

In presenting this thesis in partial fulfillment of the requirements for an advanced degree at Idaho State University, I agree that the Library shall make it freely available for inspection. I further state that permission for extensive copying of my thesis for scholarly purposes may be granted by the Dean of the Graduate School, Dean of my academic division, or by the University Librarian. It is understood that any copying or publication of this thesis for financial gain shall not be allowed without my written permission.

Signature _____

Date _____

Copyright (2022) Sarah Liftawi

Does Participation in Extra-Curricular School Activities Prevent Bullying Victimization?

A Dueling Theoretical Approach

by

Sarah Liftawi

A thesis

submitted in partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree of

Master of Arts in Sociology

Idaho State University

Spring 2022

To the Graduate Faculty:

The members of the committee appointed to examine the thesis of SARAH LIFTAWI find it satisfactory and recommend that it be accepted.

Dr. Tony Hoskin,
Major Advisor

Dr. Gesine Hearn,
Committee Member

Dr. Shannon Lynch,
Graduate Faculty Representative

Table of Contents

List of Tables.....	vi
List of Abbreviations.....	vii
Abstract.....	vii
Chapter I: Introduction.....	1
Chapter II: Literature Review.....	5
Definitions.....	5
Justification of Measures.....	6
Review of Relevant Literature.....	14
Chapter III: Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses.....	17
Routine Activity Theory.....	17
Social Exchange Theory.....	18
Dueling Theoretical Framework.....	20
Dueling Hypotheses.....	22
Intersectionality.....	23
Chapter IV: Research Methods.....	24
Measures.....	24
Participants.....	25
Statistical Analysis.....	25
Chapter V: Results.....	28

Frequency and Descriptive Statistics.....	28
Bivariate Correlation Statistics.....	29
Physical Bullying.....	30
Verbal Bullying.....	31
Relational Bullying.....	32
Any Form of Bullying.....	34
Sex and Race Interaction.....	34
Chapter VI: Discussion.....	36
Theoretical Support.....	36
Different Forms of Bullying.....	38
Research Limitations.....	39
Theoretical Implications.....	41
Policy Implications.....	42
Chapter VII: Conclusion.....	44
Appendix.....	58

List of Tables

Table 1 Descriptive and Frequency Statistics for Nominal Variables.....	27
Table 2 Bivariate Correlation Matrix.....	28
Table 3 Multivariate Logistic Regression Statistics for Physical Bullying.....	29
Table 4 Multivariate Logistic Regression Statistics for Verbal Bullying.....	30
Table 5 Multivariate Logistic Regression Statistics for Relational Bullying.....	31
Table 6 Multivariate Logistic Regression Statistics for Any Bullying Victimization.....	32
Table 7 Contingency Table Displaying Frequency of Experiencing Any Bullying (Sex and Race).....	33

List of Abbreviations

EC	Extra-Curricular
NCVS	National Crime Victimization Survey
RAT	Routine Activity Theory
SCS	School Crime Supplement
SET	Social Exchange Theory

Does Participation in Extra-Curricular School Activities Prevent Bullying Victimization?

A Dueling Theoretical Approach

Thesis Abstract—Idaho State University (2022)

Despite decades of extensive research focused on bullying behaviors and research-based bullying prevention programs, bullying still haunts the hallways of schools. The purpose of this research is to extend the literature on bullying victimization by utilizing a unique dueling theory approach, comparing the predictions of *routine activity theory* (RAT) and *social exchange theory* (SET). The goal is to analyze whether we can predict bullying victimization through involvement in extra-curricular activities as well as status-related demographic variables. This quantitative analysis utilizes secondary data from the nation's leading victimization survey, the National Crime Victimization Survey – School Crime Supplement (NCVS-SCS). The results indicate that involvement in performing arts increased the risk of experiencing any form of bullying. Involvement in any other activity did not impact risk suggesting performing arts involvement creates a unique risk compared to other activities. Due to the varied results, the predictions of RAT and SET are not supported.

Key Words: Bullying; Victimization; Extra-Curricular; Status; School; Youth

Does Participation in Extra-Curricular School Activities Prevent Bullying Victimization?

A Dueling Theoretical Approach

Chapter I: Introduction

Bullying has haunted the hallways of schools across the globe for centuries. While some argue bullying is an inevitable part of growing up with negative effects only occurring at the time of the incident, empirical data from countless studies examining the effects of bullying, indicate consequences that can last up to a lifetime (Kim and Leventhal, 2008; Nansel et al., 2001; Vaillancourt, Hymel and McDougall, 2013). The negative impacts of bullying affect not only victims, but also the families of victims, perpetrators and their families, bystanders, and the community. Short-term effects of bullying may include physical injuries, anxiety, stomach aches, drop in academic performance/interest, or bedwetting while long-term effects of bullying may include posttraumatic stress, increased risk for victimization later in life, substance abuse, and suicide (Kim and Leventhal, 2008; Nansen et al., 2001; Ybarra et al., 2014). The negative impacts associated with bullying have drawn the interest of researchers as a means of developing bullying prevention programs to decrease the associated consequences of bullying.

If the current bullying prevention programs are effective, then there should be a decrease in the rate of bullying victimization among *all* youth. While the rate of bullying victimization is decreasing for some groups (i.e., rate of physical bullying decreasing among boys), the rate of victimization is remaining stable, or even increasing, for other populations (i.e., rate of girl's overall victimization is increasing) (Kennedy, 2021). The effectiveness of bullying prevention programs not being universal suggests that researchers need to utilize novel methods of examining bullying victimization, risk factors, and prevention strategies in order improve bullying prevention efforts. The purpose of this thesis is to add to the existing literature on bullying victimization by examining the relationship between involvement in extra-curricular (EC) activities at school (i.e., sports, spirit group, performing arts, student government, and academic clubs) and risk of bullying victimization,

as well as examining the impact of youth social status, measured by various demographic variables (i.e., age, income, race, ethnicity, and gender), on one's risk of being bullied.

EC activities are defined as activities that take place outside of school hours, involve adult supervision, and are both organized and structured (Oberle et al., 2019). The most popular EC activity among American youth is sports (Veliz et al., 2019). Other activities relate to the arts, like theater, band, or choir; spirit groups like cheer or drill team; leadership like student government; or even academic clubs like mathletes or poetry writing. The many academic and social benefits of EC activities for the students involved are well documented and supported in the literature (Deutsch et al., 2017). Social benefits for students involved in EC activities include an increased feeling of connectedness with peers, ability to create more friendships, confidence, and a stronger understanding of teamwork (Aumètre & Poulin, 2018; Deutsch et al., 2017; Mahoney et al., 2005).

The academic and social benefits of EC activity involvement are all salient in the successful social development for youth (Oberle et al., 2019). In addition to the various social benefits of EC activity involvement, youth involved in these activities tend to perform better academically and are typically presented with more collegiate opportunities than those not involved in EC activities (Crosnoe et al., 2015; Hee Im et al., 2016; Moriana et al., 2006; Seow and Pan, 2014). While the benefits of involvement in EC activities are well documented, some research does indicate that involvement in certain activities might create an increased risk to students in other areas. For example, participation in varsity level sports is associated with having an increased risk of using electric cigarettes and binge drinking (Williams et al., 2020).

Research examining the impact of EC activity involvement on one's risk of being bullied is limited. The research that is available presents mixed findings in regard to type of EC activity (i.e., sports vs club) and type of student (i.e., male athlete vs female athlete) when it comes to experiencing an increased risk of victimization (Choi et al., 2016; Choi et al., 2019; Hart et al., 2013; Volk & Lagzdins, 2009). The literature review below presents a detailed breakdown of the contradicting research in this area. As an effort to better understand the relationship between EC

activity involvement and risk of being bullied, this thesis examined the risk that involvement in each EC activity poses independently of other activities and independently of the student's demographic variables.

This thesis takes a unique approach to examining the relationship between bullying victimization and EC activity involvement by utilizing a dueling theoretical framework approach. The predictions made by a popular and frequently cited criminological theory, *routine activity theory* (RAT), and a theory commonly used for workplace bullying but used far less for youth bullying, *social exchange theory* (SET), result in opposing hypotheses relating to the outcome of the predictor variables and risk of being bullied. While RAT considers the context in which deviant behavior occurs, SET considers the status of the individual actors within an interaction, like bullying. Following the two different theoretical frameworks, RAT predicts that involvement in EC activities would increase one's risk of being bullied while SET predicts that involvement would decrease one's risk of being bullied. The two theories also make several opposing predictions in regard to a student's social status related demographic factors impacting their risk of bullying victimization. The theoretical section below will present a specific breakdown of the competing theories and their framework-based opposing hypotheses.

The purpose of this thesis is to answer two main research questions including: 1) does participation in EC activities impact one's risk of being bullied, and 2) which theory's framework, RAT or SET, creates more accurate hypotheses regarding the predictor variables and risk of being bullied? Additional sub questions will be examined including which type of bullying (i.e., physical, verbal, or relational) can be better predicted using these predictor variables, whether demographic variables or EC involvement better predict risk of being bullied, and how the interaction between race and gender impact one's risk of being bullied, following an intersectionality theoretical framework.

An important aspect of this research is that rather than including demographic factors simply as control variables, this research included social status related demographic variables as independent predictor variables. This decision was made intentionally, as previous research on

bullying victimization suggests that one's social status, which is often determined by their demographic characteristics, impacts their risk of being bullied. Thus, in addition to examining the impact that involvement in EC activities has on one's risk of being bullied, this thesis also examined the impact of certain demographic factors (i.e., age, gender, race, ethnicity, and income) on risk of being bullied. In order to examine these research questions, this study utilized data from the 2017 National Crime Victimization Survey - School Crime Supplement (NCVS – SCS) to estimate eight multivariate logistic regression models. The following sections provide research-based support for including status related demographic factors as well as involvement in EC activities as predictors of bullying victimization.

Chapter II: Literature Review

Definitions of Bullying and Status

Bullying Definition

The definition of bullying is not unanimously agreed upon by researchers, however most definitions include five important elements: 1) aggressive behavior, 2) goal-oriented behavior, 3) harm, 4) repetition, and 5) power imbalance (Gibson et al., 2015; Smith, 2016; Volk et al., 2014). The integrated effect of these five elements separate bullying behavior from other aggressive behaviors like teasing, fighting, or generic youth victimization. Bullying can be categorized into various forms including physical (e.g., pushing, kicking, spitting), verbal (e.g., name-calling, insulting), relational (e.g., spreading rumors, social isolation), or cyber (e.g., verbal or relational bullying occurring online or by text) (Mcvean, 2017). The various forms of bullying have similar, but more importantly, unique characteristics. For example, according to one study, boys were statistically more likely to be involved in physical bullying in comparison to girls; however, not statistically more likely to be involved in verbal or relational bullying (McVean, 2017). As such, one of the goals of this thesis is to examine the role youth status plays in predicting risk of victimization for the various forms of bullying.

Status Definition

Sociologists have been interested in the effect one's status has on their interactions, opportunities, and behaviors for decades. While status is generally defined as one's position relative to others within a group or society, there are various operational definitions of one's status (Vaillancourt et al., 2013). For example, one can have achieved status with which they may choose to earn through achievements, skill, or merit (i.e., job title) compared to ascribed status which one has no choice over and cannot be earned but rather is determined at birth (i.e., race) (Foladare, 1969). The present research aims to assess both ascribed and achieved status of youth and how that youth status impacts their risk of being bullied. Demographic characteristics are one of the measures used in this thesis to examine the relationship between youth status and the risk of being bullied.

Research on Demographic Characteristics as Measures of Status

Gender and Status

Gender norms are behaviors, fashion preferences, and/or lifestyles individuals develop based on societal expectations of their assigned sex. Numerous academic researchers believe that gender norms heavily contribute to the imbalance of power and status among sexes, favoring men as the gender with the most power, status, and thus, influence (Berdahl, 2007; Malhotra et al., 2019; Ridgeway, 2001; Vyas & Heise, 2016). In American society, gender norms begin prior to a fetus leaving the womb in the form of gender reveal parties, nursery décor, and old wives' tales. These norms intensify as children enter grade school and begin socializing with other peers, entering various stages of puberty, and developing a sense of identity (Hill & Lynch, 1983). Society's striking history of inequality in status among genders becomes apparent when considering the number of changes in laws, company policy, academic curricula, family structure, and societal views that have occurred in recent years as an attempt to create a more equal playing field (Fiske, 1998; Rashotte & Webster, 2005).

Developed by Robert Connell (1987), the *theory of gender and power* suggests three major social structures that emphasize the inequity and power imbalance between genders including the division of labor, division of power, and structure of cathexis. Within each structure, women experience a risk for vulnerability due in part to gender-based inequality of status (Wingood & DiClemente, 2002). Additional research findings support the argument that there is an imbalance of status among genders. McClean et al. (2018) studied the mediating effect gender has on voice type and status in relation to leadership, and reported men to be more likely to benefit by speaking in a "promotive" voice within a group setting, in comparison to women who showed no benefit from speaking in a "promotive" voice. Amanatullah and Tinsley (2013) reported that results from their study on the relationship between gender and status in regard to workplace negotiations indicated that women received more financial and social backlash when making negotiations compared to men. Results from the aforementioned studies provide empirical evidence that there is a status

difference between adult men and women; however, less research has focused on the role status plays on gender among youth.

