Photo by Veronica Adrover

Reviewing the Association between Early Attachment Style and Bystander Behavior in Instances of Bullying during Childhood and Adolescence

Roisin Shannon

University of California, Merced

Attachment style, Bystander behavior, Moral disengagement, shame management

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Abstract

Although several studies have analyzed the correlation between early attachment style and the likelihood of becoming a bully or victim, little to no research has been conducted on a possible association between early attachment style and bystander behavior in children and adolescents. This is unfortunate because, though bystander intervention can help victims escape victimization, it rarely occurs. To determine whether there is a possible association between early attachment style and bystander behavior, this literature review analyzed research correlating early attachment with Moral Disengagement and Shame Management, both of which enable passivity. Analysis revealed that a plausible predictive relationship exists between passive bystander behavior and victim-blaming, and early attachment style. This literature review concludes with a discussion of limitations and suggestions for future research.

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Introduction

Houbre et al. (2006) define bullying as "all forms of repeated physical or mental violence performed by an individual on another person who is not capable of defending him/herself" (p. 183). However, it is important to note that bullying rarely concerns only the bully and the victim. Usually, there are bystanders who witness cases of bullying and, hypothetically, have the option to intervene. Although research on children and adolescents has found that bystanders are often present during instances of bullying, the same research has also found that these bystanders rarely intervene (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001; Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Craig & Pepler, 1999; and O'Connell, Pepler, & Craig, 1999). The average rate of bystander presence in these four studies was 89.5%, while the average rate of intervention was 16.5% -- and note that the intervention rate found by O'Connell, Pepler, & Craig was an outlier that raised the average from 13.6%.

Researchers have found several possible explanations as to why some individuals act as passive bystanders (bystanders who do not intervene to help or further hinder the victim explicitly, but rather do nothing), and these explanations are not mutually exclusive. One possible explanation is the Bystander Effect (Darley & Latane, 1968), in which witnesses to bullying expect other witnesses to intervene before they, themselves, do (Obermann, 2011). Another possibility is that passive bystanders simply lack the courage to intervene (Obermann, 2011). A third possibility involves the Just World Theory. According to this theory, people tend

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

to believe that victims of misfortune deserve what happens to them (Lerner, 1980). Thus, when one individual witness another individual being victimized, it threatens their Just World beliefs and arouses distress. In order to redeem their beliefs and reduce the distress, the individual may engage in victim-blaming (Harber, Podolski, & Williams, 2015). Therefore, when a child witnesses an instance of bullying, to relieve his own distress caused by the bullying, he will blame the victim for supposedly inciting the bullying, and choose not to intervene since he perceives no victim, thus becoming a passive bystander. Indeed, in their study on children's justification for bullying, Hara (2002) found a high prevalence of the 'denial of victim' justification strategy among bystanders, consistent with the Just World Theory.

Existing research on passive bystanding in relation to the Bystander Effect, courage, and Just World beliefs has been very informative about the reasons and the rationale of passive bystanders. However, although the rates of bullying intervention are low, there are children who intervene. Yet there is a paucity of research that speaks to the difference between children who do and do not intervene – children who do intervene must also experience distress when their Just World beliefs are threatened by bullying, but they do not use victim-blaming as a coping mechanism. So, what causes one child to use victim-blaming as a coping mechanism and behave passively, while another child intervenes?

Understanding the precedents of each coping style is important. Knowing the precedents could be the first step in changing the outcomes: if we understood why some children develop less passive and more positive strategies to cope with personal distress caused by witnessing the

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

victimization of another, plans could be put in place to help more children develop those strategies. Likewise, if we understood why some children develop passive coping strategies, efforts could be made to help them not go down that path. If more children intervened sympathetically in instances of bullying and did not cope by blaming the victim, doors would be opened for victims of bullying. In her literature review and analysis, Bierman (2004) reported that "peers control the niches of social opportunity to rejected children. When they decide that they do not like particular children, peers become less available to those children." Thus, a bystander is one of a victim's greatest chances to escape victimization, but this depends on whether a bystander chooses to intervene or be passive. Understanding why certain children make each choice is critical.

This literature review argues that early attachment style is one influential factor in bystander behavior in childhood and adolescence. While securely attached children are "likely to possess a representational model of attachment figure(s) as being available, responsive, and helpful" (Bowlby, 1980, p. 242), children with insecure attachment (avoidant, ambivalent/resistant, or disorganized), are, respectively, emotionally independent of their attachment figure (Behrens, Hesse. & Main, 2007), ambivalent toward their attachment figure (Ainsworth, 1970), or confused by or fearful or their attachment figure (Hesse & Main, 2006). Several studies have already noted a correlation between early attachment style and the likelihood of becoming a bully or victim (Van der Watt, 2014; Kokkinos, 2013; and Rigby, Slee, & Martin, 2007), but the correlation between early attachment style and bystander behavior has

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

been largely unanalyzed. By reviewing the literature on bystander behavior, moral development, ethical coping strategies, and early attachment style, I have determined that bystander behavior could be partially dependent on the early attachment style of the bystander. I conclude with suggestions on what steps should be taken to increase sympathetic bystander intervention, as well as recommendations for future research.

