italy. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 4*, 393-406. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/23420307>
- Menesini, E., Modena, M., & Tani, F. (2009). Bullying and victimization in adolescence: Concurrent and stable roles and psychological health symptoms. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology, 170*(2), 115-143. doi: <https://doi.org/10.3200/GNTP.170.2.115-134>.
- Miller, S. A. (2016). "How you bully a girl": Sexual drama and the negotiation of gendered sexuality in high school. *Gender & Society, 30*(5), 721-744. doi: 10.1177/0891243216664723
- Mishna, F., Saini, M., & Solomon, S. (2009). Ongoing and online: Children and youth's perceptions of cyber bullying. *Children and Youth Services Review, 31*(12), 1222-1228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2009.05.004>
- Mitsopoulou, E., & Giovazolias, T. (2015). Personality traits, empathy and bullying behavior: A meta-analytic approach. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 21*, 61-72. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2015.01.007>
- Monks, C. P., & Smith, P. K. (2006). Definitions of bullying: Age differences in understanding of this term, and the role of experience. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24*(4), 801-821. doi: 10.1348.026151005X82352
- Moore, S. E., Norman, R. E., Sly, P. D., Whitehouse, A. J. O., Zubrick, S. R., & Scott, J. (2014). Adolescent peer aggression and its association with mental health and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

substance use in an Australian cohort. *Journal of Adolescence*, 37(1), 11–21.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2013.10.006>

Morales, J. R., & Crick, N. R. (1998). Self-report measure of aggression and victimization. University of Minnesota; Twin Cities Campus. Unpublished measure.

Mouttapa, M., Valente, T., Gallaher, P., Rohrbach, L. A., & Unger, J. B. (2004). Social network predictors of bullying and victimization. *Adolescence*, 39(154), 315-335.

Murray-Close, D., Ostrov, J. M., & Crick, N. R. (2007). A short-term longitudinal study of growth of relational aggression during middle childhood: Associations with gender, friendship intimacy, and internalizing problems. *Development and Psychopathology*, 19(1), 187-203. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S0954579407070101>

Nansel, T. R., Craig, W., Overpeck, M. D., Saluja, G., & Ruan, W. J. (2004). Cross-national consistency in the relationship between bullying behaviours and psychosocial adjustment. *Archives of Pediatrics & Adolescent Medicine*, 158(8), 730-736. doi: 10.1001/archpedi.158.8.730.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *JAMA: Journal of the American Medical Association*, 285(16), 2094-2100. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.285.16.2094>

Nathan, E., Houghton, S., Tan, C., & Carroll, A. (2011). Cultivating reputations: The social goal of Western Australian primary school bullies. *Australian Journal of Guidance and Counselling*, 21(01), 33-48.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

National Union of Students (NUS). (2008). Student Experience Report. Retrieved January 9, 2018 from

https://www.nus.org.uk/PageFiles/4017/NUS_StudentExperienceReport.pdf

Navarro, R., Ruiz-Oliva, R., Larranaga, E., & Yubero, S. (2015). The impact of cyberbullying and social bullying on optimism, global and school-related happiness and life satisfaction among 10-12-year-old schoolchildren. *Applied Research on Quality of Life*, 10(1), 15-36. doi: 10.1007/s11482-013-9292-0

Naylor, P., Cowie, H., Cossin, F., de Bettencourt, R., & Lemme, F. (2006). Teachers' and pupils' definitions of bullying. *The British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 76(Pt 3), 553-576. doi: 10.1348/000709905X52229

Nelson, D. A., Robinson, C. C., & Hart, C. H. (2005). Relational and physical aggression of preschool-aged children: Peer status linkage across informants. *Early Education and Development, Special Issue: Relational Aggression During Early Childhood*, 16, 115-139.

Nelson, D. A., Springer, M. M., Nelson, L. J., & Bean, N. H. (2008). Normative beliefs regarding aggression in emerging adulthood. *Social Development*, 17(3), 638-660. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00442.x

Ojala, K., & Nesdale, D. (2004). Bullying and social identity: The effects of group norms and distinctiveness threat on attitudes towards bullying. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 22(1), 19-35.

<https://doi.org/10.1348/026151004772901096>

O'Keefe, D. J. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and research* (2nd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Oliver, R., Hoover, J. H., & Hazler, R. (1994). The perceived roles of bullying in small-town Midwestern schools. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 72(4), 416-420.

doi: 10.1002/j.1556-6676.1994.tb00960.x

Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: Bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, DC: Hemisphere, Wiley.

Olweus, D. (1991). Bully/victim problems among schoolchildren: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. In D. J. Pepler and K. H. Rubin (Eds.), *The development and treatment of childhood aggression*, 17, 411-448. Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Hillsdale, New Jersey.

Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. NY: Wiley-Blackwell.

Olweus, D. (1999). Sweden. In Smith, P.K., Morita, Y., Junger-Tas, J., Olweus, D., Catalano, R., & Slee, P. (Eds). *The Nature of School Bullying: A Cross-National Perspective* (pp. 7-27). London & New York: Routledge.

Ortega, A., Hogh, A., Pejtersen, J. H., & Olsen, O. (2009). Prevalence of workplace bullying and risk groups: A representative population study. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 82(3), 517-426. doi: 10.1007/s00420-008-0339-8

Ostrov, J. M., Ries, E. E., Stauffacher, K., Godleski, S. A. & Mullins, A. D. (2008). Relational aggression, physical aggression and deception during early childhood: a multi-method, multiinformant, short-term longitudinal study. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 37(3), 664-675.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/15374410802148137>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Owens, L., Shute, R., & Slee, P. (2000). "Guess what I just heard!": Indirect aggression among teenage girls in Australia. *Aggressive Behavior*, 26(1), 67-83. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(2000)26:1<67::AID-AB6>3.0.CO;2-C
- Owens, L., Shute, R., & Slee, P. (2000b). 'I'm in and you're out...': Explanations for teenage girls' indirect aggression. *Psychology, Evolution & Gender* 2, 19-46. doi: 10.1080/14616660050082906
- Ozdemir, M., & Stattin, H. (2011). Bullies, victims, and bully-victims: A longitudinal examination of the effects of bullying-victimization experiences on youth well-being. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research*, 3(2), 97-102. doi: 10.1108/17596591111132918
- Pabian, S., & Vandebosch, H. (2014). Using the theory of planned behaviour to understand cyberbullying: The importance of beliefs for developing interventions. *European Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 11(4), 463-477. doi: 10.1080/17405629.2013.858626
- Patchin, J. W., & Hinduja, S. (2006). Bullies move beyond the schoolyard: A preliminary look at cyberbullying. *Youth Violence and Juvenile Justice*, 4(2), 148-169. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1541204006286288>
- Peeters, M., Cillessen, A. H. N., & Scholte, R. H. J. (2010). Clueless or powerful? Identifying subtypes of bullies in adolescence. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 39(9), 1041-1052. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-009-9478-9>
- Pellegrini, A. D. (2001). The roles of dominance and bullying in the development of early heterosexual relationships. *Journal of Emotional Abuse*, 2(2-3), 63-73. https://doi.org/10.1300/J135v02n02_05

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Pellegrini, A. D., Bartini, M., & Brooks, F. (1999). School bullies, victims, and aggressive victims: factors relating to group affiliation and victimization in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 91*(2), 216-224.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.91.2.216>
- Pellegrini, A. D., & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition from primary school through secondary school. *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20*(2), 259-280.
<https://doi.org/10.1348/026151002166442>
- Pepler, D. J., Craig, W. M., Connolly, J. (1997). *Bullying and victimization: The problems and solutions for school-aged children*. Fact sheet prepared for the National Crime Prevention Council of Canada. Ottawa: National Crime Prevention Centre, Department of Justice.
- Pepler, D., Craig, W. M., & O'Connell, P. (1999). Understanding bullying from a dynamic systems perspective. In A. Slater & D. Muir (Eds.), *The Blackwell reader in developmental psychology* (pp. 440–451): Oxford, UK: Blackwell.
- Pepler, D., Craig, W. M., & O'Connell, P. (2010). Peer processes in bullying: Informing prevention and intervention strategies. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 469–479). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Pepler, D., Craig, W. M., Yuile, A., & Connolly, J. (2004). Girls who bully: A developmental and relational perspective. In M. Putallaz & K. L. Bierman (Eds.), *Aggression, antisocial behavior, and violence among girls: A developmental perspective* (pp. 90–109). New York, NY: The Guilford Press.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Pikas, A. (1989). A pure conception of mobbing gives the best results for treatment.