Children often use social characteristics, like race and gender, to make sense of their own, and others' attributes and relationships. Research examining children's use of social categories during development indicate that gender is a highly informative social characteristic, suggesting that children likely associate gender and status (Shutts et al., 2013). Research on children's judgement of job status provides evidence of that association. Liben, Bigler, and Krogh (2001) examined beliefs about job status and gender from a sample of six to 11-year-old children. Results their study indicated that among familiar occupations (i.e., banker, farmer, scientist, librarian, nurse, secretary etc.) the occupations that are viewed by the culture as masculine (banker, farmer, scientists) were typically determined to be higher status jobs compared to the occupations viewed by the culture as being feminine (librarian, nurse, secretary). Other research examining the link between status and social categories among youth indicated that while children displayed a status awareness between men and women, it did not impact their social preferences of the gender of the peers they associate with; however, viewing race as a measure of status did indicate racial preference, especially among racial-ethnic minority children (Mandalaywala et al., 2020). This research suggests that race matters more than gender for children in terms of status.

Research on Race/Ethnicity and Status

Racial prejudices, stereotypes, and assumptions have existed within American society since the development of the country. These racial beliefs have contributed to generating the racial and ethical status-hierarchy present in the U.S., today which distinguishes White, non-Hispanic individuals at the top of the chain. Various research studies involving the effect race has on one's status support this argument. Dupree et al (2021), examined three different measures of race-status associations (job-based, rank-based, attribute-based) among nine American, all White or all Black samples. Results indicated that among all nine samples, race-status associations scores were higher for White individuals and lower for Black individuals (Dupree et al., 2021). Another study assessing

the relationship between academic stereotypes among youth and race found that both White and Black students viewed White students as being better in the area of academics compared to Black students (Rowley et al., 2007). Results from this study support the argument that White individuals are often viewed as having a higher social status compared to individuals of other races, particularly historically marginalized races. These social stereotypes begin developing early among youth and exist within the school system.

In the United States, children as young as six years old expect Black individuals to have a lower status occupation in comparison to White individuals (Bigler et al., 2003). In one study, children were shown novel, identical occupations with either a Black or White individual depicted as working that job. Results indicated that when Black individuals were depicted doing the novel occupation children rated it as being a lower status job compared to when White individuals were depicted doing an identical job, suggesting a causal influence of the worker's race on the child's judgement of occupational status. In terms of economic resources, children as young as five years old, predict White adults to have nicer houses and more possessions than Black adults (Elenbaas & Killen, 2016). Other research indicates that children will use high-wealth cues to guide their assessments made of peers, and both Black and White students associate high-wealth cues with White faces more often than with Black faces (Shutts et al., 2016). While research indicates both gender and race as being predictors of one's social status, it is likely the interaction between gender and race that provides a stronger indication of status (Crenshaw, 1989).

Intersectionality: Interaction Between Race and Gender Impacting Status

The theory of *intersectionality* was developed by leading American scholar, Kimberlé Crenshaw in 1989. According to Crenshaw, traditional feminists' policies and agendas exclude Black women, as they neglect to consider the unique discrimination they experience having multiple marginalized identities. Crenshaw argues the intersection between gender and race has a greater impact than the sum of its two parts. Demographic characteristics like gender and race are often used when examining victimization rates. The examination of the *interaction* between gender

and race impacting one's risk of victimization is used less frequently. A common critique of quantitative research is that measures of status are only assessed independently of one another. When intersectionality is used, research indicates that the interaction between race and gender impacts both one's status and their daily routine activities (Blasdell, 2015; Penner & Saperstein, 2013). For example, while men have more status over women, Black men, in general, have less status than White men. In regard to daily routine, women tend to rely on public transportation to get to work more than men, yet Black women rely on public transportation more than White women (Anderson, 2016; US Census Bureau, 2019).

Criminological researcher Raleigh Blasdell (2015) examined the intersection of race, gender, and social class with criminal offending and victimization. Blasdell argues role expectations and societal constraints that impact marginalized identities also influence their routine activities and thus, their exposure to likely offenders. As such, it is key for researchers using a RAT framework to assess the interaction of demographic characteristics, like race and sex, to find more subtle interactions. This thesis will analyze the interaction of gender and race when predicting bullying victimization by using intersectionality (Crenshaw, 1989). The purpose of utilizing an intersectionality approach in this thesis is to better understand the risk of bullying victimization resulting from the intersection of one's race and gender rather than assessing the independent effect these demographic variables have on risk. An interactional analysis will be conducted to examine the difference in risk experienced by Black women, Black men, White women, and White men. This thesis will also examine age as a measure of status.

Research on Age and Status

As children mature, they are more equipped to define and recognize the existence of social stratification (Goodman et al., 2001). Research concludes that around the time of middle school when kids are maturing and becoming more aware of social status, they may engage in behaviors to increase their own status, such as bullying (Pouwels et al., 2018a; Pouwels et al., 2018b). Moreover, since older students are more aware of their own social status, they are often better at adjusting

situational factors that affect their social status. For example, high school students often have a stronger preference of the brand of clothing they wear compared to younger students because they are more aware of the price of the clothing, and as such, are aware that wearing more expensive brands is an indication of higher income and thus, a higher social status (Badaoui et al., 2018). Older students are more efficient at recognizing the effect economic status has on social status compared to younger students (Manstead, 2018). Nonetheless, determining social status among juveniles based on age is not as clear cut as determining social status based on race, gender, or income.

The American public education system utilizes an age-based grade level system (Makel et al., 2016). While students tend to engage with peers of different race/ethnicity and gender, they still typically engage with similarly aged students during school hours. Students are not likely to use age as an indication of status; instead, children often correlate level of status with social factors that occur as one ages. Popularity among youth becomes more important as they age, and youth engage in more socially undesirable behaviors (i.e., bullying perpetration or drinking) in an effort to increase their social status (Dumas et al., 2019). The popularity associated with different genders, and how that popularity is assigned changes as youth age (Thirer & Wright, 1985). For example, Thirer and Wright (1985) concluded based on the results of their research on juvenile popularity measures, that while athletic involvement is an important element of popularity among young girls, older girls tend to value being the leader of a group, for popularity, more than athletic participation. Results from research on status and age suggest that older youth are more aware of their status and means to improve their status. As such, this may provide protection against bullying behaviors.

Far fewer studies have examined age as a measure of status compared to measures like gender, race, and income. However, based on the literature that does exist on age and status, it is reasonable to assume there is a relationship between a student's age and their social status. Previous research on status and age suggest it is likely that younger students will have an increased risk of any form of bullying victimization compared to older students; however, since previous research findings are limited and not universal, more research is needed to evaluate how age

impacts youth status and bullying victimization risk. This thesis utilizes age as a measure of status when examining risk of bullying victimization. Income will also be examined as a measure of status.

Research on Income and Status

Research concludes that income is strongly correlated with social status; where, as one makes more money, they tend to have a higher social status (Paskov et al., 2017). Further, individuals become aware of the relationship between income and status during their youth regardless of not having any control of their family's income (Manstead, 2018). As such, research has indicated a positive correlation between parental economic status and youth social status (Cardel et al., 2018). Moreover, research suggests low parental income is predictive of youth depression, increased displays of externalizing behaviors, and poor academic performance (Devenish et al., 2017).

Youth social status in particular can be affected by parental income in various ways like a student being unable to participate in certain events (i.e., dances or athletic events), clubs, sports, or advanced placement courses due to financial inability (Conger et al., 2020; Post et al., 2018). Financial inability to participate in social events may have damaging effects to youth status and as a result, increase the risk of bullying victimization to youth coming from low income homes. The proposed research will utilize the evidence provided within the literature to operationalize demographic characteristics as measures of youth status. Similarly, the following literature will provide structure for operationalizing EC school activity involvement as a measure of status.

EC Activity Involvement as a Measure of Status

Prior to the 20th century, many educators were critical of student involvement in EC activities because they believed it would distract students from their academic endeavors, which is the main priority of the educational institution (Burnett, 2000). However, research in this area has quieted critics by providing numerous examples of how student involvement in EC school activities is beneficial to the student, school, and community. The following two sections describe previous research regarding youth involvement in EC activities and social status.

Sport Involvement as a Measure of Status

Sport involvement is often associated with youth social status, particularly among boys (Chase & Dummer, 1993). However, in one study, students involved in sports were more likely to report higher levels of self-perceived and peer-perceived popularity in comparison to their peers who are not involved in sports, even when controlling for grade, gender, and race (Shakib et al., 2011). One argument as to why students who are involved in school sports are frequently perceived as having a higher social status in comparison to students not involved in school sports, is due to the higher income of the student's family that is typically required for students to afford the costs necessary for participation (Cvetković et al., 2014). A research study examining youth athletes ages eight to 16 years old produced results suggesting a statistically significant under representation of working-class children across four different types of sports (i.e., tennis, swimming, football, gymnastics) in comparison to middle-class and above children (Rowley & Graham, 1999). Another explanation for the relationship between youth status and participation in sports, may involve the association between athletic training and physical appearance. More specifically, youth who participate in school sports report higher levels of physical activity (Lee et al., 2018) which is typically correlated with a fit physique - a socially desirable characteristic of physical appearance among Western societies, particularly for girls (de Bruyn & Cillessen, 2006; Weedon and Sabini, 2011). Attractiveness is a strong indicator of social status among girls.

An important factor when considering participation in youth sports as a measure of status is examining the diversity and demographics of the students involved. Youth sports participation in the United States are dominated by non-Hispanic White students (Bopp et al., 2017; Meier et al., 2018). Ohio State University (2020) reports only 16% of all boy athletes and 15% of all girl athletes in the US are African-American. Likewise, 15% of boy athletes and 17% of girl athletes are Hispanic while only 12% of boy athletes and 8% of girl athletes are Asian. Several schools offer fewer opportunities available for girls resulting in a lower participation rate of girls in comparison to boys in youth sports. Minority girls are the least probable group of students to participate in youth sports. Moreover,

participating in organized sports is becoming more unattainable for families with a low income (Pandya, 2021). Barriers for participation in youth sports become exacerbated when students belong to multiple demographics facing challenges in participation. The demographic statistics for involvement in youth sports highlight the potential status disparities which may arise from participants. This thesis will also examine non-athletic EC activities.

Other EC Activities as Measures of Status

Youth involvement in other EC school activities, such as performing arts, academic clubs, or student government appear less frequently within the literature in comparison to sports; however, these other activities are still important determinants of youth status. Similar to sport involvement, involvement in other school activities require a certain level of financial capability (Snellman et al., 2015). A study assessing the relationship between EC activities and economic status concluded that less than 10% of their sample who participated in EC activities (i.e., sports, cheer, band, academic clubs, theater, student government, or yearbook) came from a family that received food stamps (White & Gager, 2007). Authors of the study argue that students who have lower levels of economic status will likely gain less social capital compared to their peers with higher levels of economic status due to financial inability to participate in EC activities.

Similar to sports, the relationship between EC activity involvement and youth status may be explained by the demographic characteristics of the students participating. For example, white, middle-class, and non-Hispanic individuals were the most represented groups of participants involved in a variety of EC activities in one sample (42%, 70%, and 98%; respectively) (White & Gager, 2007). Another study interested in the association between EC school activity involvement and youth status argue that being involved in these activities often result in friendships with other students also involved in these activities and thus, friendships with other youth who also have a high level of social status deriving from their EC involvement (Eccles & Barber, 1999). Kids having strong connections with other kids who have perceived social status increases their own status.

The level of status obtained by participating in EC school activities is not universal among different activities. In the U.S., sports are largely considered the most popular EC activity in terms of participation rates. More students, both boys and girls, participate in school sports than any other - EC activity offered at school (Veliz et al., 2019). Since the desirability for participating in sports is higher than participating in other activities, it is reasonable to assume the students who do participate in sports have a higher social status than students who participate in less desirable activities. Moreover, research indicated that student athletes are involved in other EC activities more than non-athletes (Veliz et al., 2019). More participation in school activities likely results in students engaging with more peers giving them the opportunity to make more friends and build their peer support. Students with more friends tend to have more social status than students with less friends. The research on popularity of different school activities provides support that certain EC activities may result in more social status than others. This thesis utilizes evidence provided within the literature to justify operationalizing EC school activity involvement as a measure of youth status. This research contributes to the existing literature by looking at participation in various EC activities independently of one another and of the participants demographics, in relation to risk of various forms of bullying victimization. Moreover, this research will examine the participation in EC activities in terms of being a routine activity, as it related to bullying risk. Refer to the theoretical framework section of this thesis for more information regarding routine activities.

Previous Research on Status and Bullying Victimization

According to the definition of bullying, there must be a power imbalance favoring the perpetrator (Gibson et al., 2015; Smith, 2016; Volk et al., 2014). As a result, several researchers have studied the relationship between status and bullying since one's status is often a contributing factor to a power imbalance. Status is one of the strongest predictions for youth bullying victimization, where youth with low social status have a higher risk of being victimized by a bully compared to youth with high social status (Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention, 2013; Pouwels et al., 2018b). The relationship between status and bullying victimization remains fairly stable

throughout all grades (Pouwels et al., 2018b). Measures of youth status like peer acceptance and attractiveness are more accurate predictors of bullying victimization for girls, while peer rejection and leadership are more accurate predictors of bullying victimization for males (Closson, 2009; Sentse et al., 2015). Furthermore, research suggests that individuals who have low social status as a result of coming from a low-income household, also have an increased risk of bullying victimization (Tippett & Wolke, 2014).