Methods

The articles used for this literature review were found in the databases Google Scholar and PsycINFO, while the books used for this review were acquired through the University of California library. I began my research by reading about the rationale found for passive bystander behavior in instances of school bullying. When the two terms, Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement repeatedly appeared throughout the literature as passivity enablers, I first studied the concepts, then researched whether personality attributes consistent with Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement have been determined to be correlated to early attachment style.

To ensure that my sources were valid, I refined my searches to include only empirical, and peer-reviewed works. These sources included both studies and literature reviews – while studies provided me with empirical findings and data, literature reviews provided me with references and arguments that further helped my research.

Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacements are important factors in bystander behavior and victim-blaming, especially, as they permit individuals to perceive an ethically-threatening situation as just or insignificant.

Moral Disengagement is "disengagement and detachment from mainstream societal values" (Hyde, Shaw, & Moilanen, 2010) and is an "individual predisposition to evoke cognitions that allow individuals to restructure their actions to appear less harmful, minimize their role in the outcomes of their actions, or attenuate the distress that they cause to others" (Yang, 2012). In a similar vein, Shame Displacement involves blaming others for a wrongdoing. Shame Displacement is one of two types of Shame Management, which is a set of strategies used to rationalize wrongdoings which threaten our ethical identity (Ahmed, 2008). While the second type of Shame Management, Shame Acknowledgement, is an admission of shame and involves expressing remorse, an individual with Shame Displacement would likely become angry at a victim of bullying for supposedly inciting the bullying, rather than feeling shame for not intervening.

Although much of the research conducted on Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement has focused only on bullies, a few studies have found correlations between Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement, and passive bystander behavior. Obermann (2011) found that unconcerned passive bystanders displayed higher levels of moral disengagement than defenders and guilty bystanders in instances of bullying, and Ahmed (2008) found that children with Shame Displacement are less likely to intervene and help victims in instances of bullying.

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Although the research on these correlations is sparse, it can still be argued that Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement are important predictors of passive by-standing and victim blaming. Thus, what predicts children's likelihood of developing Moral Disengagement and Shame Management? In the next section, I review their ties to early attachment style.

Early Attachment Style

There are likely several contributing reasons why some children develop Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement while others do not. However, my attention was caught by existing research which has found that early attachment style influences the likelihood that a child will become a bully or a victim. Specifically, I was interested in what Van der Watt (2014) reported in her study on attachment and bullying: that more research is needed to clarify the correlation between insecure attachment and misconceptions of the self and of others. Passive bystanding and victim-blaming hinge on Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement. Moreover, if Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement hinge on changing one's perception of who is to blame in a specific situation and what is ethical, Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement must hinge, to some degree, on misconceptions of others. Thus, it could be possible that passive bystanding and victim-blaming are influenced by insecure attachment. This section analyzes the possible influences that early attachment style has on the development of Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement.

Moral Disengagement and Early Attachment Style

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

The amount of research on the development and predictors of Moral Disengagement is scant, but at least one study has examined the association between early attachment and the later development of Moral Disengagement. Hyde, Shaw, & Moilanen (2009) found that rejecting parenting at ages 1.5 and 2 years predicted Moral Disengagement at age 15. The researchers also found that empathy was a very strong predictor of Moral Disengagement, and they suggested that quality of parenting contributes to the development of empathy in an individual. Indeed, several studies have found positive correlations between early insecure attachment and low empathy[1].

Shame Displacement and Early Attachment Style

Although the amount of research on the development and predictors of Shame Displacement is also scant, existing research conducted by one team of researchers, Ahmed et al. (2001), is somewhat extensive. In one study, Ahmed and colleagues analyzed the correlations between Shame Displacement, and both personality variables and family variables. They found negative correlations between Shame Displacement, and empathy, internal locus of control, and pride-proneness, and positive correlations between Shame Displacement and impulsivity. Moreover, the researchers found a negative correlation between positive parent-child affect and Shame Displacement, and a positive correlation between family disharmony and Shame Displacement.

[1] These findings are discussed fully on page 6

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

In addition to the findings by Ahmed et al. (2001), this paper argues that there may be a positive correlation between negative attributional style and Shame Displacement. Although this personality variable was not tested by Ahmed et al. (2001), it is reasonable to hesitantly assume that someone prone to Shame Displacement would logically have a negative attribution style, as they assign negative intentions and actions to others.