School Psychology International, 10(2), 95-104.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0143034389102003>

Plopa, M., Plopa, W., & Skuzinska, A. (2017). Bullying at work, personality and

subjective well-being. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 22(1), 19-27.

doi: 10.1037/a0040320

Pomery, E. A., Gibbons, F. X., Reis-Bergan, M., & Gerrard, M. (2009). From willingness

to intention: Experience moderates the shift from reactive to reasoned

behavior. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 35(7), 894-908. doi:

10.1177/0146167209335166

Powell, K., & Hawkins, D. (Eds.). (1996). Youth violence prevention: Description and

baseline data from 13 evaluation projects. *American Journal of Preventive*

Medicine, Supplement to 12(5), 1-134.

Prather, E., Dahlen, E. R., Nicholson, B. C., & Bullock-Yowell, E. (2012). Relational

aggression in college students' dating relationships. *Journal of Aggression,*

Maltreatment & Trauma, 21(7), 705-720.

<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1080/10926771.2012.693151>

Price, J. M., & Dodge, K. A. (1989). Reactive and proactive aggression in childhood:

Relations to peer status and social context dimensions. *Journal of Abnormal*

Child Psychology, 17(4), 455-471. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF00915038>

Prinstein, M. J., Boergers, J., & Vernberg, E. M. (2001). Overt and relational aggression

in adolescents: Social-psychological adjustment of aggressors and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

victims. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 30(4), 479-491.

doi: 10.1207/S15374424JCCP3004_05

Pronk, R. E., & Zimmer-Gembeck, M. J. (2010). It's "mean," but what does it mean to adolescents? Relational aggression described by victims, aggressors, and their peers. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 25(2), 175-204.

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558409350504>

Pulkkinen, L. (1996). Proactive and reactive aggression in early adolescence as precursors to anti and prosocial behaviour in young adults. *Aggressive Behavior*, 22(4), 241-257. [http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1098-2337\(1996\)22:4<241::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-O](http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1098-2337(1996)22:4<241::AID-AB1>3.0.CO;2-O)

Ragatz, L. L., Anderson, R. J., Fremouw, W., & Schwartz, R. (2011). Criminal thinking patterns, aggression styles, and the psychopathic traits of late high school bullies and bully-victims. *Aggressive Behavior*, 37(2), 145–160. doi: 10.1002/ab.20377.

Raine, A., Dodge, K., Loeber, R., Gatzke-Kopp, L., Lynam, D., Reynolds, C., ... Liu, J. (2006). The Reactive–Proactive Aggression Questionnaire: Differential correlates of reactive and proactive aggression in adolescent boys. *Aggressive Behavior*, 32(2), 159–171. <http://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20115>

Rayner, C., & Hoel, H. (1997). A summary review of literature relating to workplace bullying. *Journal of Community and Applied Social Psychology*, 7(3), 181–191. [https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-1298\(199706\)7:3<181::AID-CASP416>3.0.CO;2-Y](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-1298(199706)7:3<181::AID-CASP416>3.0.CO;2-Y)

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Regan, P. M., & Sweet, D. L. (2015). Chapter VII: Girls and Online Drama: Aggression, Surveillance, or Entertainment? In J. Bailey & V. Steeves (Eds.), *eGirls, eCitizens* (pp. 175-197). Ottawa, Canada: University of Ottawa Press.
- Reijntjes, A., Vermande, M., Thomaes, S., Goossens, F., Olthof, T., Aleva, L., & Van der Meulen, M. (2016). Narcissism, bullying, and social dominance in youth: A longitudinal analysis. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology*, 44(1), 63–74. doi: 10.1007/s10802-015-9974-1
- Reyna, V. F., & Ellis, S. C. (1994). Fuzzy-trace theory and framing effects in children's risky decision making. *Psychological Science*, 5(5), 275–279.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.1994.tb00625.x>
- Reynolds, B. M., & Repetti, R. L. (2010). Teenage girls' perceptions of the functions of relationally aggressive behaviors. *Psychology in the Schools*, 47(3), 282-296.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/pits.20470>
- Rigby, K. (2002). *New perspectives on bullying*. London: Jessica Kingsley.
- Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1991). Bullying among Australian school children: Reported behaviour and attitudes toward victims. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 131(5), 615-627. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1991.9924646
- Rigby, K., & Slee, P. T. (1993). Dimensions of interpersonal relating among Australian school children and their implications for psychological well-being. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 133(1), 33-42.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00224545.1993.9712116>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Ringrose, J., Harvey, L., Gill, R., & Livingstone, S. (2013). Teen girls, sexual double standards and 'sexting': Gendered value in digital image exchange. *Feminist Theory, 14*(3), 305-323. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1464700113499853>
- Rios-Ellis, B., Bellamy, L., & Shojic, J. (2000). An examination of specific types of Ijime within Japanese schools. *School Psychology International, 21*(3), 227-241. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034300213001>
- Rivis, A., Abraham, C., & Snook, S. (2011). Understanding young and older male drivers' willingness to drive while intoxicated: The predictive utility of constructs specified by the theory of planned behaviour and the prototype willingness model. *British Journal of Health Psychology, 16*(2), 445-456. doi: 10.1348/135910710X522662
- Rivis, A., & Sheeran, P. (2003). Social influences and the theory of planned behaviour: Evidence for a direct relationship between prototypes and young people's exercise behaviour. *Psychology and Health, 18*(5), 567-583. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0887044032000069883>
- Rodkin, P. C., & Berger, C. (2008). Who bullies whom? Social status asymmetries by victim gender. *International Journal of Behavioral Development, 32*(6), 473-485. doi: 10.1177/0165025408093667
- Roland, E. (2002). Bullying, depressive symptoms, and suicidal thoughts. *Educational Research, 44*(1), 55-67. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/00131880110107351>
- Romano, E., Tremblay, R. E., Boulerice, B., & Swisher, R. (2005). Multilevel correlates of childhood physical aggression and prosocial behavior. *Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 33*(5), 565-578. doi: 10.1007/s10802-005-6738-3

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Rosch, E. (1973). On the internal structure of perceptual and semantic categories. In T. E. Moore (Ed.), *Cognitive development and the acquisition of language* (pp. 111-144). New York: Academic Press.
- Rosch, E. (1975). Cognitive representations of semantic categories. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, 104(3), 192-233. doi: 10.1037/0096-3445.104.3.192
- Rospenda, K. M., Richman, J. A., Wolff, J. M., Burke, L. A. (2013). Bullying victimization among college students: negative consequences for alcohol use. *Journal of Addictive Diseases*, 32(4), 325–342. doi: 10.1080/10550887.2013.849971.
- Russell, D. (1996). UCLA Loneliness Scale (Version 3): Reliability, validity, and factor structure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 66(1), 20-40. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa6601_2
- Russell, D., Peplau, L. A., & Ferguson, M. L. (1978). Developing a measure of loneliness. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 42(3), 290-294. doi: 10.1207/s15327752jpa4203_11
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15(2), 112–120. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007>
- Salmivalli, C., Huttunen, A., & Lagerspetz, K. M. J. (1997). Peer networks and bullying in schools. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, 38(4), 305–312. doi: 10.1111/1467-9450.00040