A large amount of the research assessing the relationship between youth status and bullying victimization focuses on student's perceptions of peer status (i.e., popularity, peer acceptance, number of friends/friend groups), demographic measures of social status (i.e., race, age, gender), or rely on familial socio-economic status (i.e., income) as measures of youth status (Jain et al. 2018; Longobardi et al. 2018; Tippett & Wolke 2014). While these are all important and accurate predictors of youth bullying victimization, they are measures of status that parents and school administration have little, if any, control over; thus, leaving little room for prevention measures. As such, it is important for future research to focus on measures of youth status that parents and schools have more control over, like youth involvement in EC school activities, and how youth status resulting from that involvement predicts bullying victimization.

Previous Research on EC Activity Involvement and Bullying Victimization

Previous research assessing the relationship between EC school activities and bullying victimization have produced inconsistent results. For example, Choi et al., (2016), who assessed the relationship between capable guardianship and bullying victimization, concluded that the structured environment of school sports and clubs reduced the amount of physical and non-physical bullying victimization among their sample of students; yet Volk and Lagzdins (2009) concluded that female athletes were three times more likely to be bully victims compared to non-female athletes from their sample. Similarly, another study examining lifestyle and RAT as an approach in predicting bullying victimization, concluded that involvement in performing arts increased youth vulnerability, while Hart et al., (2013), who examined situational and contextual correlates of bullying victimization

determined that involvement in EC school activities, including performing arts, had no effect on bullying victimization among their sample (Choi et al., 2019).

There is a need for future research to focus on less studied measures of status like EC school activity involvement. The aforementioned conflicting results ought to encourage future research to examine the relationship between bullying victimization and EC school activities using new methods and approaches in order to understand the correlation more effectively. The purpose of this research is to contribute to the literature on bullying victimization by using a novel approach to assess the relationship between various forms of bullying victimization (i.e., physical, verbal, and relational), involvement in EC activities, and status related demographic variables. This study utilized a novel theoretical framework that compared two theories, a major criminological theory, RAT, and a theory less popular theory, SET.

Chapter III: Theories of Bullying Victimization

Routine Activity Theory (RAT)

Routine activity theory (RAT), coined and developed by Lawrence Cohen and Marcus Felson (1979), is a leading, influential, and frequently cited criminological theory (Miró 2014). Many leading criminological theories focus on the perpetrator of a crime in regard to sociological, psychological, environmental, or biological motivations leading to the crime's occurrence (i.e., rational choice theory, labeling theory, self-control theory, strain theory etc...). In contrast to those theories, RAT focuses on the patterns, routines, and structure of one's daily activities to study and predict crime as an event and the differential likelihood of being victimized. RAT approaches the examination of deviant behavior by considering the crime context (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000). In contrast to other leading criminological theories, RAT focuses on the victim of crimes by analyzing the situational determinants of victimization.

Specifically, RAT focuses on the interaction between three elements of a crime event including: 1) motivated offenders (i.e., drug user in need of money); 2) suitable targets (people or objects); and 3) absence of capable guardians (i.e., police presence, street lights, security cameras, witnesses, etc...), when assessing risk for victimization (Cohen & Felson, 1979; Karmen, 2018). According to RAT, victimization occurs when there is a motivated offender who finds a suitable target with the absence of a capable guardian, simultaneously. Factors relating to the school setting (i.e., demographics of students and EC school activities), potentially create an environment (i.e., motivated offenders, suitable targets, and absence of capable guardians) that increases the risk of bullying victimization. Furthermore, participation in EC school activities likely impacts a student's exposure to motivated offenders and the presence of a capable guardians which in turn impacts their risk of becoming a bully victim.

RAT has been frequently cited as a theoretical framework utilized when understanding risk (Cecen-Celik and Keith 2019; Cho and Lee, 2018; Karmen, 2018; Popp & Peguero, 2018; Schreck et al., 2003). However, research studies examining bullying victimization through a RAT framework

have produced mixed results in regard to RAT being an effective framework in predicting the risk of bullying victimization. For example, Cecen-Celik and Keith (2019) utilized a RAT framework in their study of bullying victimization and reported more severe measures of school security (capable guardian) significantly decreased the likelihood of bullying victimization among their sample; however, Schreck, Miller, and Gibson (2003) reported in their study of youth victimization at school that school security measures, like metal detectors and security guards, did not successfully decrease victimization risk among their sample.

Furthermore, RAT asserts that individuals from varying demographic groups experience differential risk to being victimized based on the types of activities individuals across varying demographic groups engage in, (Bunch et al. 2015). RAT predicts that non-Whites, students from low income households, males, older students, and those who engage in after-hours school activities, experience a higher risk of victimization as a result of these individuals tending to inhabit riskier environments and be in situations without supervision (Bunch et al. 2015; Cecen-Celik & Keith, 2019). However, previous research studies assessing the correlation between demographic characteristics and bullying victimization in school produce results that do not support the predictions made by RAT, and other researchers argue when making RAT predictions, demographic characteristics are not reliable measures of victimization (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000). As such, this thesis will test the accuracy and validity of one of the leading criminological school of thoughts, RAT, in regard to bullying victimization risk, by utilizing a dueling theory approach which introduces a rarely used theory in youth bullying victimology – *Social Exchange Theory (SET)*.

Social Exchange Theory (SET)

Social Exchange Theory (SET) was developed by sociologist George Homans in 1958 and is based on an economic and social-behavioral framework (Homans, 1958). According to SET, a cost-benefit analysis process is utilized when individuals determine whether and/or how to interreact in social situations involving an exchange of material or non-material goods (Schwab et al., 2017). For a social exchange to occur, there must be two or more actors who each have behaviors or possessions

valued by others called *resources* (Molm, 2003). These resources may include material goods and services and non-material goods such as one's approval or status.

SET relies on the human assumptions that individuals will always engage in a cost-benefit analysis before engaging in an interaction, and humans will always favor interactions with more benefits than costs, and as such, will consciously seek out interactions that gain themselves maximum benefit (Emerson, 1976). Unfortunately, not all social exchanges end in an equal exchange of goods among the actors involved due to individual differences in resources (Vaillancourt et al., 2010; Schwab et al., 2017). When one actor has more resources (i.e., status) than the other actor within a social exchange, it may create a power differential among the actors. The individual with less resources within a power differential has an increased risk of victimization from the more powerful actor (Vaillancourt et al., 2010; Schwab et al., 2017). Individuals who have high status see interactions with low status individuals as an opportunity. SET proposes that having high status enables individuals to victimize less powerful individuals successfully (Emerson, 1976). High status individuals will interact with low status individuals if they believe they will have an opportunity to gain from the weaker person. Within a social interaction, individuals may perceive a status gain by belittling the individual with less status. Further, since status is largely a social reality dependent on the perceptions of others, individuals are likely to belittle others in front of an audience (Kraus et al., 2012; Rahal et al., 2020).

Various research studies have utilized a SET framework when examining workplace bullying (Parzefall & Salin, 2010; Paul & Kee, 2020; Scott et al., 2013); however, few studies have applied SET as a framework when assessing school bullying among youth. Vaillancourt et al. (2010), incorporate SET into their assessment of the relationship between power and bullying behaviors among youth friendships. Vaillancourt et al. (2010) argue that because no two individuals are the same, among a dyad there is an increased risk for the one with less social assets to be at risk for becoming victimized by the one with more social assets. Numerous research studies have indicated the relevance of differential power among youth as a key element of youth bullying.

Dueling Theoretical Framework

Several research studies have produced evidence supporting RAT's predictions on bullying victimization; however, other research studies produce results that contradict RAT's predictions on bullying victimization. Further, SET is a commonly used theory when assessing workplace bullying but is limited in its application to school bullying; however, the power dynamic of bullying and the power exchange element of SET suggest this theory to be effective in predicting school bullying victimization. Previous research on bullying victimization suggests both theories would be effective in predicting differential risk of bullying victimization; however, RAT and SET make some contradicting predictions on whom has an increased risk, particularly in regard to involvement in EC activities predicting bullying victimization. As such, this thesis utilizes a dueling theoretical approach to examine which theory is more effective in predicting bullying victimization among youth through the examination of demographic characteristics as well as EC activity involvement.

RAT's Explanation and Predictions for Bullying Victimization. The three interrelated elements of RAT, a motivated offender finding a suitable target with the absence of a capable guardian, create a specific prediction on who is most at risk to be victimized. According to RAT, a student who spends more time in at-risk environments is more likely to be victimized than a student who spends more time in a safe environment. The more time students spend at school, the greater their exposure to high rates of motivated offenders becomes. Thus, students who spend more time at school after hours, when there is less supervision by teachers and administration, would have an increased risk of experiencing bullying victimization compared to students who are at home after school hours. Students involved in EC activities are at school after hours and away from the home more than students who do not participate. As such, following a RAT framework, students who participate in EC school activities are at a higher risk of experiencing any form of bullying victimization than students who do not engage in EC school activities.

RAT's predictions on risk for victimization based on demographic characteristics are explained by assessing individual's exposure to motivated offenders (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000).

Likely motivated offenders often share similar demographic characteristics. Moreover, offenders and victims often share the same demographics and inhabit the same risky environments. Crime data indicates that males, historically marginalized races (with the exception of Asian individuals), and individuals from lower income households have an increased risk of offending, and thus being victimized, in comparison to females, White, non-Hispanic individuals, and those coming from higher income households (Beck, 2021). As such, following a RAT framework, male, historically marginalized races, and lower income household individuals have an increased risk for experiencing any form of bullying victimization in comparison to female, non-Hispanic White, and higher income household individuals. In regard to age, RAT asserts that those who inhabit risky environments are more likely to experience victimization. Since secondary education tends to provide more opportunities for school related EC activities compared to primary or intermediate education, RAT would predict older students to be at an increased risk of bullying victimization in comparison to younger students.

SET's Explanation and Predictions for Bullying Victimization. SET's predictions of bullying victimization based on demographic characteristics and involvement in EC activities, rely on evidence previously established in literature regarding the relationship between bullying victimization and social status. SET asserts that youth who have low status have an increased risk of experiencing any form of bullying victimization in comparison to high status youth. Research discussed in the literature review provided evidence that males, non-Hispanic White students, older students, and those coming from higher income households tend to have higher status compared to their counterparts. Thus, SET predicts that females, individuals with historically marginalized racial and ethnic backgrounds, younger students, and those living in lower income households have an increased risk of experiencing bullying victimization.

SET utilizes the evidence that youth who come from families with more resources have the ability to participate in EC activities whereas families with limited resources are less likely to be able to have a student participate in EC activities (Cvetkovic et al., 2014). Furthermore, participation alone in EC activities may provide students with some social status, as students typically have to try

out or compete for a spot in these activities, and recognition for that spot may come in the form of social status. A SET framework for predicting bullying victimization based on involvement in EC activities relies on the assumption that students who are involved in EC activities have more status than students who are not involved based on the necessary resources necessary for them to participate. Thus, SET predicts that youth who are not involved in EC activities have an increased risk for experiencing bullying victimization in comparison to those who are involved.

Dueling Hypotheses

Table one displays the dueling hypotheses based on predictions made from a RAT framework compared to a SET framework. Hypotheses following these dueling theoretical frameworks make similar predictions in terms of race and income with both theories predicting individuals from historically marginalized racial/ethnic backgrounds or lower income to have an increased risk of experiencing any form of bullying victimization; however, the predictions contradict each other in terms of age, gender, and involvement in EC activities with RAT predicting older students, boys, and those involved in EC activities to have an increased risk of victimization while SET predicts girls, younger students, and those who do not participate in EC activities to have an increased risk of victimization. This thesis does not specifically hypothesize which theory will be more effective at predicting bullying victimization risk, but rather is taking an exploratory approach to examine the most effective theory for predicting various forms of bullying victimization based on demographic and EC involvement predictors. Refer to the methods section of this paper for details on how theories will be compared.

Table 1. Dueling Hypotheses Concerning the Relationship between Predictor Variables and Bullying Victimization.

Status Variable	SET	RAT
Male	-	+
Female	+	-
White	-	-
Non-White	+	+
Hispanic	+	+
Non-Hispanic	-	-
Older Age	-	+
Younger Age	+	-
Higher Income	-	-
Lower Income	+	+
Sports	-	+
Spirit Group	-	+
Performing Arts	-	+
Student Government	-	+
Academic Club	-	+

Note: ‘+’ indicates prediction of increased risk for victimization; ‘-’ indicates no prediction of increased risk for victimization.

Intersectionality Predictions (RaceXgender interaction)

The statistical analyses of this thesis include an interaction variable for gender and race following the recommendations of Crenshaw’s (1989) theory of *intersectionality*. Rather than looking at the impact of being Black or White and being a boy or girl on bullying victimization independently of one another, the interaction between race and gender are examined to reveal subtle differences in status. The difference in status may lead to a differential risk of being bullied. Research findings discussed within the literature review of this paper suggest that among juveniles, race matters more than gender in terms of determining status (Mandalaywala et al., 2020). Further, research indicates White students have more social status among peers in comparison to Black (Dupree et al., 2021; Elenbaas & Killen, 2016; Shutts et al., 2016). Similarly, boys have more social status than girls (McClean et al., 2018; Shutts et al., 2013; Amanatullah & Tinsley, 2013). Following the structure of *intersectionality* and previous research findings of status based on gender and race, the predictions of the interaction between race and gender on bullying victimization are that Black girls will face the highest risk of any bullying victimization followed by Black boys, White girls, and White boys will experience the lowest risk of any form of bullying victimization.

Chapter IV: Methods

Measures

This thesis project is a secondary data analysis utilizing data from the 2017 National Crime Victimization Survey-School Crime Supplement (NCVS-SCS). Data from the NCVS and SCS are free and available for researchers to download and analyze. The data used for this project was downloaded from the ICPSR (2021) data sharing site. The following sections describe the NCVS and SCS, discuss the purpose, and explain how this project utilizes data from the NCVS-SCS to answer the research questions.