The following subsections analyze the correlations between these variables and early attachment style to determine whether Shame Displacement may be correlated with early attachment style and whether early attachment style may be connected to passive bystander behavior.

Empathy and early attachment style. Several studies have found positive correlations between insecure early attachment and the development of low empathy. In her literature review and analysis, Feldman (2007) found that the degree of synchrony (which predicts attachment security) during the first year of life was directly predictive of the level of empathy observed in adolescence, as well as the child's self- regulatory abilities at 2, 4, and 6. Another study, by Kestenbaum, Farber, & Sroufe (1989), found that children with histories of secure early attachment were rated as more empathic by their teachers than children without histories of secure attachment. Moreover, Bischof-Kohler (2000), found that young children assessed as insecurely attached did not respond empathetically to others. Similar findings have been reported by Raikes & Thompson (2006) and Laible & Thompson (1998). Additionally, in

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

her literature review on childhood emotional abuse and attachment, Riggs (2010) presented a conceptual model grounded in attachment theory describing the cycle of childhood emotional abuse (e.g., parental rejection, intrusion, control, hostility, or frightening behavior) in the absence of intervention. The model portrays emotionally abusive parenting behaviors as precedents to infant attachment insecurity, and then lists low empathy as one antecedent of insecure attachment in a hierarchical regression.

Existing literature clearly indicates a plausible causal relation between early attachment style and the development of empathy, with less securely attached infants later displaying less empathy. Based on these findings, it is reasonable to argue that the same children and adolescents susceptible to low empathy as a result of early insecure attachment are likely also susceptible to Shame Displacement, based on the finding, by Ahmed et al. (2001), that there is a negative correlation between Shame Displacement and empathy. Thus, with empathy acting as a partial conduit, there may be a connection between early insecure attachment and Shame Displacement, which, in turn, could lead to passive bystanding.

Internal locus of control and early attachment style. Few recent peer-reviewed studies have analyzed the relationship between one's internal locus of control and attachment style. One such existing study by Di Pentima and Toni (2010) found that an internal locus of control in children is positively associated with secure attachment, while an external locus of control in children is associated with insecure attachment.

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Although this study by Di Pentima and Toni is the only one of its kind in the 21st century so far to analyze the direct relationship between early attachment style and locus of control, several earlier studies have analyzed the relationship between parenting characteristics and locus of control in children. In their study on parental antecedents of the development of children's locus of control, Davis and Phares (1969) found that nurturing parenting was associated with children developing an internal locus of control, while rejecting and inconsistent parenting was associated with children developing an external locus of control. Similarly, in his literature review on the impact of family processes on control beliefs, Schneewind (1995) found that responsive and emotionally supportive parenting was associated with children developing an internal locus of control, while parenting that was neglectful, rejecting, and less responsive was associated with the development of an external locus of control. Similar conclusions were reached by Diethelm (1991). While these studies did not analyze locus of control in direct relation to early attachment, the parenting characteristics determined to correlate significantly with locus of control have been found to be highly predictive of attachment style. In her literature review, Riggs (2010) lists neglectful, rejecting, and inconsistently responsive parenting behaviors as features of insecure attachment – as associated with the Adult Attachment Interview and the Strange Situation task – while sensitive and responsive parenting behaviors are listed as features of secure attachment. Thus, although these studies do not examine the direct relationship between attachment style and locus of control, other existing literature suggests a positive correlation between early insecure attachment and an external locus of control.

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Based on these findings, it is reasonable to argue that the same children and adolescents susceptible to an external locus of control, as a result of early insecure attachment, are also likely susceptible to Shame Displacement, based on the finding, by Ahmed et al. (2001), that there is a negative correlation between Shame Displacement and internal locus of control. Thus, with locus of control acting as a partial conduit, there may be a connection between early insecure attachment and Shame Displacement, which, in turn, could lead to passive bystanding.

Pride-proneness and early attachment style. Ahmed et al. (2001, p. 269) define pride-proneness as a "stable tendency to experience pride in performance in response to a positively evaluated behavior." While a few researchers have analyzed some aspects of pride-proneness – its respective positive and negative relations to guilt- proneness and shame-proneness (Tangey, 1990), as well as its negative relationship with aggression (Ornstein, 1997) – I found no research analyzing possible precedents of pride- proneness, including the relationship between early attachment and pride-proneness. Most of the literature I ran across looked at pride, but not pride-proneness, indicating a need for more research.