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Salmivalli, C., & Kaukiainen, A. (2004). Female aggression' revisited: Variable- and person-centered approaches to studying gender differences in different types of aggression. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30(2), 158–163. doi: 10.1002/ab.20012.
- Salmivalli, C., Lagerspetz, K., Björkqvist, K., Österman, K., & Kaukiainen, A. (1996). Bullying as a group process: Participant roles and their relations to social status within the group. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 22(1), 1-15. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2009.08.007
- Salmivalli, C., & Nieminen, E. (2002). Proactive and reactive aggression among school bullies, victims, and bully-victims. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 28(1), 30-44.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.90004>
- Salmivalli, C., & Voeten, M. (2004). Connections between attitudes, group norms, and behaviour in bullying situations. *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 28(3), 246-258. doi: 10.1080/01650250344000488
- Salmon, G., James, A., & Smith, D. M. (1998). Bullying in schools: Self reported anxiety, depression, and self esteem in secondary school children. *British Medical Journal*, 317(7163), 924-925. doi: 10.1136/bmj.317.7163.924
- Sanchez, F. C., Romero, M. F., Navarro-Zaragoza, J., Ruiz Cabello, A. L., Frantzisko, O. R., & Maldonado, A. L. (2016). Prevalence and patterns of traditional bullying victimization and cyber-teasing among college population in Spain. *BMC Public Health*, 16(1), 176. doi: 10.1186/s12889-016- 2857-8.
- Sanders, C., & Phye, G. (2004). *Bullying: Implications for the classroom*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Scheithauer, H., Hayer, T., Petermann, F., & Jugert, G. (2006). Physical, verbal, and relational forms of bullying among German students: Age trends, gender differences, and correlates. *Aggressive Behavior: Official Journal of the International Society for Research on Aggression*, 32(3), 261-275.

<https://doi.org/10.1002/ab.20128>

Schwartz, D., McFadyen-Ketchum, S. A., Dodge, K. A., Pettit, G. S., & Bates, J. E. (1998). Peer group victimization as a predictor of children's behaviour problems at home and in school. *Development and Psychopathology*, 10(1), 87-99.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1017/S095457949800131X>

Seuntjens, T. G., Zeelenberg, M., Breugelmans, S. M., & van de Ven, N. (2015).

Defining greed. *British Journal of Psychology*, 106(3), 505-525. doi:

10.1111.bjop.12100

Sharpsteen, D. J. (1993). Romantic jealousy as an emotion concept: A prototype analysis. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10(1), 69-82.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0265407593101005>

Shaw, T., Dooley, J. J., Cross, D., Zubrick, S. R., Waters, S. (2013). The Forms of Bullying Scale (FBS): Validity and reliability estimates for a measure of bullying victimization and perpetration in adolescence. *Psychological Assessment*, 25(4), 1045-1057. doi: 10.1037/a0032955

Shepherd, H., & Levy Paluck, E. (2015). Stopping the drama: Gendered influence in a network field experiment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 78(2), 173-193. doi:

10.1177/0190272515581212

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Sheppard, B. H., Hartwick, J., & Warshaw, P. R. (1988). The theory of reasoned action:

A meta-analysis of past research with recommendations for modifications and future research. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 15(3), 325–343.

<https://doi.org/10.1086/209170>

Sigurdson, J. F., Wallander, J., & Sund, A. M. (2014). Is involvement in school bullying

associated with general health and psychosocial adjustment outcomes in adulthood. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 38(10), 1607-1617. doi:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chiabu.2014.06.001>

Slee, P. T. (1995). Bullying in the playground: The impact of inter-personal violence on

Australian children's perceptions of their play environment. *Children's Environments*, 12(3), 320–327.

Smith, P. K., Cowie, H., Ólafsson, R. F., & Liefhoghe, A. P. D. (2002). Definitions of

bullying: A comparison of terms used, and age and gender differences, in a fourteen-country international comparison. *Child Development*, 73(4), 1119-1133.

doi: 10.1111/1467-8624.00461

Smith, P. K., & Levan, S. (1995). Perceptions and experiences of bullying in younger

pupils. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 65(4), 489-500. doi:

10.1111/j.2044-8279.1995.tb01168.x

Smith, P. K., & Sharp, S. (1994), *School Bullying. Insights and Perspectives*, London,

Routledge.

Soto, C. J., & John, O. P. (2017). The next Big Five Inventory (BFI-2): Developing and

assessing a hierarchical model with 15 facets to enhance bandwidth, fidelity, and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

predictive power. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 113(1), 117-143.

doi: 10.1037/pspp0000096

Sourander, A., Helstelä, L., Helenius, H., & Piha, J. (2000). Persistence of bullying from childhood to adolescence - a longitudinal 8-year follow-up study. *Child Abuse & Neglect*, 24(7), 873-881. doi: 10.1016/S0145-2134(00)00146-0

Sourander, A., Jensen, P., Ronning, J. A., Niemela, S., Helenius, H., Sillanmaki, L.,... Almqvist, F. (2007). What is the early adulthood outcome of boys who bully or are bullied in childhood? The Finnish "From a Boy to a Man" study. *Pediatrics*, 120, 397-404. doi: 10.1542/peds.2006-2704.

Statistics Canada. (2013). *Table 105-1101 Mental health profile, Canadian Community Health Survey - Mental Health (CCHS), by age group and sex, Canada and provinces*. CAMSIM (database).

Steiger J. H., & Lind, J. M. (1980). Statistically based tests for the number of factors. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Psychometric Society, Iowa City, IA.

Steinberg, L., & Morris, A. S. (2001). Adolescent development. *Journal of Cognitive Education and Psychology*, 2(1), 55-87. doi: 10.1891/194589501787383444

Stellwagen, K. K., & Kerig, P. K. (2013). Ringleader bullying: Association with psychopathic narcissism and theory of mind among child psychiatric inpatients. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, 44(5), 612-620. doi: 10.1007/s10578-012-0355-5.

Storch, E. A., Bagner, D. M., Geffken, G. R., & Baumeister, A. L. (2004). Association between overt and relational aggression and psychosocial adjustment in

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

undergraduate college students. *Violence and Victims*, 19(6), 689-700.

<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/>

10.1891/vivi.19.6.689.66342

Storch, E. A., & Masia-Warner, C. (2004). The relationship of peer victimization to social anxiety and loneliness in adolescent females. *Journal of Adolescence*, 27(3), 351-362. doi: 10.1016/j.adolescence.2004.03.003

Storch, E. A., Werner, N. E., & Storch, J. B. (2003). Relational aggression and psychosocial adjustment in intercollegiate athletes. *Journal of Sport Behavior*, 26(2), 155-167.

Sutton, J., & Keogh, E. (2000). Social competition in school: Relationships with bullying, Machiavellianism and personality. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 70(3), 443-456. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1348/000709900158227>

Sutton, J., Smith, P. K., & Swettenham, J. (1999). Social cognition and bullying: Social inadequacy or skilled manipulation? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology*, 17(3), 435-450. <https://doi.org/10.1348/026151099165384>

Swearer, S. M. (2005). *The Bully Survey*. Unpublished manuscript. The University of Nebraska—Lincoln.

Swearer, S. M., & Cary, P. T. (2003). Perceptions and attitudes toward bullying in middle school youth: A developmental examination across the bully/victim continuum. *Journal of Applied School Psychology*, 19(2), 63-79.
doi: 10.1300/J008v19n02_05

Swearer, S., Siebecker, A. B., Johnsen-Frerichs, L. A., & Wang, C. (2010). Assessment of bullying/victimization: The problem of comparability across studies and