National Crime Victimization Survey (NCVS)

The NCVS is conducted by the U.S. Census Bureau on behalf of the Bureau of Justice Statistics (BJS) and is the nation's leading criminal victimization survey (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2021). The information collected within the NCVS includes frequency, characteristics, and consequences of criminal victimization that may have occurred within a home. The NCVS collects data on victimization crimes that have both been reported and remain unreported. The types of crimes included on the NCVS are nonfatal personal crimes (i.e., robbery, sexual assault or rape, personal larceny, and simple or aggravated assault), or household property crimes (i.e., burglary/trespassing, motor vehicle theft or other theft) (ICPSR, 2021). Additionally, demographic questions are collected for survey participants (i.e., age, gender, race, ethnicity, marital status, education level, and income) as well as demographic characteristics of the offender (i.e., race, age, ethnicity, gender, and victim-offender relationship) and details regarding the victimization (i.e., time, location, injuries, weapon usage, and victim-offender relationship). Other questions include whether or not the crime was reported to the police and why, as well as what experiences the victim may have had with the criminal justice system (Brick & Lohr, 2021). Additional questions on the NCVS may include supplementary surveys, like the SCS, which is utilized in this study.

School Crime Supplement (SCS)

The SCS to the NCVS is a national survey given to students who are in grades sixth-twelfth and who participated in the NCVS in the given year that the SCS was conducted (Hansen, 2015). The purpose of the SCS is to collect information regarding school-related victimizations that have occurred within the last year as well as the student's perception of their school's crime patterns and safety measures (Musu et al., 2019). Questions on the SCS (i.e., students' participation in after school activities; students' perception of school rules and enforcement of these rules; the presence of weapons, drugs, alcohol, and gangs in school; student bullying; hate-related incidents; and attitudinal questions relating to the fear of victimization at school) are asked in order to collect information for researchers, policymakers, and school personnel to improve existing policies or to create new policies and programs (National Center for Education Statistics, 2015).

Participants

Participants of this thesis project come from a nationally representative sample of American youth who are in grades sixth through twelfth and completed the 2017 NCVS and SCS (Bureau of Justice Statistics, 2021). Participants were randomly selected to participate in the NCVS and SCS and have no identifying information tied to their responses. This project included the responses from all participants who did not fall into the exclusion criteria. Individuals were excluded if they did not answer both the NCVS questions and SCS questions. Furthermore, other participants will be excluded if they answered survey questions with "don't know," refused to answer, or the data was missing for any other reason. Thus, the sample used in this thesis project will include more than 5,000 American youth enrolled in grades sixth through twelfth. For a specific breakdown of participants, please refer to Table 1 listed in the results section.

Statistical Analysis

The statistical analyses in this project were conducted using IBM SPSS Statistics (version 28.0.0.0 [190]). Seventeen variables were used within this data analysis and came directly from the NCVS-SCS survey questionnaire. These variables include demographic questions (age, gender, race,

ethnicity, and income), EC school activity participation questions (i.e., sports, spirit clubs, performing arts, student government, and school clubs), and bullying victimization questions (two forms of physical bullying victimization, two forms of verbal bullying victimization, and three forms of relational bullying victimization). All EC activity participation questions were coded into binary variables (1 - participation; 0 - no participation). Additionally, the bullying victimization questions were coded into binary variables (1 - bullied; 0 - not bullied).

The questions regarding the demographic measures gender and ethnicity were recoded into binary variables with the assumed high-status demographic measure coded as 1, and the assumed low-status demographic coded as 0 (i.e., males - 1, females - 0; non-Hispanic - 1; Hispanic - 0). The age and income variables are both interval variables and are included as is. Since the race questions are nominal variables, they were transformed into a set of dummy variables to include them within the multivariate analyses. 'White only' is the comparison group used for all dummy race variables (Black only, Asian only, American Native only, and other races) for all analyses. For a specific breakdown of questions used in this analysis please refer to the Appendix: Variables and Models.

The data used in this project come from a large, nationally representative sample and includes only binary dependent variables (i.e., yes or no questions) thus, the most appropriate statistical method is multivariate logistic regression (Field et al., 2012). Eight multivariate logistic regression models will be examined, each including the same 10 predictor variables and a unique binary dependent variable. Each model's binary dependent model will be a question measuring one of the three various forms of bullying (i.e., physical, verbal, or relational). Models 1 and 2 have a form of physical bullying victimization as the dependent variable, models 3 and 4 have a form of verbal bullying victimization as the dependent variable, models 5, 6, and 7 have a form of relational bullying victimization as the dependent variable, and model eight's dependent variable was created by summing the individual victimizations, creating a variable that ranges from 0 to 7, then coding the variable as follows: 0 = 0; 1-7 = 1, to represent any form of bullying. In addition to the multivariate

logistic regression analysis, a bivariate correlation analysis will be examined. For details regarding each of the eight statistical models please reference the Appendix: Variables and Models.

Statistical support for the competing theories will be determined by examining the sign of the predictor coefficients (e.g., the direction of the relationship) to see which theory is most consistent in their hypotheses of predictor variables correlating with the dependent variables. For example, SET and RAT make opposing predictions of victimization based on the participant's age. SET predicts younger students to have an increased risk as they have a decreased level of status resulting from their age; whereas, RAT predicts older students to have an increased risk as they have more freedom, resources, and opportunities to be in a context where bullying is more likely to occur. Moreover, since the victimizations take place at school, RAT predicts older students to have an increased risk as they are typically watched less closely by teachers and are able to move about the school with looser supervision in comparison to younger students.

To examine which theory is more accurate in their predictions of age, the sign of the age coefficient will be examined to determine theoretical support (i.e., a negative relationship supports SET while a positive relationship supports RAT). The Nagelkerke R-squared coefficient will be used to compare the eight models in terms of the predictor variables' ability to predict different types of bullying victimization. If the models with physical bullying DVs have a higher Nagelkerke R-Square variable than the models examining relational bullying, for example, then it can be assumed the chosen predictor variables are better at predicting physical bullying compared to relational bullying. The following section discusses the results of the statistical analyses conducted in this thesis.

Chapter V: Results

Table 1 displays the frequency statistics for the nominal variables used in all eight statistical models. A total of 6,164 participants from the NCVS-SCS were utilized in the present statistical analyses including 3,120 boys and 3,044 girls. The majority of the sample reported their race as White only (76.86%), while 12.56% reported as Black only, followed by 5.56% Asian only, .92% Native American or Alaskan Native, and 4.12% reporting as other. Three quarters of the sample reported being non-Hispanic (75.75%). More than half of the sample (64.3%) reported some sort of involvement in a school activity being either an athletic activity, spirit group, performing art, student government, or an academic club. Around 20% of the sample reported experiencing at least one form of bullying victimization in the last school year. Continuous variables are not included in the table but will be reported here.

The average age of participants was 14.7 years of age with a standard deviation of 1.89 years. The median yearly household income (reported by parent of participant) of the sample is between \$50,000 - \$74,999 with nearly half (46%) of the sample reporting a yearly household income ranging between \$50,000 and \$149,999. In general, relational bullying was the most common type of bullying victimization experienced by the sample while physical bullying victimization was the least common type of bullying victimization. For a more specific breakdown of school activity participation or specific types of bullying victimization, please refer to Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive and Frequency Statistics for Nominal Variables.

Variable	Category	Number	Percentage
Gender of Victim	Boy	3,120	50.61%
	Girl	3,044	49.39%
Race of Victim	White Only	4,738	76.86%
	Black Only	772	12.52%
	Asian Only	343	5.56%
	Native American/Alaskan Native	57	0.92%
	Other	254	4.12%
Ethnicity of Victim	Hispanic	1,495	24.25%
	Non-Hispanic	4,669	75.75%
Athletic Team Participation	Yes	2,346	38.10%
	No	3,726	60.45%
Spirit Group Participation	Yes	503	8.29%
	No	5,566	90.30%
Performing Arts Participation	Yes	1,693	27.47%
	No	4,373	70.94%
Academic Club Participation	Yes	1,311	21.27%
	No	4,754	77.13%
Student Government Participation	Yes	359	5.82%
	No	5,703	92.52%
Any School Activity Participation	Yes	3,962	64.3%
	No	2,202	35.7%
Pushed, Shoved, Tripped, or Spat on	Yes	318	5.2%
	No	5,714	92.7%
Had Property Destroyed on Purpose	Yes	320	5.2%
	No	5,705	92.6%
Made fun of, Called names, Insulted	Yes	812	13.2%
	No	5,218	84.7%
Threatened with Harm	Yes	234	3.8%
	No	5,796	94.0%
Rumors Spread to make you Disliked	Yes	834	13.5%
	No	5,188	84.2%
Made to do things you did not want to do	Yes	125	2.0%
	No	5,907	95.8%
Excluded from Activity on Purpose	Yes	320	5.2%
	No	5,705	92.6%
Any type of Bullying Victimization	Yes	1,258	20.4%
	No	4,779	77.5%

SOURCE: U.S. Bureau of Justice statistics. National Crime Victimization Survey-School Crime Supplement, 2017.

Correlation statistics are reported in Table 2. There is a statistically significant relationship between younger students and all types of bullying victimization, where younger students have an increased risk of victimization. Similarly, there is a statistically significant relationship between various types of bullying victimization and being a boy. Individuals coming from lower income households also have an increased risk of various types of bullying victimization. Hispanic individuals and Asian individuals both have an increased risk of experiencing victimization in comparison to non-Hispanic and non-Asian individuals. In regard to involvement in school activities, those who participated in performing arts had an increased risk of every type of bullying victimization compared to students who did not participate in performing arts, while none of the other types of school involvement produced a statistically significant relationship to bullying victimization.

Table.2 Bivariate Correlation Matrix.

Predictors	Pushed (1)	Destroyed Property (2)	Insulted (3)	Threatened (4)	Rumors (5)	Forced (6)	Exclude d (7)	Any Bully (8)
Age	-.123***^	-.055***^	-.123***^	-.065***^	-.047***^	-.039*^	-.055***^	-.109***^
Gender	.042***	.072***	.078***	.012	.122***	.018	.072***	.080***
Income	-.065***^	-.001^	-.027*^	-.062***^	-.044*^	-.020^	-.001^	-.053***^
Ethnicity	.011	.052***	.061***	.028	.033	.009	.052***	.057***
Race – Black	.003	.031	.003	.026*	.005	.002	.031	.011
Race – Asian	.028	.041***	.049***	.034***	.053***	.010	.041***	.058***
Race – NA/AN	.031	.007	.017	.007	.005	.002	.007	.016
Race - Other	.022*	.025*	.004	.023*	.019	.007	.025*	.028
Sports	.006	.005	.020	.016	.021	.016	.005	.003
Spirit	.006	.007	.008	.020	.030	.007	.007	.034
Performing arts	.051***	.072***	.114***	.024*	.093***	.049***	.072***	.121***
Stud. Gov	.015	.013	.014	.010	.101	.007	.013	.016
Academic club	.025*	.015	.004	.030	.019	.014	.015	.019

NOTE. * $P < .05$; *** $p < .001$; ^ indicates point-biserial correlation, all others are Cramer's V statistics

Table 3 displays the multivariate logistic regression statistics for physical bullying (models 1 and 2). For model one, examining the question of whether a student was pushed, shoved, or tripped has a statistically significant relationship with age, gender, and household income. Younger students, boys, and those coming from lower income households have an increased risk of physical bullying victimization. This form of physical bullying is the only type of bullying where boys have an increased risk over girls, and in this case, the risk of being bullied in this manner is nearly one and a half times higher for boys than for girls.

Model two assesses the relationship between the student having their property destroyed by the bully and status characteristics. There is a statistically significant relationship between being bullied in this manner and numerous status characteristics. Notably, non-Hispanic students are two times more at risk of being victimized in this manner in comparison to Hispanic students. Additionally, students who participated in performing arts were one and a half times more likely to be victimized in this type of bullying. Young students and girls were more likely to have their property destroyed, while Black and Asian individuals faced a lower risk of victimization compared to White individuals.

Table 3. Multivariate Logistic Regression Statistics for Physical Bullying (models 1 & 2)

Variables	Coefficient	Odds Ratio
Pushed, Shoved, tripped (1)	-	-
Age	-.294*** (.038)	.745
Gender	.386* (.130)	1.471
Ethnicity	-.316 (.159)	1.372
Household Income	-.076*** (.015)	.927
Race - Black	-.160 (.204)	.852
Race - Asian	-.570 (.372)	.565
Race – Native American/Alaskan Native	.527 (.450)	1.695
Race - Other	.405 (.256)	1.499
Sports	-.018 (.133)	.982
Spirit Group	.197 (.233)	1.217
Performing Arts	.305 (.135)	1.357
Student Government	-.099 (.301)	.906
Academic Clubs	-.090 (.170)	.914
Nagelkerke R Square	.071	-
Destroyed Property (2)	-	-
Age	-.114*** (.034)	.892
Gender	-.684*** (.132)	.505
Ethnicity	-.756*** (.176)	2.131
Household Income	-.032 (.016)	.969
Race – Black Only	-.851*** (.246)	.427
Race – Asian Only	-1.571* (.511)	.208
Race – Native American/Alaskan native	-.207 (.607)	.813
Race - Other	.339 (.248)	1.404
Sports	-.124 (.131)	.883
Spirit Group	-.125 (.220)	.882
Performing Arts	.419* (.130)	1.520
Student Government	.123 (.246)	1.131
Academic Clubs	.097 (.152)	1.102
Nagelkerke R Square	.061	-

NOTE. N = 5,069 participants (1); N = 5,064 participants (2)

*p < .05; ***p < .001

The multivariate logistic regression statistics reported in Table 4 relate to questions asked about verbal bullying. Model 3 assess the relationship between youth status and being bullied by insult or by being called names. There is a statistically significant relationship between this form of verbal bullying and age, gender, ethnicity, household income, race, and involvement in sports or performing arts. Most notable is the increased risk experienced by non-Hispanic students and those involved in performing arts, both groups experiencing an increased risk by more than one and a half times compared to their counterparts. Younger students, girls, those with lower household incomes, and White students (in comparison to Asian students) also experience an increased risk of this form of verbal bullying. Model 4 assess the relationship between being verbally threatened as a form of bullying and status with the results indicating a statistically significant relationship between this bullying type and age, ethnicity, household income, and race. Younger students, non-Hispanic students, students coming from lower income households, and students identifying as “other race” had an increased risk compared with older, Hispanic, higher income, or White students.

Table 4. Multivariate Logistic Regression Statistics for Verbal Bullying (models 3 & 4)

Variables	Coefficient	Odds Ratio
Insulted or called names (1)	-	-
Age	-.178*** (.023)	.837
Gender	-.399*** (.085)	.671
Ethnicity	-.556*** (.111)	1.743
Household Income	-.036*** (.011)	.965
Race – Black Only	-.162 (.132)	.851
Race – Asian Only	-.879*** (.247)	.415
Race – Native American/Alaskan native	.181 (.363)	1.198
Race - Other	.010 (.194)	1.010
Sports	-.148* (.088)	.863
Spirit Group	.002 (.146)	1.002
Performing Arts	.423*** (.088)	1.527
Student Government	.242 (.166)	1.274
Academic Clubs	.058 (.104)	1.060
Nagelkerke R Square	.064	-
Threatened (2)	-	-
Age	-.182*** (.041)	.834
Gender	.177 (.150)	1.193
Ethnicity	-.588* (.197)	1.801
Household Income	-.080*** (.017)	.924
Race – Black Only	.087 (.213)	1.091
Race – Asian Only	-1.256 (.580)	.285
Race – Native American/Alaskan native	-.269 (.731)	.764
Race - Other	.525* (.285)	1.690
Sports	-.147 (.158)	.863
Spirit Group	-.192 (.302)	.825
Performing Arts	.207 (.160)	1.230
Student Government	.064 (.342)	1.066
Academic Clubs	-.239 (.208)	.787
Nagelkerke R Square	.049	-

NOTE. N = 5,070 participants (1); N = 5,069 Participants (2)

* $p < .05$; *** $p < .001$

Table 5 displays the multivariate logistic regression statistics for the relational bullying questions including models 5 through 7. Model 5 reflects the type of relational bullying where one spreads rumors about you or tries to make others dislike you. Girls, non-Hispanic students, and those coming from lower income households have a statistically significant increased risk of experiencing bullying victimization in comparison to their counterparts. Similar to previous models, White students have an increased risk of experiencing this type of bullying in comparison to Asian students. Furthermore, students who are involved in sports or performing arts have an increased risk to those not involved in these activities with those who participate in performing arts being nearly 1.5 times more at risk than those who do not participate in performing arts.

Model 6 assess the relationship between youth status and the form of relational bullying where the student is made to do things they did not want to do. Boys are 1.4 times more likely to experience this form of bullying, and those who participate in performing arts are twice as likely to be victimized in this manner in comparison to those who are not in performing arts activities. The

final model for relational bullying looks at the question of whether a student was excluded from activities on purpose and the results indicate that age, gender, ethnicity, race, and performing arts participation are all statistically significant predictors of this form of bullying. Specifically, younger students, girls, non-Hispanic students, and White students in comparison to Asian or Black students have an increased risk.

Table 5. Multivariate Logistic Regression Statistics for Relational Bullying (models 5, 6, & 7)

Variables	Coefficient	Odds Ratio
Spreading Rumors or Making Others Dislike You (5)		
Age	-.057 (.022)	.945
Gender	-.725*** (.086)	.484
Ethnicity	-.288* (.105)	.749
Household Income	-.044*** (.010)	.957
Race - Black	-.143 (.131)	.867
Race - Asian	-.804* (.246)	.448
Race – Native American/Alaskan Native	-.117 (.396)	.889
Race - Other	.283 (.181)	1.327
Sports	.160* (.086)	1.174
Spirit Group	.016 (.139)	1.016
Performing Arts	.382*** (.088)	1.465
Student Government	-.011 (.169)	.989
Academic Clubs	.054 (.101)	1.055
Nagelkerke R Square	.055	-
Made You do Things You did not Want to do (6)		
Age	-.112 (.054)	.894
Gender	.351* (.200)	1.421
Ethnicity	-.178 (.250)	.837
Household Income	-.049 (.024)	.953
Race - Black	.021 (.299)	1.022
Race - Asian	-.064 (.470)	.938
Race – Native American/Alaskan Native	-17.521 (5494.585)	.000
Race - Other	.281 (.519)	.755
Sports	.318 (.198)	1.374
Spirit Group	.294 (.324)	1.342
Performing Arts	.732*** (.203)	2.080
Student Government	-.091 (.436)	.913
Academic Clubs	-.356 (.267)	.700
Nagelkerke R Square	.035	-
Another Student Excluding you from Activities on Purpose (7)		
Age	-.114*** (.034)	.892
Gender	-.684*** (.132)	.505
Ethnicity	-.756*** (.176)	.469
Household Income	-.032 (.016)	.969
Race - Black	-.851*** (.246)	.427
Race - Asian	-1.571* (.511)	.208
Race – Native American/Alaskan Native	-.207 (.607)	.813
Race - Other	.339 (.248)	1.404
Sports	-.124 (.131)	.883
Spirit Group	-.125 (.220)	.882
Performing Arts	.419* (.130)	1.520
Student Government	.123 (.246)	1.131
Academic Clubs	.097 (.152)	1.102
Nagelkerke R Square	.061	-

NOTE. *N* = 5,064 participants (5); *N* = 5,070 participants (6); *N* = 5,064 participants (7).

p* < .05; **p* < .001

The statistics relating to the status predictor variables and any form of bullying victimization are reported in Table 6. Students who participate in performing arts are 1.6 times more likely to be victimized by any form of bullying than those who do not participate. Additionally, age, gender, ethnicity, household income, and race are statistically significant predictors of any form of bullying victimization. Girls, younger students, lower income students, and non-Hispanic students are more likely to experience any bullying victimization than their counterparts. Moreover, White students have an increased risk of experiencing any form of bullying victimization in comparison to Asian students. Finally, in regard to model fit, all eight models have small Nagelkerke R-square coefficients, indicating that much of the variation in bullying victimization is not explained by the included predictors.

Table 6. Multivariate Logistic Regression Statistics for Any Bullying Victimization (model 8)

Predictor Variable	Coefficient	Odds Ratio
Age	-.133*** (.019)	.875
Gender	-.414*** (.072)	.661
Ethnicity	-.426*** (.091)	.653
Household Income	-.040*** (.009)	.961
Race - Black	-.114 (.112)	.893
Race - Asian	-.846*** (.202)	.429
Race – Native American/Alaskan Native	.216 (.317)	1.242
Race - Other	.354 (.156)	1.242
Sports	.007 (.074)	1.007
Spirit Group	.115 (.122)	1.122
Performing Arts	.464*** (.075)	1.590
Student Government	.163 (.144)	1.177
Academic Clubs	.083 (.087)	1.086
Nagelkerke R Square	.066	-

NOTE. N = 5,072 participants

*p < .05; ***p < .001

A contingency table was created to examine the interaction between gender (girl/boy) and race (Black only/White only) as it relates to risk of experiencing any form of bullying victimization. The frequencies suggest that girls experience a higher risk of bullying victimization (27%) than boys do (19.2%). Both Black and White girls experience a higher risk of bullying victimization compared to both Black and White boys. While Black individuals do experience a higher risk of experiencing any form of bullying victimization, the difference of percentage is less than two percent for both boys and girls as well as the total sample of those experiencing any form of bullying victimization, regardless of gender. There is no evidence to suggest that race nor the interaction between gender

and race will have an impact on overall risk for experiencing any form of bullying victimization. To see specific frequencies, refer to Table 7.

Table 7. Contingency Table Displaying Frequency of Experiencing Any Bullying Victimization

Participant Sex	Bullied		White Only	Black only	Total
Girl	No	% within	73.1%	72.5%	73.0%
		N	1695	293	1988
	Yes	% within	26.9%	27.5%	27.0%
		N	624	111	735
Boy	No	% within	80.9%	79.9%	80.8%
		N	1957	294	2251
	Yes	% within	19.1%	20.1%	19.2%
		N	462	74	536
Total	No	% within	77.1%	76.0%	76.9%
		N	3652	587	4239
	Yes	% within	22.9%	24.0%	23.1%
		N	1086	185	1271

Note. *N* = 5,510 participants

Chapter VI: Discussion

Support for Dueling Hypotheses

The results of this study do not clearly support the predictions made by either SET or RAT. SET's hypotheses predicted that students who have low social status, measured by demographic variables and involvement in EC activities, will have an increased risk of experiencing bullying victimization compared to students who have high social status (Emerson, 1976). Specifically, SET predicts that younger students, girls, non-White and/or Hispanic students, students from low income families, and those not involved in EC activities would have an increased risk of victimization in comparison to their counterparts, due to their low status (Shwab et al., 2017; Vaillencourt et al., 2010). Results of the multivariate logistic regression analyses conducted in this study indicate that SET was correct in the predictions made regarding age and income in six out of the eight statistical models. Younger students and those coming from low income families have an increased risk for experiencing physical, verbal, and relational bullying victimization compared to older students and those coming from higher income families. Furthermore, while the predictions made regarding the students' gender was supported in five models, the predictions were not supported in three models, as two of them indicated boys had an increased risk and one indicated that gender was not a predictor for that form of victimization. The predictions made by SET in regard to participation in EC activities were not supported by any model. These results suggest that demographic variables might be better measures of social status for students compared to their involvement in EC activities, at least in the context of bullying victimization. Another possibility is that involvement in EC activity does reflect status but status is not a major, consistent predictor of being bullied. Perhaps some process other than power differentials is driving bullying.

Opposing SET's predictions, RAT's hypotheses predict that boys, older students, and those who are involved in EC activities experience an increased risk of bullying victimization. The hypotheses stemming from RAT's framework predict that the patterns, routines, and structure of one's daily activities impact their risk of victimization (Mustaine & Tewksbury, 2000). Results from

two of the eight models support RAT's hypotheses on gender; however, since five models indicate that girls have an increased risk for experiencing victimization, the overall prediction that boys have an increased risk of victimization is not supported by this analysis. Since five of the eight models indicate that students from low income families have an increased risk of victimization, the predictions RAT makes regarding income are supported, however the predictions made by RAT and SET in regard to income are the same. RAT predicted that involvement in EC activities would increase students' risk of being bullied. There is strong support that involvement in performing arts increases ones' risk of bullying victimization; however, involvement in any other EC activity did not predict bullying victimization. Therefore, it is likely that the increased risk of bullying victimization faced by students who are involved in performing arts is not a result of patterns, routines, and daily activities, but rather, that there are special circumstances surrounding performing arts involvement, which is leading to this increased risk, not experienced by those involved in other EC activities.

SET and RAT both hypothesized that Hispanic and/or historically marginalized students have an increased risk of bullying victimization; however, results of the various statistical analyses do not support this prediction and suggest the opposite to be true. Non-Hispanic students had an increased risk of being bullied in six of the eight models in comparison to Hispanic students. White students had an increased risk of experiencing bullying victimization in comparison to Black students in two models and compared to Asian students in five models. In only one model did White students *not* face an increased risk of bullying victimization when compared to students of "other" race. These results indicate that neither SET nor RAT make accurate predictions regarding race and victimization in the context of bullying.

Nonetheless, the results indicate a strong pattern regarding non-Hispanic students facing an increased risk of victimization compared to Hispanic students and a mild pattern where White students face an increased risk of victimization compared to students who are Black, Asian, Native American/Alaskan Native, or other races. Perhaps it is less of a factor that White non-Hispanic students get bullied more than their counterparts, and more of a factor that non-Hispanic White

students report their victimizations at higher rates. These results correlate with prior research suggesting that Hispanic individuals report crime in general at a lower rate than their non-Hispanic counterparts (Menjívar et al., 2018). Lower reporting is suggested to be correlated with having less trust in the police compared to non-Hispanic White individuals. Another possibility might be that culture plays a role in how a student interprets bullying behaviors. Bullying may be considered less problematic in Hispanic cultures, so Hispanic students are less likely to define negative reactions in terms of bullying. Future research and theories surrounding bullying victimization ought to take a new approach to examining the impact of race and ethnicity on risk of bullying victimization.

Following an *intersectionality* theoretical framework, it was hypothesized that the interaction between race and gender is more significant than the impact of the demographic variables independent of one another (Crenshaw, 1989). Specifically, this study hypothesized that race matters more than gender in predicting victimization and therefore Black girls have the highest risk of experiencing bullying victimization followed by Black boys, White girls, and finally White boys experiencing the lowest risk of bullying victimization. The frequencies produced in a cross-tabulation examination suggested that it is gender that matters more than race when predicting bullying victimization. The difference in percentage of girls victimized by bullying compared to boys was noteworthy, while the difference in percentage of Black students being victimized by bullying compared to White students was small (less than a 2-point difference). While Black girls having a high rate of victimization and White boys having a low rate of victimization support the predictions, White girls having a high rate of victimization and Black boys having a low rate of victimization contradict the hypotheses. To summarize, the findings of this study do not offer much support for the theory of intersectionality within the context of bullying victimization.