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- methodologies. In S. R. Jimerson, S. M. Swearer, & D. L. Espelage (Eds.), *Handbook of bullying in schools: An international perspective* (pp. 305–327). New York, NY: Routledge.
- Swearer, S. M., Turner, R. K., Givens, J. E., & Pollack, W. S. (2008). “You’re so gay!”: Do different forms of bullying matter for adolescent males? *School Psychology Review*, 37(2), 160-173.
- Tani, F., Greenman, P. S., Schneider, B. H., & Fregoso, M. (2003). Bullying and the Big Five: A study of childhood personality and participant role in bullying incidents. *School Psychology International*, 24(2), 131-146.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0143034303024002001>
- Thornberg, R. (2011). ‘She’s weird!’—The social construction of bullying in school: A review of qualitative research. *Children & Society*, 25(4), 258–267.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.2011.00374.x>
- Thunfors, P., & Cornell, D. (2008). The popularity of middle school bullies. *Journal of School Violence*, 7(1), 65-82, doi: 10.1300/J202v07n01_05
- Todd, J., & Mullan, B. (2011). Using the theory of planned behaviour and prototype willingness model to target binge drinking in female undergraduate university students. *Addictive Behaviors*, 36(10), 980-986. doi: 10.1016/j.addbeh.2011.05.010
- Tremblay, R. E. (2000). The development of aggressive behaviour during childhood: What have we learned in the past century? *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 24(2), 129–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/016502500383232>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., & Lösel, F. (2012). School bullying as a predictor of violence later in life: A systematic review and meta-analysis of prospective longitudinal studies. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 17*(5), 405-418. doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2012.05.002
- Ttofi, M. M., Farrington, D. P., Lösel, F., & Loeber, R. (2011). Do the victims of school bullies tend to become depressed later in life? A systematic review and meta-analysis of longitudinal studies. *Journal of Aggression, Conflict and Peace Research, 3*(2), 63-73. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/17596591111132873>
- Turner, I., Reynolds, K. J., Lee, E., Subasic, E., & Bromhead, D. (2014). Well-being, school climate, and the social identity process: A latent growth model study of bullying perpetration and peer victimization. *School Psychology Quarterly, 29*(3), 320-335. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/spq0000074>
- Underwood, M. K., Galen, B. R., & Paquette, J. A. (2001). Top ten challenges for understanding gender and aggression in children: Why can't we all just get along? *Social Development, 10*(2), 248-266. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/1467-9507.00162>
- Undheim, A. M., & Sund, A. M. (2010). Prevalence of bullying and aggressive behaviour and their relationship to mental health problems among 12- to 15-year-old Norwegian adolescents. *European Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 19*(11), 803-811. doi: 10.1007/s00787-010-0131-7
- Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2003). Bullying is power: Implications for school-based intervention strategies. *Journal of Applied School Psychology, 19*(2), 157-176. doi: 10.1300/J008v19n02_10

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Vaillancourt, T., McDougall, P., Hymel, S., Krygsman, A., Miller, J., Stiver, K., & Davis, C. (2008). Bullying: Are researchers and children/youth talking about the same thing? *International Journal of Behavioral Development*, 32(6), 486-495. doi: 10.1177/0165025408095553
- van den Putte, B. (1991). *20 years of the theory of reasoned action of Fishbein and Ajzen: A meta-analysis*. Unpublished manuscript. University of Amsterdam, Amsterdam, the Netherlands.
- van Geel, M., Goemans, A., Toprak, F., & Vedder, P. (2017). Which personality traits are related to traditional bullying and cyberbullying? A Study with the Big Five, Dark Triad and sadism. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 106, 231-235. doi: 10.1016/j.paid.2016.10.063
- Van Gool, E., Van Ouytsel, J., Ponnet, K., & Walrave, M. (2015). To share or not to share? Adolescents' self-disclosure about peer relationships on Facebook: An application of the Prototype Willingness Model. *Computers in Human Behaviour*, 44, 230-239. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2014.11.036>
- Vartia, M. A. (2001). Consequences of workplace bullying with respect to the well-being of its targets and the observers of bullying. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*. 27(1), 63-69. doi: 10.5271/sjweh.588
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., Winter, A. F. D., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2005). Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: A comparison of bullies, victims, Bully/Victims, and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology*, 41(4), 672-682. doi: 10.1037/0012-1649.41.4.672

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Verona, E., Sadeh, N., Case, S. M., Reed, A., & Bhattacharjee, A. (2008). Self-reported use of different forms of aggression in late adolescence and emerging adulthood. *Assessment, 15*(4), 493-510. doi: 10.1177/1073191108318250
- Vitiello, B., Behar, D., Hunt, J., Stoff, D., & Ricciuti, A. (1990). Subtyping aggression in children and adolescents. *Journal of Neuropsychiatry, 2*(2), 189–192.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1176/jnp.2.2.189>
- Volk, A. A., Dane, A. V., & Marini, Z. A. (2014). What is bullying? A theoretical redefinition. *Developmental Review, 34*(4), 327–343.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2014.09.001>
- Volk, A. A., Veenstra, R., & Espelage, D. L. (2017). So you want to study bullying? Recommendations to enhance the validity, transparency, and compatibility of bullying research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior, 36*, 34-43.
doi: 10.1016/j.avb.2017.07.003
- Walrave, M., Ponnet, K., Van Ouytsel, J., Van Gool, E., Heirman, W., & Verbeek, A. (2015). Whether or not to engage in sexting: Explaining adolescent sexting behaviour by applying the prototype willingness model. *Telematics and Informatics, 32*(4), 796-808. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.tele.2015.03.008>
- Ward, L. M., & Carlson, C. (2013). Modeling meanness: Associations between reality TV consumption, perceived realism, and adolescents' social aggression. *Media Psychology, 16*(4), 371-389. doi: 10.1080/15213269.2013.832627
- Warden, D., Cheyne, B., Christie, D., Fitzpatrick, H., & Reid, K. (2003). Assessing children's perceptions of prosocial and antisocial peer behaviour. *Educational Psychology, 23*(5), 547-567. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/0144341032000123796>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Psychology*, 54(6), 1063- 1070. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063>
- Werner, N. E., & Crick, N. R. (1999). Relational aggression and social-psychological adjustment in a college sample. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology*, 108(4), 615-623. doi: 10.1037/0021-843X.108.4.615
- Werner, N. E., & Hill, L. G. (2010). Individual and peer group normative beliefs about relational aggression. *Child Development*, 81(3), 826-836. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-8624.2010.01436.x
- Werner, N. E., & Nixon, C. L. (2005). Normative beliefs and relational aggression: An investigation of the cognitive bases of adolescent aggressive behaviour. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 34(3), 229-243. doi: 10.1007/s10964-005-4306-3
- Whitney, I. & Smith, P. K. (1993). A survey of the nature and extent of bullying in junior/middle and secondary schools. *Educational Research*, 35(1), 3-25. doi: 10.1080/0013188930350101
- Whitaker, L., Long, J., Petróczi, A., & Backhouse, S. H. (2014). Using the prototype willingness model to predict doping in sport. *Scandinavian Journal of Medicine & Science in Sports*, 24(5), e398-e405. doi:10.1111/sms.12148
- Wiklund, G., Ruchkin, V. V., Koposov, R. A., & af Klinteberg, B. (2014). Pro-bullying attitudes among incarcerated juvenile delinquents: Antisocial behavior, psychopathic tendencies and violent crime. *International Journal of Law and Psychiatry*, 37(3), 281-288. doi: 10.1016/j.ijlp.2013.11.019

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

- Williams, J. R., Fredland, N., Han, H., Campbell, J. C., & Kub, J. E. (2009). Relational aggression and adverse psychosocial and physical health symptoms among urban adolescents. *Public Health Nursing, 26*(6), 489-499. doi: 10.1111/j.1525-1446.2009.00808.x
- Williams, K. R., & Guerra, N. G. (2007). Prevalence and predictors of internet bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 41*(6), S14-S21.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.08.018>
- Wilson, C. J., & Nagy, M. S. (2017). The effects of personality on workplace bullying. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 20*(3), 123-147. doi: 10.1037/mgr0000054
- Wolke, D., Copeland, W. E., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2013). Impact of bullying in childhood on adult health, wealth, crime, and social outcomes. *Psychological Science, 24*(10), 1958–1970. doi: 10.1177/0956797613481608
- Zint, M. (2002). Comparing three attitude-behavior theories for predicting science teachers' intentions. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 39*(9), 819-844.
<http://dx.doi.org.proxy.library.carleton.ca/10.1002/tea.10047>

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix A Demographic Questionnaire

Please answer the following questions before we begin.