Ability to Predict Different Forms of Bullying

One of the goals of this study was to examine whether the predictor variables were better at predicting specific types of bullying victimization better than others (i.e., physical, verbal, or relational). The reported Nagelkerke R-squared coefficients in all eight models is small. In other

words, status related demographic variables and involvement in EC activities are weak in their abilities to explain the variation seen in physical, verbal, or relational bullying victimization. This is indicative that the models used in the present study to examine bullying victimization are missing vital predictors. It could also be that our ability to predict bullying victimization among youth is limited simply due to the randomness involved in the behavior. Future researchers ought to consider the limitations of this project when developing future studies regarding bullying victimization among youth.

Research Limitations

The findings of this thesis research are impactful to the study of bullying victimization and provide clear direction for future research. However, there were several limitations to this project which future researchers ought to consider when moving forward examining bullying victimization. While self-report surveys are the most efficient way to gather data from especially large, nationally representative samples on crime, offending, and victimization, there are some limitations regarding the nature of self-report questionnaires which may have impacted the statistical findings of this research (Hunter et al., 2021). Since the findings of this research project rely on self-report data, the related limitations are important to note.

The validity and reliability of self-report questionnaires depend on honest and accurate responses from participants. Issues relating to social desirability sometimes impact a participant's honesty when responding to certain questions (Miller, 2011). While some responses used in this research analysis are unlikely to be impacted by the issue of social desirability, like demographic variables and involvement in EC activities, other responses may have been impacted by social desirability, such as the questions asking about having been bullied in the past. Some students may have been hesitant to report being bullied because being a victim is not considered to be socially desirable for some, especially among boys in the U.S., as a result of gendered stereotypes (Pontes et al., 2018).

Other issues regarding self-report data might stem from participant's accuracy of recalling details surrounding their victimization. Since the NCVS asks about victimization occurring within the last year, the accuracy of some of the participant's responses may have been impacted by their memory of when the event occurred. Participants are involved in the NCVS for up to three years; therefore, they may end up over-reporting or under-reporting the incidences of victimization they experienced due to incorrectly remembering when the incident occurred. Lastly, the validity of self-report data might be impacted by the participant's interpretation of the question being asked. For example, when being asked if they have ever been threatened before, different participants might have different interpretations of whether what they experienced was a threat or not. Future research would benefit by examining official reports and observations of bullying behaviors in addition to including self-report data to ensure all incidents of bullying are being examined as intended by researchers.

Another limitation of this research project is not considering the context of the EC activities or specific incidents of victimization within the analysis. For example, while the data used in this study provides information regarding which students are involved in EC activities and which of those students were bullied, the data does not provide context regarding whether the bullying occurred in the environment of the EC activity or outside the context of that activity. Future researchers examining the relationship between EC activity involvement and bullying victimization should consider the context of those incidents within their analysis. Specifically, future research should consider when the bullying occurred in relation to the EC activity. If a student is involved in Spring sports but the bullying occurred in the Fall, then the likelihood that EC activity involvement played a role in the victimization is low; however, if the bullying occurred while the student was actively involved in the activity, it is more likely that EC activity involvement played a role. Future research should also consider if bullying incidents increased once a student became involved in the EC activity, or decreased to examine the impact that involvement may have had.

Research Implications

Theoretical Implications

One of the goals of this research was to evaluate whether RAT or SET was more accurate in their predictions of bullying victimization. Based on the results of this study, bullying victimization is not well explained or predicted by either RAT or SET. Other studies using RAT to predict bullying victimization have produced some support; however, the predictor variables used in those studies were different. When a similar research study examined whether being involved in EC activities increased or decreased a youth's risk of being bullied following a RAT framework, they found that students who spent more time at school, via EC activity participation, had an increased risk of being bullied (Peguero, 2008). However, their study also indicated that the type of activity the student was involved in and the number of activities the student was involved in impacted their risk, similar to the results of this study. Therefore, RAT was not fully supported by their study examining the impact of EC activities and bullying victimization. Other studies have found support for a RAT framework in regard to bullying victimization but they utilize other measures like students' trust in resource officers or examining the impact of cyberbullying (Choi et al., 2016; Choi et al., 2019). Likewise, several studies examining workplace bullying among adults produced results supporting a SET framework; however, since few studies have used SET to examine bullying victimization among youth involved in EC activities, future research is necessary to evaluate whether SET may be an effective theoretical framework if other measures were used (Parzefall & Salin, 2010; Paul & Kee, 2020).

The results of this research study in conjunction with results of similar research indicate that researchers interested in bullying victimization ought to revise current theories or develop new ones that better explain and predict bullying victimization. Since RAT specifically focuses on crime, perhaps revising the theory to include more general deviant behaviors, like youth bullying, may make the theory more effective in its predictions. Moreover, revising SET to involve more youth interactions rather than focusing on adult interactions might improve the predictions SET makes in

regard to bullying victimization. Overall, the results of this study indicate that while perhaps bullying victimization is too random to predict, more effective theories explaining and predicting bullying victimization ought to be developed.

Policy Implications

While it was not a specific goal of this research to examine the effectiveness of the current bullying prevention programs in place, the findings of this research indicate that certain populations of students (i.e., young students, performing arts participants, girls, or students coming from low-income homes) have a consistently high risk of being bullied compared to their counterparts, suggesting that improvements need to be made to the current prevention programs in place. Some researchers have suggested EC activities as a resource to assess bullying victimization as well as employ prevention and intervention strategies (Stelko-Pereira et al., 2018). This suggestion is supported by research findings indicating that recreational activities like sports and arts improve participants' social skills, cognitive and motor abilities, self-esteem, and confidence, which are all important factors for successful youth development (Bandura et al., 2017). Strengthening these skills is also argued to lower an individual's risk of being bullied (Stelko-Pereira et al., 2018). Therefore, participating in EC activities ought to lower an individual's risk of experiencing bullying victimization.

Haner et al. (2009), argue that an arts-based curriculum would efficiently prevent bullying due to its ability to impact students' thoughts and feelings based on the findings of their study which examined the impact of opera performance among three Canadian schools. Likewise, Joronen et al. (2011) suggest that theater is an effective resource in bullying prevention as results of their study indicate a decline of 20.7% in the rate of bullying victimization among their sample once introducing a theater-based bullying program to one school (prior to intervention 58.8% victimization compared to post intervention 38.1% victimization). Nonetheless, the findings of this thesis suggest that students who are involved in the arts are not prevented from being bullied, rather they experience an increased risk of being bullied in any form. Thus, before bullying prevention programs continue to suggest performing arts involvement as a resource for bullying prevention and intervention - future

research must be conducted to examine why involvement in performing arts creates an increased risk of being bullied. Following the findings of that research, future performing art curriculums must address the factors leading to an increased risk of being bullied. If performing art-based prevention programs address the areas leading to increased risk of victimization, then the overall benefits of being involved in the arts ought to work towards decreasing the rate of victimization.

Direction for Future Research

Some guidance for future research was given when discussing this project's limitations; however, the key findings of this research ought to direct future researchers to more closely examine the relationship between bullying victimization and performing arts participation. Some of the questions future research on performing arts involvement and bullying victimization ought to address includes: 1) do all performing arts activities increase participants' risk of being bullied equally, or do certain activities (i.e., theater, band, choir, etc..) impact risk more than others? 2) Are participants being bullied by fellow performing arts participants or by outsiders? 3) Does the bullying relate to one's involvement in the activity (i.e., mocking one's ability to perform), or is it unrelated (i.e., making fun of one's height)? 4) What is the participant's relative status within the performing arts activity (i.e., lead role vs understudy, first chair vs third chair)? Overall, future researchers interested in examining bullying victimization and performing arts involvement must examine the context of the bullying and how it relates or does not relate to their experience in performing arts.

Chapter VII: Conclusion

The purpose of this research is to examine whether involvement in EC activities, as well as status-related demographics, impacts one's risk of being bullied. This thesis also examined whether RAT or SET was more accurate in their predictions of bullying victimization. The key finding from this research is that students involved in performing arts have a strong, statistically significant risk of being victimized by nearly every form of bullying. Involvement in any other EC activity did not produce an increased or decreased risk of being bullied. Other important findings include the increased risk of being bullied experienced by girls, younger students, non-Hispanic White students, and students from low-income families. The findings of this research did not provide support for either RAT or SET in explaining or predicting bullying victimization among youth when utilizing the measures used in this study. Moreover, the small R-squared coefficients produced in this study indicate that the predictor variables used in the present study are not very effective at predicting any type of bullying victimization.

The findings from this thesis provide a clear direction for future research. Future research focused on bullying victimization should examine the relationship between performing arts involvement and bullying victimization deeper. Understanding the context of the victimization in regard to the context of the performing art would provide researchers with a better idea of what factor surrounding performing arts involvement creates the increased risk of being bullied. Moreover, those developing prevention programs and policies targeting bullying victimization must consider the increased risk experienced by certain population. Then, they ought to revise their programs to more effectively prevent bullying for those populations. Bullying victimization will continue to impact American schools until researchers can better identify victimization risks and develop more effective bullying prevention programs. The findings of this research project provide a direction for future research to take in an effort to lower the overall rate of bullying victimization and the negative consequences associated with being victimized.

References

- Amanatullah, E. T., & Tinsley, C. H. (2013). Ask and Ye Shall Receive? How Gender and Status Moderate Negotiation Success. *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, 6(4), 253–272. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12014>
- Anderson, M. (2016). Who relies on public transit in the U.S. *Pew Research Center*.
<https://www.pewresearch.org/fact-tank/2016/04/07/who-relies-on-public-transit-in-the-us/>
- Aumètre, F., & Poulin, F. (2018). Academic and behavioral outcomes associated with organized activity participation trajectories during childhood. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, 54, 33–41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.appdev.2017.11.003>
- Badaoui, K., Lebrun, A.-M., Su, C.-J., & Bouchet, P. (2018). The influence of personal and social identity on the clothing consumption of adolescents. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne Des Sciences de l'Administration*, 35(1), 65–78.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/cjas.1397>
- Badura, P., Sigmundova, D., Sigmund, E., Madarasova Geckova, A., van Dijk, J. P., & Reijneveld, S. A. (2017). Participation in organized leisure-time activities and risk behaviors in Czech adolescents. *International Journal of Public Health*, 62(3), 387–396.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-016-0930-9>
- Beck, A. (2021). Race and Ethnicity of Violent Crime Offenders and Arrestees, 2018. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*, 13.
- Berdahl, J. L. (2007). Harassment Based on Sex: Protecting Social Status in the Context of Gender Hierarchy. *The Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 641–658.
<https://doi.org/10.2307/20159319>
- Bigler, R. S., Averhart, C. J., & Liben, L. S. (2003). Race and the workforce: Occupational status, aspirations, and stereotyping among African American children. *Developmental Psychology*, 39(3), 572–580. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0012-1649.39.3.572>

- Blasdel, R. (2015). The intersection of race, gender, and class in routine activities: A proposed criminological model of victimization and offending. *Race, Gender & Class*, 22(3–4), 260–273.
- Bopp, T., Turick, R., Vadeboncoeur, J. D., & Aicher, T. J. (2017). *Are You Welcomed? A Racial and Ethnic Comparison of Perceived Welcomeness in Sport Participation*. 12.
- Brick, J. M., & Lohr, S. (2021). *National Crime Victimization Survey Local-Area Crime Survey: Field Test Methodology Report*. 419.
- Bunch, J., Clay-Warner, J., & Lei, M.-K. (2015). Demographic Characteristics and Victimization Risk: Testing the Mediating Effects of Routine Activities. *Crime & Delinquency*, 61(9), 1181–1205.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128712466932>
- Burnett, M. A. (2000). “One strike and you’re out”: An analysis of no pass/no play policies. *High School Journal* 84(2):1–6.
- Bureau of Justice Statistics. (2021). Data Collection: National Crime Victimization Survey (NCSV). Retrieved from <https://www.bjs.gov/index.cfm?ty=dcdetail&iid=245>
- Cardel, M. I., Tong, S., Pavela, G., Dhurandhar, E., Miller, D., Boles, R., & Haemer, M. (2018). Youth Subjective Social Status (SSS) is Associated with Parent SSS, Income, and Food Insecurity but not Weight Loss Among Low-Income Hispanic Youth. *Obesity*, 26(12), 1923–1930.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/oby.22314>
- Cecen-Celik, H., & Keith, S. (2019). Analyzing Predictors of Bullying Victimization With Routine Activity and Social Bond Perspectives. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 34(18), 3807–3832.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260516672941>
- Chase, M., & Dummer, G. (1993). The Role of Sports as a Social Status Determinant for Children. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport*, 63, 418–424.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02701367.1992.10608764>
- Cho, S., & Lee, J. M. (2018). Explaining physical, verbal, and social bullying among bullies, victims of bullying, and bully-victims: Assessing the integrated approach between social control and

- lifestyles-routine activities theories. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 91, 372–382.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chidyouth.2018.06.018>
- Choi, K.-S., Cronin, S., & Correia, H. (2016). The Assessment of Capable Guardianship Measures against Bullying Victimization in the School Environment Crime Prevention and Community Resilience; Multi-Dimensional Perspectives. *Police Practice and Research*, 17(2), 149–159.
- Choi, K.-S., Earl, K., Lee, J. R., & Cho, S. (2019). Diagnosis of cyber and non-physical bullying victimization: A lifestyles and routine activities theory approach to constructing effective preventative measures. *Computers in Human Behavior*, 92, 11–19.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chb.2018.10.014>
- Closson, L. M. (2009). Status and Gender Differences in Early Adolescents' Descriptions of Popularity. *Social Development*, 18(2), 412–426. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2008.00459.x>
- Cohen, L. E., & Felson, M. (1979). Social Change and Crime Rate Trends: A Routine Activity Approach. *American Sociological Review*, 44(4), 588–608. <https://doi.org/10.2307/2094589>
- Conger, D., Long, M. C., & Raymond, M. J. (2020). *Advanced Placement and Initial College Enrollment: Evidence from an Experiment*. <https://doi.org/10.26300/CX24-VX18>
- Connell, R. (1987). *Gender and Power: Society, the Person, and Sexual Politics*. Stanford University Press.
- Crenshaw, K. (1989). Demarginalizing the Intersection of Race and Sex: A Black Feminist Critique of Antidiscrimination Doctrine, Feminist Theory and Antiracist Politics. *University of Chicago Legal Forum*, 1989(1), 31.
- Crosnoe, R., Smith, C., & Leventhal, T. (2015). Family background, school-age trajectories of activity participation, and academic achievement at the start of high school. *Applied Developmental Science*, 19(3), 139–152.
- Cvetković, N., Nikolić, D., Pavlović, L., Djordjević, N., Golubović, M., Stamenković, S., & Veličković, M. (n.d.). *The Socio-Economic Status of Parents and Their Children's Sports Engagement*. 12.

- de Bruyn, E., & Cillessen, A. (2006). Popularity in Early Adolescence: Prosocial and Antisocial Subtypes. *Journal of Adolescent Research - J ADOLESCENT RES*, 21, 607–627.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558406293966>
- Deutsch, N. L., Blyth, D. A., Kelley, J., Tolan, P. H., & Lerner, R. M. (2017). Let's Talk After-School: The Promises and Challenges of Positive Youth Development for After-School Research, Policy, and Practice. In N. L. Deutsch (Ed.), *After-School Programs to Promote Positive Youth Development: Integrating Research into Practice and Policy, Volume 1* (pp. 45–68). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-319-59132-2_4
- Devenish, B., Hooley, M., & Mellor, D. (2017). The Pathways Between Socioeconomic Status and Adolescent Outcomes: A Systematic Review. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 59(1–2), 219–238. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ajcp.12115>
- Dumas, T. M., Davis, J. P., & Ellis, W. E. (2019). Is It Good to Be Bad? A Longitudinal Analysis of Adolescent Popularity Motivations as a Predictor of Engagement in Relational Aggression and Risk Behaviors. *Youth & Society*, 51(5), 659–679.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X17700319>
- Dupree, C. H., Torrez, B., Obioha, O., & Fiske, S. T. (2021). Race–status associations: Distinct effects of three novel measures among White and Black perceivers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 120(3), 601–625. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000257>
- Eccles, J. S., & Barber, B. L. (1999). Student Council, Volunteering, Basketball, or Marching Band: What Kind of Extracurricular Involvement Matters? *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 14(1), 10–43. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558499141003>
- Elenbaas, L., & Killen, M. (2016). Age-Related Changes in Children's Associations of Economic Resources and Race. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 7.
<https://www.frontiersin.org/article/10.3389/fpsyg.2016.00884>
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 335–362.
- Field, A., Miles, J., & Field, J. 2012. *Discovering Statistics Using R*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

- Fiske, S. T. (2000). Stereotyping, prejudice, and discrimination at the seam between the centuries: Evolution, culture, mind, and brain. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 30(3), 299–322.
[https://doi.org/10.1002/\(SICI\)1099-0992\(200005/06\)30:3<299::AID-EJSP2>3.0.CO;2-F](https://doi.org/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(200005/06)30:3<299::AID-EJSP2>3.0.CO;2-F)
- Foladare, I. S. (1969). A Clarification of “Ascribed Status” and “Achieved Status.” *The Sociological Quarterly*, 10(1), 53–61.
- Gibson, J. E., Flaspohler, P. D., & Watts, V. (2015). Engaging Youth in Bullying Prevention Through Community-Based Participatory Research. *Family & Community Health*, 38(1), 120–130.
<https://doi.org/10.1097/FCH.0000000000000048>
- Goodman, E., Adler, N. E., Kawachi, I., Frazier, A. L., Huang, B., & Colditz, G. A. (2001). Adolescents’ Perceptions of Social Status: Development and Evaluation of a New Indicator. *PEDIATRICS*, 108(2), e31–e31. <https://doi.org/10.1542/peds.108.2.e31>
- Haner, D., Pepler, D., Cummings, J., & Rubin-Vaughan, A. (2010). The Role of Arts-Based Curricula in Bullying Prevention: Elijah’s Kite—A Children’s Opera. *Canadian Journal of School Psychology*, 25(1), 55–69. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0829573509349031>
- Hansen, R. (2015). Measuring School Climate Using the 2015 School Crime Supplement. *Technical Report*, 47.
- Hart, T., Hart, J., & Miethe, T. (2013). Situational Context of Student Bullying Victimization and Reporting Behavior. *Justice Research and Policy*, 15, 43–73.
<https://doi.org/10.3818/JRP.15.2.2013.43>
- Hee Im, M., Hughes, J. N., Cao, Q., & Kwok, O. (2016). Effects of extracurricular participation during middle school on academic motivation and achievement at grade 9. *American Educational Research Journal*, 53(5), 1343–1375.
- Hill, J. P., & Lynch, M. E. (1983). The Intensification of Gender-Related Role Expectations during Early Adolescence. In J. Brooks-Gunn & A. C. Petersen (Eds.), *Girls at Puberty* (pp. 201–228). Springer US. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-0354-9_10
- Homans, G. C. (1958). Social Behavior as Exchange. *American Journal of Sociology*, 63(6), 597–606.

- Hunter, S. C., Noret, N., & Boyle, J. M. E. (2021). Measurement issues relevant to questionnaire data. In *The Wiley Blackwell handbook of bullying: A comprehensive and international review of research and intervention, Vol. 1* (pp. 179–195). Wiley Blackwell.
- ICPSR. (2021). Resource Guide: National Crime Victimization Survey. *Institute for Social Research University of Michigan*. Retrieved from <https://www.icpsr.umich.edu/web/pages/NACJD/NCVS/index.html>
- Jain, S., Cohen, A. K., Paglisotti, T., Subramanyam, M. A., Chopel, A., & Miller, E. (2018). School climate and physical adolescent relationship abuse: Differences by sex, socioeconomic status, and bullying. *Journal of Adolescence*, 66, 71–82. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2018.05.001>
- Joronen, K., Konu, A., Rankin, H. S., & Åstedt-Kurki, P. (2012). An evaluation of a drama program to enhance social relationships and anti-bullying at elementary school: A controlled study. *Health Promotion International*, 27(1), 5–14. <https://doi.org/10.1093/heapro/dar012>
- Karmen, A. (2018). *Crime Victims: An introduction to Victimology* (10th ed.). Cengage.
- Kim, Y. S., & Leventhal, B. (2008). Bullying and suicide. A review. *International Journal of Adolescent Medicine and Health*, 20(2). <https://doi.org/10.1515/IJAMH.2008.20.2.133>
- Kennedy, R. S. (2021). Bullying Trends in the United States: A Meta-Regression. *Trauma, Violence, & Abuse*, 22(4), 914–927. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1524838019888555>
- Kraus, M. W., Piff, P. K., Mendoza-Denton, R., Rheinschmidt, M. L., & Keltner, D. (2012). Social class, solipsism, and contextualism: How the rich are different from the poor. *Psychological Review*, 119(3), 546–572. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0028756>
- Lee, J. E., Pope, Z., & Gao, Z. (2018). The Role of Youth Sports in Promoting Children’s Physical Activity and Preventing Pediatric Obesity: A Systematic Review. *Behavioral Medicine*, 44(1), 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08964289.2016.1193462>

- Liben, L. S., Bigler, R. S., & Krogh, H. R. (2001). Pink and blue collar jobs: Children's judgments of job status and job aspirations in relation to sex of worker. *Journal of Experimental Child Psychology*, 79(4), 346–363. <https://doi.org/10.1006/jecp.2000.2611>
- Longobardi, C., Iotti, N. O., Jungert, T., & Settanni, M. (2018). Student-teacher relationships and bullying: The role of student social status. *Journal of Adolescence*, 63, 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.adolescence.2017.12.001>
- Makel, M., Mathews, M., Peters, S., Rambo-Hernandez, K., & Plucker, J. (2016). *How Can So Many Students Be Invisible? Large Percentages of American Students Perform Above Grade Level*.
- Manstead, A. S. R. (2018). The psychology of social class: How socioeconomic status impacts thought, feelings, and behaviour. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 57(2), 267–291. <https://doi.org/10.1111/bjso.12251>
- al and Emotional Adjustment of Participants. *Graduate Thesis and Dissertations*, 114.
- Mahoney, J. L., Larson, R. W., Eccles, J. S., & Lord, H. (2005). Organized activities as contexts of development: *Extracurricular activities, after-school and community programs*, 3–22.
- Malhotra, A., Amin, A., & Nanda, P. (2019). Catalyzing Gender Norm Change for Adolescent Sexual and Reproductive Health: Investing in Interventions for Structural Change. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 64(4), S13–S15. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2019.01.013>
- Mandalaywala, T. M., Tai, C., & Rhodes, M. (2020). Children's use of race and gender as cues to social status. *PLOS ONE*, 15(6), e0234398. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0234398>
- McClean, E. J., Martin, S. R., Emich, K. J., & Woodruff, Col. T. (2018). The Social Consequences of Voice: An Examination of Voice Type and Gender on Status and Subsequent Leader Emergence. *Academy of Management Journal*, 61(5), 1869–1891. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2016.0148>
- Mcvean, M. (2017). Physical, Verbal, Relational and Cyber-Bullying and Victimization: Examining the Soci

- Meier, A., Hartmann, B. S., & Larson, R. (2018). A Quarter Century of Participation in School-Based Extracurricular Activities: Inequalities by Race, Class, Gender and Age? *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 47(6), 1299–1316. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-018-0838-1>
- Menjívar, C., Simmons, W. P., Alvord, D., & Salerno Valdez, E. (2018). Immigration Enforcement, the Racialization of Legal Status, and Perceptions of the Police: Latinos in Chicago, Los Angeles, Houston, and Phoenix in Comparative Perspective. *Du Bois Review: Social Science Research on Race*, 15(1), 107–128. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1742058X18000115>
- Miller, A. L. (2011). *Running Head: SOCIAL DESIRABILITY BIAS*. 18.
- Miró, F. (2014). Routine Activity Theory. In *The Encyclopedia of Theoretical Criminology* (pp. 1–7). American Cancer Society. <https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118517390.wbetc198>
- Molm, L. D. (2003). Theoretical Comparisons of Forms of Exchange. *Sociological Theory*, 21(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9558.00171>
- Moriana, J. A., Alós, F., Alcalá, R., Pino, M. J., Herruzo, J., & Ruiz, R. (2006). *Extra-curricular activities and academic performance in secondary students*. 4(8), 12.
- Mustaine, E. E., & Tewksbury, R. (2000). Comparing the Lifestyles of Victims, Offenders, and Victim-Offenders: A Routine Activity Theory Assessment of Similarities and Differences for Criminal Incident Participants. *Sociological Focus*, 33(3), 339–362.
- Musu, L., Zhang, A., Wang, K., Zhang, J., Oudekerk, B. (2019). Indications of School Crime and Safety, 2018. *United States Department of Education*.
- Nansel, T., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R., Ruan, J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying Behaviors Among US Youth: *Prevalence and Association With Psychosocial Adjustment*. *JAMA*, 285(16), 2094–2100. <https://doi.org/doi:10.1001/jama.285.16.2094>
- National Center for Education Statistics. (2015). School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey 2005. *Bureau of Justice Statistics*.
- Oberle, E., Ji, X. R., Guhn, M., Schonert-Reichl, K. A., & Gadermann, A. M. (2019). Benefits of Extracurricular Participation in Early Adolescence: Associations with Peer Belonging and

- Mental Health. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 48(11), 2255–2270.
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s10964-019-01110-2>
- Office of Juvenile Justice and Delinquency Prevention. (2013). “Bullying Literature Review.”
 Development Services Group, Inc. Retrieved from
<https://www.ojjdp.gov/mpg/litreviews/Bullying.pdf>
- Ohio University. (2020). *The Diversity and Demographics of American Youth Sports* [Infographic].
<https://onlinemasters.ohio.edu/blog/diversity-demographics-of-american-youth-sports/>
- Pandya, N. K. (2021). Disparities in Youth Sports and Barriers to Participation. *Current Reviews in Musculoskeletal Medicine*, 14(6), 441–446. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12178-021-09716-5>
- Parzefall, M.-R., & Salin, D. M. (2010). Perceptions of and reactions to workplace bullying: A social exchange perspective. *Human Relations*, 63(6), 761–780.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726709345043>
- Paskov, M., Gërzhani, K., & van de Werfhorst, H. G. (2017). Giving Up on the Joneses? The Relationship between Income Inequality and Status-seeking. *European Sociological Review*, jcw052. <https://doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcw052>
- Paul, G. D., & Kee, D. M. H. (2020). *HR, Workplace Bullying, and Turnover Intention: The role of Work Engagement*. 8(1), 5.
- Peguero, A. A. (2008). Bullying Victimization and Extracurricular Activity. *Journal of School Violence*, 7(3), 71–85.
- Penner, A. M., & Saperstein, A. (2013). Engendering Racial Perceptions: An Intersectional Analysis of How Social Status Shapes Race. *Gender and Society*, 27(3), 319–344.
- Pontes, N. M. H., Ayres, C. G., Lewandowski, C., & Pontes, M. C. F. (2018). Trends in bullying victimization by gender among U.S. high school students. *Research in Nursing & Health*, 41(3), 243–251. <https://doi.org/10.1002/nur.21868>