1. What is your age? _____ years
2. What is your sex or current gender?
 - ☐ Male
 - ☐ Female
 - ☐ TransMale/TransFemale
 - ☐ Genderqueer (don't subscribe to conventional gender distinctions)
 - ☐ Additional category _____
 - ☐ Decline to state
3. How would you best describe yourself in terms of ethnic or cultural heritage? Check any that apply.
 - ☐ Caucasian/White (e.g. British, German, Italian, Russian, Israeli, etc.)
 - ☐ Asian/Asian American/Asian Canadian (e.g., Chinese, Japanese, Taiwanese, Korean, East Indian, Pakistani, Sri Lankan, Indo-Guyanese, Cambodian, Indonesian, Laotian, Vietnamese, etc.)
 - ☐ African/African-American/African-Canadian (e.g., African-American, Caribbean, Haitian, Jamaican, Somali, Nigerian, African)
 - ☐ Hispanic/Latin American (e.g., Cuban, Puerto Rican, Salvadorian, Mexican, Argentinean, etc.)
 - ☐ Other (please specify) _____
4. Think of this scale as representing where people stand in Canada. At the **RIGHT** of the scale are people who are the best off- those who have the most money, the most education and the most respected jobs. At the **LEFT** are the people who are the worst off- who have the least money, least education, and the least respected jobs or no job. The further to the right you are on this scale, the closer you are to the people who are wealthy, educated, and with highly respected careers; the further to the left you are, the closer you are to the people with little money, education, or poorly respected jobs.

Where would you place yourself on this scale? Please place a large X.

0100
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|

Little Money
Little to No Education
Poorly Respected Jobs or Jobless

Most Money
Highly Educated
Highly Respected Jobs

Appendix B
Measure of Perceptions of Drama/Bullying

Perceptions of Drama

This is a study on the perceptions and attributes of forms of conflict in your peer group. We are interested in what you have in mind when you hear and use certain words. For example, if you were asked to list the characteristics of a person experiencing fear, you might write: possible danger occurs, attention is focused on the threat, heart beats wildly, the person runs as fast as they can. In this section of the study, we are not interested in attributes of fear but in attributes of *drama*. Imagine that you are explaining the word *drama* to someone who does not know what it is. *Here, we are referring to the type of drama that occurs in social interactions between friends, peer groups, or larger social networks, NOT the type of drama in theatrical performances or television/movie forms of entertainment.* Write down in the spaces provided all of the characteristics you think of when you hear the word *drama*. Remember that these attributes can be positive or negative. Include the obvious; however, try not to just free-associate. Use either single words or short phrases rather than full sentences. There are no right or wrong answers and your personal opinion is of particular interest to us.

List the features or characteristics of drama you can think of using a free-response format. Please provide one response per box below. Take as much time as you need. Next to each characteristic or attribute you describe, please rate how positive or negative it is on the scale provided by checking the appropriate box.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Characteristic/Attribute of Drama	Extremely Negative				Extremely Positive			
1.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
2.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
3.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
4.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
5.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
6.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
7.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
8.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
9.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
10.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
11.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
12.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
13.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
14.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
15.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
16.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
17.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
18.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
19.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
20.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	

Perceptions of Bullying

In this section of the study, we are not interested in attributes of drama but in attributes of *bullying*. Imagine that you are explaining the word *bullying* to someone who does not know what it is. Write down in the spaces provided all of the characteristics you think of when you hear the word *bullying*. Remember that these attributes can be positive or negative. Include the obvious; however, try not to just free-associate. Use either single words or short phrases rather than full sentences. There are no right or wrong answers and your personal opinion is of particular interest to us.

List the features or characteristics of bullying you can think of using a free-response format. Please provide one response per box below. Take as much time as you need. Next to each characteristic or attribute you describe, please rate how positive or negative it is on the scale provided by checking the appropriate box.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Characteristic/Attribute of Bullying	Extremely Negative				Extremely Positive			
1.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
2.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
3.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
4.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
5.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
6.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
7.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
8.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
9.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
10.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
11.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
12.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
13.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
14.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
15.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
16.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
17.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
18.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
19.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	
20.	-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3	

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix C Aggressive Behaviour

Please read each of the following statements carefully and rate on the scale below how often you have done each of these to others or how often they have been done to you **in the last month**.

	(1) Never	(2) Once	(3) More than once	(4) Often	(5) Very Often
1. I have hit or kicked others to hurt them	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Others have pushed or shoved me around	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Others have accused me of lying or cheating	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I have threatened to hurt others if they didn't do something	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I have called others names or made fun of them	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I have stolen things or purposely destroyed other's property	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I have spread rumours about others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Others have threatened me or tried to intimidate me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I have purposely left someone out of plans or activities	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I fight a lot	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Others have picked on or bullied me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Others have stolen my belongings or vandalized my property	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Others have intentionally left me out or excluded me from a group or activity	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Others have told lies about me or spread nasty rumours	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Appendix D
Measure for Centrality Rating of Drama/Bullying

Centrality Rating of Drama

In this section of the study we are interested in drama that occurs in friendships, peer groups, and larger social networks. In a previous study, we asked people to tell us their views of *drama*. Specifically, we asked them to “list the characteristics or attributes of *drama* that come to mind”. Below are the responses of some of the people in our earlier study. After you have read each one, please rate how central or important you think each of the characteristics are to the concept of *drama*.

Please rate each of the attributes listed below on how well it characterizes the experience of drama among adolescents. Rate each of the characteristics or attributes on a scale from 1 (*extremely poor feature of drama*) to 8 (*extremely good feature of drama*) based on how well it characterizes your perceptions of drama.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Characteristic/Attribute of Drama	Extremely Poor Feature				Extremely Good Feature			
1. (All blanks filled in with the 131 categories of drama from Study 1)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2. Lies	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3. Gossip	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4. Broken relationships	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5. Backstabbing	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Immaturity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7. Attention seeking	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. Exaggerating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. Exclusion/Isolation	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10. Misunderstanding	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11. Anger	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12. Jealousy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13. Argument	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14. Exciting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15. Fight	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
16. Lack of empathy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
17. Stress	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
18. In school	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
19. Friendships	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
20. Unnecessary etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

Centrality Rating of Bullying

In this section of the study, we are interested in bullying. In a previous study, we asked people to tell us their views of *bullying*. Specifically, we asked them to “list the characteristics or attributes of *bullying* that come to mind”. Below are the responses of some of the people in our earlier study. After you have read each one, please rate how central or important you think each of the characteristics are to the concept of *bullying*.

Please rate each of the attributes listed below on how well it characterizes the experience of bullying among adolescents. Rate each of the characteristics or attributes on a scale from 1 (*extremely poor feature of bullying*) to 8 (*extremely good feature of bullying*) based on how well it characterizes your perceptions of bullying.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Characteristic/Attribute of Bullying	Extremely Poor Feature				Extremely Good Feature			
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. (All blanks filled in with the 106 categories of bullying from Study 1)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
2. Intimidating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
3. Powerful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
4. Hurtful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
5. Abuse	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
6. Gossip	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
7. Isolating	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
8. Teasing/Picking on others	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
9. Insecurity	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
10. Emotional	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
11. Painful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
12. Aggressive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
13. Insulting	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
14. Unnecessary	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
15. Depressed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
16. Lack of empathy	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
17. Ganging up on people	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
18. Problematic	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
19. Hateful	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
20. Presence of bystanders etc.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix E Engagement in Bullying and Drama

Please read the following questions and rate how often you currently engage in each behaviour. Please respond to each question by rating how often you engage in these behaviours on a scale from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Everyday).

<i>Please rate how often you typically engage in the following behaviours:</i>	Not at all Everyday						
1. How often do you bully others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. How often do you create drama?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. How often are you mean or cruel to someone?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. How often do you engage in backstabbing?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. How often do you physically harm someone?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. How often do you exaggerate things?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. How often are you verbally abusive towards someone?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. How often do you lie to others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. How often do you harm someone?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. How often do you gossip about others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. How often do you tease or pick on others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. How often do you exclude others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix F
Bullying and Common Forms of Aggression

Behaviour	Definition
<i>Bullying</i>	Intentional and repeated acts of aggression involving a difference of power between the perpetrator and target (e.g., Olweus, 1978; Vaillancourt, Hymel & McDougall, 2003)
<i>Physical Aggression</i>	A direct physical assault or threat to cause physical harm to someone or something (e.g., hitting, pushing, shoving, kicking, biting, punching) (e.g., Coie & Dodge, 1998; Ostrov et al., 2008)
<i>Verbal Aggression</i>	A direct communicative assault or threat with the intent to cause harm to someone; may be direct (e.g., arguing, face to face name calling, nasty remarks, insults) or indirect (e.g., rumour spreading behind someone's back) (e.g., Coie & Dodge, 1998; Ostrov et al., 2008)
<i>Relational Aggression</i>	Causing harm or threatening to cause harm to another person by openly or covertly damaging their social relationships, friendships, or feelings of acceptance or inclusion in the peer group (e.g., rumour spreading, gossiping, social exclusion, rejection, telling lies). Relational aggression strongly resembles <i>social aggression</i> and <i>indirect aggression</i> . (e.g., Crick & Grotpeter, 1995; Nelson et al., 2005)
<i>Cyber Aggression</i>	Causing harm or threatening to cause harm to another person using online or social media sources (e.g., Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, instant messaging, text messaging, or email) and involves sending threatening or nasty messages, spreading rumours, excluding others, and sharing private or personal information or images of others (e.g., Menesini et al., 2012; Smith et al., 2008)
<i>Proactive Aggression</i>	Deliberate behaviour that is controlled by external reinforcements or the achievement of a desired goal (Crick & Dodge, 1996)
<i>Reactive Aggression</i>	Causing harm to another person as an angry, defensive response to frustration or provocation (Crick & Dodge, 1996)

Appendix G

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Relational Aggression

In the last year, I have...	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Very Often (5)
1. Threatened to end a friendship if someone didn't do what I wanted them to do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Not invited someone to a party even though you knew they wanted to come*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Threatened to exclude someone if they didn't do what I wanted them to do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Refused to listen to someone I was mad at	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Said "I'm not your friend" unless someone did what I wanted them to do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Gossiped about others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. Spread rumours or said something negative about someone who wasn't there at the time*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Made backbiting comments about others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. Broken confidences with others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. Criticized others' clothes and personality behind their back	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. Intentionally ignored others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. Deliberately left others out of the group	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. Socially ostracized or excluded others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. Turned people against each other	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. Become friends with another person for revenge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. Imitated others or talked about them behind their backs*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. Embarrassed others in public	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. Given others dirty looks*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. Rolled my eyes at someone*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

20. Said something hurtful that appeared rational when questioned	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. Put undue pressure on someone	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
22. Judged others in an unjust manner	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
23. Reduced other's opportunity to express their opinions	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
24. Openly dismissed the opinions of others	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
25. Influenced others by making them feel guilty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
26. Pretended to be hurt to make others feel bad	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
27. Stolen someone's boyfriend or girlfriend, or someone they like*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
28. Withdrawn attention or love from someone to get their attention or for revenge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
29. Threatened to break up with someone if they did not comply with my wishes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
30. Used infidelity as revenge	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
31. Flirted with another person to make someone feel jealous	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
32. Deliberately ignored someone in order to exclude, alienate, or embarrass them*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
33. Kept someone from being accepted by your group of friends*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
34. Given someone the "silent treatment"*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
35. Tried to get your friends to not like a particular person*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
36. Turned away or kept talking to someone else when someone came over to say something to you*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
37. Stopped talking when someone came over to you so they couldn't join the conversation*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
38. Glared or stared at someone meanly*	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
39. Acted "cold" or indifferent towards someone until I get what I want	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
40. Threatened to share private information about my friends with other people in order to get them to comply with my wishes	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
41. Sought revenge for not being invited to do	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

something with a group of people, by excluding those people from future activities					
42. Tried to damage a person's reputation by gossiping about him or her or by passing on negative information about him/her to other people	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix H Cyber Aggression

In the last year, how often have you...	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Very Often (5)
1. Posted something online about someone else to make others laugh?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Sent someone a message (online or via text) to make them angry or to make fun of them?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. Sent someone an email to make them angry or to make fun of them?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Posted something online to make someone angry or to make fun of them?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. Posted a picture or video of someone online without their permission?	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix I Bullying

In the last year...	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Very Often (5)
1. I teased someone in nasty ways.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I told secrets about someone to others to deliberately hurt him/her.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I hurt someone by trying to break up a friendship they had.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I deliberately frightened or threatened someone.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I deliberately physically hurt or ganged up on someone.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I called someone names in nasty ways.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I told someone I would not like them unless they did what I said.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. I deliberately damaged, destroyed, and/or stole someone's things.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I tried to hurt someone by leaving them out of a group or by not talking to them.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I told lies and/or spread false rumours about someone, to make their friends or others not like them.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix J **Physical and Verbal Aggression**

Please rate each of the following items in terms of how characteristic they are of you. Use the following scale for answering these items.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
extremely						extremely
uncharacteristic						characteristic
of me						of me

- 1) Once in a while I can't control the urge to strike another person.
- 2) Given enough provocation, I may hit another person.
- 3) If somebody hits me, I hit back.
- 4) I get into fights a little more than the average person.
- 5) If I have to resort to violence to protect my rights, I will.
- 6) There are people who pushed me so far that we came to blows.
- 7) I can think of no good reason for ever hitting a person.
- 8) I have threatened people I know.
- 9) I have become so mad that I have broken things.
- 10) I tell my friends openly when I disagree with them.
- 11) I often find myself disagreeing with people.
- 12) When people annoy me, I may tell them what I think of them.
- 13) I can't help getting into arguments when people disagree with me.
- 14) My friends say that I'm somewhat argumentative.

Appendix K
Drama

<i>Please rate how often you typically engage in the following behaviours:</i>	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Sometimes (3)	Often (4)	Very Often (5)	Nearly Every Day (6)	Every Day (7)
1. How often are you highly or overly emotional in social situations?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. How often do you gossip about others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. How often do you start or spread rumours about others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. How often do you backstab or talk about others behind their back?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. How often do you get in arguments with others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. How often do you get jealous of others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. How often do you create problems in social situations?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. How often do you manipulate or break relationships?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. How often do you overreact about things?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. How often do you tell lies?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. How often do you have a difference of opinion with someone else?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. How often do you exaggerate things?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13. How often do you fight with others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14. How often do you act in ways to seek attention from others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15. How often are you involved in or do you create conflict with others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16. How often do you exclude or isolate others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

17. How often are you involved in misunderstandings with others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18. How often do you create a negative social climate or negative social environment?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix L Proactive and Reactive Aggression

Instructions

There are times when most of us feel angry, or have done things we should not have done. Rate each of the items below by putting a circle around 1 (never), 2 (sometimes), or 3 (often). Do not spend a lot of time thinking about the items—just give your first response.

How often have you...	Never	Sometimes	Often
1. Yelled at others when they have annoyed you	1	2	3
2. Had fights with others to show who was on top	1	2	3
3. Reacted angrily when provoked by others	1	2	3
4. Taken things from other students	1	2	3
5. Gotten angry when frustrated	1	2	3
6. Vandalized something for fun	1	2	3
7. Had temper tantrums	1	2	3
8. Damaged things because you felt mad	1	2	3
9. Had a gang fight to be cool	1	2	3
10. Hurt others to win a game	1	2	3
11. Become angry or mad when you don't get your way	1	2	3
12. Used physical force to get others to do what you want	1	2	3
13. Gotten angry or mad when you lost a game	1	2	3
14. Gotten angry when others threatened you	1	2	3
15. Used force to obtain money or things from others	1	2	3
16. Felt better after hitting or yelling at someone	1	2	3
17. Threatened and bullied someone	1	2	3
18. Made obscene phone calls for fun	1	2	3
19. Hit others to defend yourself	1	2	3
20. Gotten others to gang up on someone else	1	2	3
21. Carried a weapon to use in a fight	1	2	3
22. Gotten angry or mad or hit others when teased	1	2	3
23. Yelled at others so they would do things for you	1	2	3

Appendix M
Need for Drama

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Somewhat Disagree	Neutral	Somewhat Agree	Agree	Strongly Agree
1. Sometimes it's fun to get people riled up	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Sometimes I say something bad about someone with the hope that they find out what I said	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I say or do things just to see how others react	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. Sometimes I play people against each other to get what I want	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I wait before speaking my mind	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I always speak my mind but pay for it later	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. It's hard for me to hold my opinion back	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. People who act like my friends have stabbed me in the back	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. People often talk about me behind my back	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I often wonder why such crazy things happen to me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. I feel like there are people in my life who are out to get me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. A lot of people have wronged me	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix N The Big Five Inventory–2

Here are a number of characteristics that may or may not apply to you. For example, do you agree that you are someone who *likes to spend time with others*? Please write a number next to each statement to indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with that statement.