- Popp, A. M., & Peguero, A. A. (2011). Routine Activities and Victimization at School: The Significance of Gender. *Journal of Interpersonal Violence*, 26(12), 2413–2436.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/0886260510383021>
- Post, E. G., Green, N. E., Schaefer, D. A., Trigsted, S. M., Brooks, M. A., McGuine, T. A., Watson, A. M., & Bell, D. R. (2018). Socioeconomic status of parents with children participating on youth club sport teams. *Physical Therapy in Sport*, 32, 126–132.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ptsp.2018.05.014>
- Pouwels, J. L., Lansu, T. A. M., & Cillessen, A. H. N. (2018). A developmental perspective on popularity and the group process of bullying. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 43, 64–70.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.avb.2018.10.003>
- Pouwels, J. L., Noorden, T. H. J. van, Lansu, T. A. M., & Cillessen, A. H. N. (2018). The participant roles of bullying in different grades: Prevalence and social status profiles. *Social Development*, 27(4), 732–747. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12294>
- Pouwels, J. L., Salmivalli, C., Saarento, S., Berg, Y. H. M. van den, Lansu, T. A. M., & Cillessen, A. H. N. (2018). Predicting Adolescents' Bullying Participation from Developmental Trajectories of Social Status and Behavior. *Child Development*, 89(4), 1157–1176.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/cdev.12794>
- Rahal, D., Huynh, V., Cole, S., Seeman, T., & Fuligni, A. (2020). Subjective Social Status and Health during High School and Young Adulthood. *Developmental Psychology*, 56(6), 1220–1232.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/dev0000919>
- Rashotte, L. S., & Webster, M. (2005). Gender status beliefs. *Social Science Research*, 34(3), 618–633.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssresearch.2004.05.004>
- Ridgeway, C. L. (2001). Gender, Status, and Leadership. *Journal of Social Issues*, 57(4), 637–655.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/0022-4537.00233>

- Rowley, S. J., Kurtz-Costes, B., Mistry, R., & Feagans, L. (2007). Social Status as a Predictor of Race and Gender Stereotypes in Late Childhood and Early Adolescence. *Social Development*, 16(1), 150–168. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9507.2007.00376.x>
- Rowley, S. R. W., & Graham, P. J. (1999). Intensive training in youth sport: An example of unequal opportunity. *Children & Society*, 13(2), 119–129. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1099-0860.1999.tb00113.x>
- Schreck, C. J., Miller, J. M., & Gibson, C. L. (2003). Trouble in the School Yard: A Study of the Risk Factors of Victimization at School. *Crime & Delinquency*, 49(3), 460–484. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0011128703049003006>
- Schwab, K. A., Dustin, D. L., and Bricker, K.S. (2017). Reframing Humankind’s Relationship with Nature: Contributions from Social Exchange Theory. *Journal of Sustainability Education*, 12.
- Scott, K. L., Restubog, S. L. D., & Zagenczyk, T. J. (2013). A social exchange-based model of the antecedents of workplace exclusion. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(1), 37–48. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0030135>
- Sentse, M., Kretschmer, T., & Salmivalli, C. (2015). The Longitudinal Interplay between Bullying, Victimization, and Social Status: Age-related and Gender Differences. *Social Development*, 24(3), 659–677. <https://doi.org/10.1111/sode.12115>
- Seow, P.-S., & Pan, G. (2014). A Literature Review of the Impact of Extracurricular Activities Participation on Students’ Academic Performance. *Journal of Education for Business*, 89(7), 361–366. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08832323.2014.912195>
- Shakib, S., Veliz, P., Dunbar, M. D., & Sabo, D. (2011). Athletics as a Source for Social Status among Youth: Examining Variation by Gender, Race/Ethnicity, and Socioeconomic Status. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28(3), 303–328. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.28.3.303>
- Shutts, K., Roben, C. K. P., & Spelke, E. S. (2013). Children’s Use of Social Categories in Thinking About People and Social Relationships. *Journal of Cognition and Development*, 14(1), 35–62. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15248372.2011.638686>

- Shutts, K., Brey, E. L., Dornbusch, L. A., Slywotzky, N., & Olson, K. R. (2016). Children Use Wealth Cues to Evaluate Others. *PLOS ONE*, 11(3), e0149360.
<https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0149360>
- Smith, P. K. (2016). Bullying: Definition, Types, Causes, Consequences and Intervention. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 10(9), 519–532. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spc3.12266>
- Snellman, K., Silva, J. M., Frederick C. B., & Putnam, R. D. (2015). The Engagement Gap: Social Mobility and Extracurricular Participation among American Youth. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 657, 194–207.
- Stelko-Pereira, A. C., Valle, J. E., Williams, L. C. A. (2018). The Importance of Recreational Activities to Assess and Prevent Bullying. *Positive Schooling and Child Development*.
https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-13-0077-6_14
- Thirer, J., & Wright, S. D. (1985). Sport and Social Status for Adolescent Males and Females. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 2(2), 164–171. <https://doi.org/10.1123/ssj.2.2.164>
- Tippett, N., & Wolke, D. (2014). Socioeconomic Status and Bullying: A Meta-Analysis. *American Journal of Public Health*, 104(6), e48–e59. <https://doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.2014.301960>
- US Census Bureau. (2019). Commuting Characteristics by Sex (S0801) [data file]. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/cedsci/table?q=gender%20and%20public%20transportation&tid=A CSST1Y2019.S0801>
- Vaillancourt, T., Hymel, S., & McDougall, P. (2013). The Biological Underpinnings of Peer Victimization: Understanding Why and How the Effects of Bullying Can Last a Lifetime. *Theory Into Practice*, 52(4), 241–248. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00405841.2013.829726>
- Vaillancourt, T., McDougall, P., Hymel, S., & Sunderani, S. (2010). Respect or Fear? The relationship between power and bullying behavior. In *The Handbook of Bullying in Schools: An International Perspective* (pp. 211–219).

- Veliz, P., Snyder, M., & Sabo, D. (2019). *The State of High School Sports in America: An Evaluation of the Nation's Most Popular Extracurricular Activity*. New York, NY: Women's Sports Foundation.
- Volk, A., & Lagzdins, L. (2009). Bullying and victimization among adolescent girl athletes. *Journal of Athletic Training*, 11, 13–31.
- Volk, A. A., Dane, A. V., & Marini, Z. A. (2014). What is bullying? A theoretical redefinition. *Developmental Review*, 34(4), 327–343. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dr.2014.09.001>
- Vyas, S., & Heise, L. (2016). How do area-level socioeconomic status and gender norms affect partner violence against women? Evidence from Tanzania. *International Journal of Public Health*, 61(8), 971–980. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00038-016-0876-y>
- Weeden, J., & Sabini, J. (2005). Physical Attractiveness and Health in Western Societies: A Review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 131(5), 635–653. <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.131.5.635>
- White, A. M., & Gager, C. T. (2007). Idle Hands and Empty Pockets? Youth Involvement in Extracurricular Activities, Social Capital, and Economic Status. *Youth & Society*, 39(1), 75–111. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0044118X06296906>
- Williams, G. C., Burns, K. E., Battista, K., de Groh, M., Jiang, Y., & Leatherdale, S. T. (2020). High school sport participation and substance use: A cross-sectional analysis of students from the COMPASS study. *Addictive Behaviors Reports*, 12, 100298. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.abrep.2020.100298>
- Wingood, G., & DiClemente, R. (2002). “The Theory of Gender and Power: A Social Structural Theory for Guiding Public Health Interventions.” *Strategies for Improving Public Health*. 313-346.
- Ybarra, M. L., Espelage, D. L., & Mitchell, K. J. (2014). Differentiating Youth Who Are Bullied From Other Victims of Peer-Aggression: The Importance of Differential Power and Repetition. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, 55(2), 293–300. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jadohealth.2014.02.009>

Appendix

Variables and Statistical models

Model 1.

The dependent variable for model 1 is, VS0076 – Q22D “During this school year has another student: pushed you, shoved you, tripped you, or spit on you?” The nine covariates include the participant’s 1) age (V3014), 2) gender (V3018), 3) race (V3023A), 4) ethnicity (V3024), 5) sport involvement (VS0029 – Q9A), 6) spirit group involvement (VS0030 – Q9B), 7) performing arts involvement (VS0031 Q9C), 8) student government involvement (VS0033 Q9E), and 9) other school club involvement (VS0035 – Q9G). This model will be used to assess the relationship between physical bullying victimization and the predictor variables.

Model 2.

The dependent variable for model 2 is, VS0079 – Q22G “During this school year has another student: destroyed your property on purpose?” The nine covariates include the participant’s 1) age (V3014), 2) gender (V3018), 3) race (V3023A), 4) ethnicity (V3024), 5) sport involvement (VS0029 – Q9A), 6) spirit group involvement (VS0030 – Q9B), 7) performing arts involvement (VS0031 Q9C), 8) student government involvement (VS0033 Q9E), and 9) other school club involvement (VS0035 – Q9G). This model will be used to assess the relationship between physical bullying victimization and the predictor variables.

Model 3.

The dependent variable for model 3 is, VS0073 – Q22A “During this school year, has another student: made fun of you, called you names, or insulted you, in a hurtful way?” The nine covariates include the participant’s 1) age (V3014), 2) gender (V3018), 3) race (V3023A), 4) ethnicity (V3024), 5) sport involvement (VS0029 – Q9A), 6) spirit group involvement (VS0030 – Q9B), 7) performing arts involvement (VS0031 Q9C), 8) student government involvement (VS0033 Q9E), and 9) other school club involvement (VS0035 – Q9G). This model will be used to assess the relationship between verbal bullying victimization and the predictor variables.

Model 4.

The dependent variable for model 4 is, VS0075 – Q22C “During this school year has another student: threatened you with harm?” The nine covariates include the participant’s 1) age (V3014), 2) gender (V3018), 3) race (V3023A), 4) ethnicity (V3024), 5) sport involvement (VS0029 – Q9A), 6) spirit group involvement (VS0030 – Q9B), 7) performing arts involvement (VS0031 Q9C), 8) student government involvement (VS0033 Q9E), and 9) other school club involvement (VS0035 – Q9G). This model will be used to assess the relationship between verbal bullying victimization and the predictor variables.

Model 5.

The dependent variable for model 5 is, VS0074 Q22B “During this school year has another student: spread rumors about you or tried to make others dislike you?” The nine covariates include the participant’s 1) age (V3014), 2) gender (V3018), 3) race (V3023A), 4) ethnicity (V3024), 5) sport involvement (VS0029 – Q9A), 6) spirit group involvement (VS0030 – Q9B), 7) performing arts involvement (VS0031 Q9C), 8) student government involvement (VS0033 Q9E), and 9) other school club involvement (VS0035 – Q9G). This model will be used to assess the relationship between relational bullying victimization and the predictor variables.

Model 6.

The dependent variable for model 6 is, VS0077 – Q22E “During this school year has another student: tried to make you do things you did not want to do?” The nine covariates include the participant’s 1) age (V3014), 2) gender (V3018), 3) race (V3023A), 4) ethnicity (V3024), 5) sport involvement (VS0029 – Q9A), 6) spirit group involvement (VS0030 – Q9B), 7) performing arts involvement (VS0031 Q9C), 8) student government involvement (VS0033 Q9E), and 9) other school club involvement (VS0035 – Q9G). This model will be used to assess the relationship between relational bullying victimization and the predictor variables.

Model 7.

The dependent variable for model 7 is, VS0078 – Q22F “During this school year has another student: excluded you from activities on purpose?” The nine covariates include the participant’s 1) age (V3014), 2) gender (V3018), 3) race (V3023A), 4) ethnicity (V3024), 5) sport involvement (VS0029 – Q9A), 6) spirit group involvement (VS0030 – Q9B), 7) performing arts involvement (VS0031 Q9C), 8) student government involvement (VS0033 Q9E), and 9) other school club involvement (VS0035 – Q9G). This model will be used to assess the relationship between relational bullying victimization and the predictor variables.

Model 8.

The dependent variable for model 8 does not come directly from the NCVS-SCS. Rather, the dependent variable used in this model was a new variable created by summing the previously mentioned seven dependent variables and coded to differentiate those who have experienced one or more types of bullying from those who have not experienced any type of bullying victimization. The dependent variable for model 7 is, VS0078 – Q22F “During this school year has another student: excluded you from activities on purpose?” The nine covariates include the participant’s 1) age (V3014), 2) gender (V3018), 3) race (V3023A), 4) ethnicity (V3024), 5) sport involvement (VS0029 – Q9A), 6) spirit group involvement (VS0030 – Q9B), 7) performing arts involvement (VS0031 Q9C), 8) student government involvement (VS0033 Q9E), and 9) other school club involvement (VS0035 – Q9G). This model will be used to assess the relationship between any form of bullying victimization and the predictor variables.