1	2	3	4	5
Disagree strongly	Disagree a little	Neutral; no opinion	Agree a little	Agree strongly

I am someone who...

1. ___ Is outgoing, sociable.
2. ___ Is compassionate, has a soft heart.
3. ___ Tends to be disorganized.
4. ___ Is relaxed, handles stress well.
5. ___ Has few artistic interests.
6. ___ Has an assertive personality.
7. ___ Is respectful, treats others with respect.
8. ___ Tends to be lazy.
9. ___ Stays optimistic after experiencing a setback.
10. ___ Is curious about many different things.
11. ___ Rarely feels excited or eager.
12. ___ Tends to find fault with others.
13. ___ Is dependable, steady.
14. ___ Is moody, has up and down mood swings.
15. ___ Is inventive, finds clever ways to do things.
16. ___ Tends to be quiet.
17. ___ Feels little sympathy for others.
18. ___ Is systematic, likes to keep things in order.
19. ___ Can be tense.
20. ___ Is fascinated by art, music, or literature.
21. ___ Is dominant, acts as a leader.
22. ___ Starts arguments with others.
23. ___ Has difficulty getting started on tasks.
24. ___ Feels secure, comfortable with self.
25. ___ Avoids intellectual, philosophical discussions.
26. ___ Is less active than other people.
27. ___ Has a forgiving nature.
28. ___ Can be somewhat careless.
29. ___ Is emotionally stable, not easily upset.
30. ___ Has little creativity.
31. ___ Is sometimes shy, introverted.
32. ___ Is helpful and unselfish with others.

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

33. ___ Keeps things neat and tidy.
34. ___ Worries a lot.
35. ___ Values art and beauty.
36. ___ Finds it hard to influence people.
37. ___ Is sometimes rude to others.
38. ___ Is efficient, gets things done.
39. ___ Often feels sad.
40. ___ Is complex, a deep thinker.
41. ___ Is full of energy.
42. ___ Is suspicious of others' intentions.
43. ___ Is reliable, can always be counted on.
44. ___ Keeps their emotions under control.
45. ___ Has difficulty imagining things.
46. ___ Is talkative.
47. ___ Can be cold and uncaring.
48. ___ Leaves a mess, doesn't clean up.
49. ___ Rarely feels anxious or afraid.
50. ___ Thinks poetry and plays are boring.
51. ___ Prefers to have others take charge.
52. ___ Is polite, courteous to others.
53. ___ Is persistent, works until the task is finished.
54. ___ Tends to feel depressed, blue.
55. ___ Has little interest in abstract ideas.
56. ___ Shows a lot of enthusiasm.
57. ___ Assumes the best about people.
58. ___ Sometimes behaves irresponsibly.
59. ___ Is temperamental, gets emotional easily.
60. ___ Is original, comes up with new ideas.

Appendix O

The Dark Triad Scale - Narcissism and Machiavellianism

Rate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by placing a number from the following scale into the blank next to each item.

1-----2-----3-----4-----5
strongly disagree strongly agree

- _____ 1. I tend to want others to admire me
- _____ 2. I tend to want others to pay attention to me
- _____ 3. I tend to expect special favours from others
- _____ 4. I tend to seek prestige or status
- _____ 5. I have used deceit or lied to get my way
- _____ 6. I tend to manipulate others to get my way
- _____ 7. I have used flattery to get my way
- _____ 8. I tend to exploit others towards my own end

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix P Prototypical Images of Bullying

Think about the type of person your age who bullies others frequently. Indicate how well each of the adjectives below describes your image of this prototypical individual on a scale from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Very much).

Characteristics of Bullies <i>How well do the following adjectives describe someone who bullies others?</i>	Not at all Typical				Very Much Typical		
1. Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Confused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Dull	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Immature	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Considerate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Self-centered	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Careless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix Q
Prototypical Images of Drama

Think about the type of person your age who frequently engages in social drama. Indicate how well each of the adjectives below describes your image of this prototypical individual on a scale from 1 (Not at all) to 7 (Very much).

Characteristics of Social Dramatists <i>How well do the following adjectives describe someone who engages in social drama?</i>	Not at all Typical				Very Much Typical		
1. Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Confused	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3. Dull	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4. Popular	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5. Immature	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6. Considerate	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7. Self-confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8. Independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9. Self-centered	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10. Careless	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11. Unattractive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12. Cool	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix R Subjective Norms for Bullying and Drama

Please rate how much do you agree with each sentence:

	Strongly Disagree (0)	Disagree (1)	Agree (2)	Strongly Agree (3)
1. In general, it is wrong to bully others	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. It is OK to be mean to others	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. In general, it is OK to tease others	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. It is usually OK to cause harm to others	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. It is wrong to physically harm others	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. It is OK to verbally abuse others	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. In general, it is wrong to create social drama	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. It is OK to gossip about others	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. In general, it is OK to lie to others	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. It is usually OK to exaggerate things	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. It is wrong to exclude others	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. It is OK to engage in backstabbing about others	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix S Bullying Attitudes

Please rate how much do you agree with each sentence:

	Totally false	Sort of false	Both true and false	Sort of true	Totally true
1. Bullying is a problem for people my age.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. Bullies are popular.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I don't like bullies.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I would be friends with a person who bullied others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I think bullies should be punished.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. Bullies make people feel bad.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I feel sorry for people who are bullied.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Being bullied is no big deal.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix T Drama Attitudes

Please rate how much do you agree with each sentence:

	Totally false	Sort of false	Both true and false	Sort of true	Totally true
1. Drama is a problem for people my age.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. People who use social drama are popular.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I don't like people who use social drama.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I would be friends with a person who used social drama against others.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I think people who use social drama should be punished.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. People who use social drama make other people feel bad.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I feel sorry for people who are targeted by social drama.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. Being the target of social drama is no big deal.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix U Behavioural Expectations

Please report how much you expect to engage in these behaviours in the future on the scale from 1 (I definitely will not) to 7 (I definitely will).

	I definitely will not				I definitely will		
1. Do you think you will bully others in the future?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2. Do you think you will engage in social drama in the future?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix V Behavioural Willingness

Imagine yourself in the following situations and think about how you might respond in each situation.

<i>Suppose you were with some friends and one of them started <u>bullying</u> someone else. How likely is it that you would do <u>each</u> of the following:</i>	Not at all Likely	Very Likely
1. Join in bullying that individual.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
2. Tell your friends not to do that	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
3. Walk away or ignore what is happening	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
<i>Suppose you were with some friends and one of them started <u>creating social drama</u> in your peer group. How likely is it that you would do <u>each</u> of the following:</i>	Not at all Likely	Very Likely
1. Join in the social drama.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
2. Tell your friends not to do that.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	
3. Walk away or ignore what is happening.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	

Appendix W
Direct, Indirect and Total Effects of the Path Analysis for Bullying

<i>Endogenous Variables</i>	<i>Exogenous Variables</i>									
	Beta					B				
	Norms	Attitude	Images	Intent	Willing	Norms	Attitude	Images	Intent	Willing
Direct										
Intent	.04	.06	---	---	.70**	.11	.14	---	---	.82**
Willing	.21**	.30**	.09*	---	---	.43**	.54**	.11*	---	---
Bullying	---	---	---	.23*	.29**	---	---	---	.16*	.24**
Indirect										
Intent	.14**	.21**	.06*	---	---	.35**	.44**	.09*	---	---
Willing	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Bullying	.10**	.15**	.04*	---	.16*	.18**	.22**	.04*	---	.13*
Total										
Intent	.19**	.27**	.06*	---	.70**	.43**	.58**	.09*	---	.82**
Willing	.21**	.30**	.09*	---	---	.46**	.54**	.11*	---	---
Bullying	.10**	.15**	.04*	.23*	.45**	.18**	.22**	.04*	.16	.37**

** $p < .01$; * $p < .05$

Appendix X
Direct, Indirect and Total Effects of the Path Analysis for Drama

<i>Endogenous Variables</i>	<i>Exogenous Variables</i>									
	Beta					B				
	Norms	Attitude	Images	Intent	Willing	Norms	Attitude	Images	Intent	Willing
Direct										
Intent	.11*	.05	---	---	.61**	.37*	.12	---	---	.69**
Willing	.33**	.18**	.07			1.00**	.40**	.13		
Drama	---	---	---	.31**	.26**	---	---	---	.17**	.17**
Indirect										
Intent	.20**	.11**	.04	---	---	.69**	.27**	.09	---	---
Willing	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---	---
Drama	.18**	.10**	.03	---	.19**	.35**	.13**	.04	---	.12**
Total										
Intent	.30**	.16**	.04	---	.61**	1.06**	.40**	.09	---	.69**
Willing	.33**	.18**	.07	---	---	1.00**	.40**	.13	---	---
Drama	.18**	.10**	.03	.31**	.45**	.35**	.13**	.04	.17**	.29**

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix Y Life Satisfaction Questionnaire

Using the 1-7 scale below, indicate your agreement with each item by choosing the appropriate number for each line. Please be open and honest in your responding.

	Strongly Disagree (1)	Disagree (2)	Slightly Disagree (3)	Neither Agree nor Disagree (4)	Slightly Agree (5)	Agree (6)	Strongly Agree (7)
1. In most ways my life is close to my ideal.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. The conditions of my life are excellent.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I am satisfied with my life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. So far I have gotten the important things I want in life.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. If I could live my life over, I would change almost nothing.	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix Z Subjective Happiness Scale (SHS)

For each of the following statements and/or questions, please circle the point on the scale that you feel is most appropriate in describing you.

1. In general, I consider myself:						
1 not a very happy person	2	3	4	5	6	7 a very happy person
2. Compared to most of my peers, I consider myself:						
1 less happy	2	3	4	5	6	7 more happy
3. Some people are generally very happy. They enjoy life regardless of what is going on, getting the most out of everything. To what extent does this characterization describe you?						
1 not at all	2	3	4	5	6	7 a great deal
4. Some people are generally not very happy. Although they are not depressed, they never seem as happy as they might be. To what extent does this characterization describe you?						
1 not at all	2	3	4	5	6	7 a great deal

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix AA Positive and Negative Affect Schedule

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer in the space next to that word. Indicate to what extent you have felt this way **in the last month**.

	Very Slightly or Not at All (1)	A Little (2)	Moderately (3)	Quite a Bit (4)	Extremely (5)
Interested	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Distressed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Excited	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Upset	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Strong	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Guilty	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Scared	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Hostile	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Enthusiastic	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Proud	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Irritable	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Alert	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Ashamed	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Inspired	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Nervous	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Determined	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Attentive	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Jittery	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Active	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
Afraid	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix BB Strength and Difficulties Questionnaire (SDQ)

Instructions: For each item, please mark the box for Not True, Somewhat True or Certainly True. It would help if you answered all items as best you can even if you are not absolutely certain. Please give your answers on the basis of how things have been for you over the **last six months**.

	Not True	Somewhat True	Certainly True
1. I try to be nice to other people. I care about their feelings	☐	☐	☐
2. I am restless, I cannot stay still for long	☐	☐	☐
3. I get a lot of headaches, stomach-aches, or sickness	☐	☐	☐
4. I usually share with others, for example music, games, food	☐	☐	☐
5. I get very angry and often lose my temper	☐	☐	☐
6. I would rather be alone than with people of my age	☐	☐	☐
7. I usually do as I am told	☐	☐	☐
8. I worry a lot	☐	☐	☐
9. I am helpful if someone is hurt, upset or feeling ill	☐	☐	☐
10. I am constantly fidgeting or squirming	☐	☐	☐
11. I have one good friend or more	☐	☐	☐
12. I fight a lot. I can make other people do what I want	☐	☐	☐
13. I am often unhappy, depressed or tearful	☐	☐	☐
14. Other people my age generally like me	☐	☐	☐
15. I am easily distracted, I find it difficult to concentrate	☐	☐	☐
16. I am nervous in new situations. I easily lose confidence	☐	☐	☐
17. I am kind to younger children	☐	☐	☐
18. I am often accused of lying or cheating	☐	☐	☐
19. Other children or young people pick on me or bully me	☐	☐	☐
20. I often volunteer to help others (parents, teachers, children)	☐	☐	☐
21. I think before I do things	☐	☐	☐
22. I take things that are not mine from home, school or elsewhere	☐	☐	☐
23. I get along better with adults than with people my own age	☐	☐	☐
24. I have many fears, I am easily scared	☐	☐	☐
25. I finish the work I'm doing. My attention is good	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Emotional Problems Scale: Items 3, 8, 13, 16, 24

Conduct Problems Scale: Items 5, 7, 12, 18, 22

Hyperactivity Scale: Items 2, 10, 15, 21, 25

Peer Problems Scale: Items 6, 11, 14, 19, 23

Prosocial Scale: Items 1, 4, 9, 17, 20

Appendix CC
Loneliness

The following statements describe how people sometimes feel. For each statement, please indicate how often you feel the way described using the numbers below. There are no right or wrong answers.

	Never (1)	Rarely (2)	Some- times (3)	Often (4)
1. How often do you feel unhappy doing so many things alone?	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. How often do you feel you have nobody to talk to?	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. How often do you feel you cannot tolerate being so alone?	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. How often do you feel as if nobody really understands you?	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. How often do you find yourself waiting for people to call or write?	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. How often do you feel completely alone?	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. How often do you feel unable to reach out and communicate with those around you?	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. How often do you feel starved for company?	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. How often do you feel it is difficult for you to make friends?	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. How often do you feel shut out and excluded by others?	☐	☐	☐	☐

BULLYING AND DRAMA AMONG COLLEGE STUDENTS

Appendix DD Depression, Anxiety, and Stress

Please read each statement and select a number, which indicates how much the statement applied to you over the past month. There are no right or wrong answers.

0 = Did not apply to me at all

1 = Applied to me to some degree or for some of the time

2 = Applied to me to a considerable degree or for a good part of time

3 = Applied to me very much or most of the time

	0	1	2	3
1. I found it hard to 'wind down' (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐
2. I was aware of dryness of my mouth (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐
3. I couldn't seem to experience any positive feelings at all (D)	☐	☐	☐	☐
4. I experienced breathing difficulty (e.g., breathlessness or excessively rapid breathing in the absence of physical exertion) (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐
5. I found it difficult to work up the initiative to do things (D)	☐	☐	☐	☐
6. I tend to over-react to situations (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐
7. I experienced trembling (e.g. in the hands) (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐
8. I felt that I was using a lot of nervous energy (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐
9. I was worried about situations in which I might panic and make a fool of myself (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐
10. I felt that I had nothing to look forward to (D)	☐	☐	☐	☐
11. I found myself getting agitated (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐
12. I found it difficult to relax (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐
13. I felt down-hearted and blue (D)	☐	☐	☐	☐
14. I was intolerant of anything that kept me from getting on with what I was doing (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐
15. I felt I was close to panic (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐
16. I was unable to become enthusiastic about anything (D)	☐	☐	☐	☐
17. I felt I wasn't worth much as a person (D)	☐	☐	☐	☐
18. I felt that I was rather touchy (S)	☐	☐	☐	☐
19. I was aware of the action of my heart in the absence of physical exertion (e.g., sense of heart rate increase, heart 'missing a beat') (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐
20. I felt scared without any good reason (A)	☐	☐	☐	☐
21. I felt that life was meaningless (D)	☐	☐	☐	☐