Impulsivity and early attachment style. Several studies indicate a positive correlation between secure early attachment and later adaptive impulse control (ego-control) in children. In their study on adopted children's adjustment in middle childhood as predicted by maternal sensitivity, infant attachment and temperament, Stams, Juffer, and Van IJzendoorn (2002) found that more secure infant attachment predicted better social and cognitive

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

development overall, and the combination of attachment disorganization and difficult temperament predicted lower ego-control. Other researchers have found that insecure attachment, though not necessarily disorganized and without the influence of difficult temperament, can alone predict maladaptive levels of ego-control. In their study on the correlation between early parenting and later ego-control, Kremen & Block (1998) found that positive, affectionate, and autonomy-promoting relations with parents served as protective factors against developing maladaptive levels of ego-control (maladaptively high or low). These parenting behaviors – affection and autonomy-promoting – were also found by Riggs (2010) to be positively associated with secure attachment and negatively associated with insecure attachment. Thus, one can infer that attachment style is thereby predictive of ego-control. Similar findings were reported by Olson, Bates, and Bayles (1990) in their study of the early antecedents of childhood impulsivity. The authors found that responsive and stimulating parenting in the 2nd year of life predicted later ego-control, as did the security of mother-infant attachment, though only in boys. Moreover, Arend, Grove, and Sroufe (1979) found that infants with anxious-resistant attachment and anxious avoidant attachment later developed maladaptive levels of ego-control (too low and too high, respectively), while securely attached infants later developed moderate, adaptive ego-control.

These findings strongly indicate that early attachment style is predictive of later impulse control, with more secure attachment predicting better control. Based on these findings, it is reasonable to argue that the same children and adolescents susceptible to impulsivity as a result

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

of early insecure attachment are likely also susceptible to Shame Displacement, based on the finding, by Ahmed et al. (2001), that there is a positive correlation between Shame Displacement and impulsivity. Thus, with impulsivity acting as a partial conduit, there may be a connection between early insecure attachment and Shame Displacement, which, in turn, could lead to passive bystanding.

Parent-child affect and early attachment style. To analyze the relationship between positive parent-child affect and Shame Displacement, Ahmed et al. (2001) measured positive parent-child affect with the following operational definitions: warm and intimate interactions between parent and child; parental affection expressed through hugging, kissing, and holding the child; finding parental satisfaction in one's child; parents joking and playing with child; parents feeling easygoing and relaxed with child; frequent anger with child (reverse score); and frequent conflict between parent and child (reverse score).

Although not every item used by Ahmed et al. (2001) to measure parent-child affect was analyzed by Riggs (2010), several were. With regards to warm and intimate parent-child interactions and physical expressions of parental affection, Riggs (2010) reported that parents of securely- attached infants display sensitive behaviors, while parents of insecurely-attached infants avoid emotional and physical closeness. Additionally, in regard to frequent anger with one's child, Riggs (2010) reported that angry, frightening, and hostile behaviors are found more often in parents of insecurely-attached infants.

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

These findings suggest that parent-child affect is associated with early attachment style, with positive affect predicting secure attachment and negative affect predicting insecure attachment. Based on these findings, it is reasonable to argue that the same children and adolescents who experienced negative parent-child affect and related early insecure attachment are likely also susceptible to Shame Displacement, based on the finding, by Ahmed et al. (2001), that there is a negative correlation between Shame Displacement and positive parent-child affect. Thus, with parent-child affect acting as a partial conduit, there may be a connection between early insecure attachment and Shame Displacement, which, in turn, could lead to passive bystanding.

Family harmony and early attachment style. To analyze the relationship between family harmony and Shame Displacement, Ahmed et al. (2001) measured family disharmony with the following operational definitions: frequency with which parents ignore child; frequency with which parents check up on child; frequency of difficulties among family members; and frequency of arguments or disagreements in the family.

Like the parent-child affect scale used by Ahmed et al. (2001), not every item used by the researchers to measure family disharmony has been extensively analyzed in relation to early attachment style, though several have. In regard to parents ignoring their child, Riggs (2010) reported that parents of insecurely-attached infants were more likely to display rejecting parenting behaviors. Moreover, in regard to difficulties among family members and arguments or

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

disagreements in the family, Cummings & Davies (2010) reported that destructive marital conflict behaviors (e.g., physical aggression, marital pursuit and withdrawal, nonverbal anger, and verbal hostility) can lead to interparental insecurity or parenting difficulties that can, in turn, lead to parent-child attachment insecurity.

These findings suggest that, like parent-child affect, family harmony is associated with early attachment style, with harmony predicting secure attachment and disharmony predicting insecure attachment. Based on these findings, it is reasonable to argue that the same children and adolescents who experienced family disharmony and related early insecure attachment are likely also susceptible to Shame Displacement, based on the finding, by Ahmed et al. (2001), that there is a positive correlation between Shame Displacement and family disharmony. Thus, with family disharmony acting as a partial conduit, there may be a connection between early insecure attachment and Shame Displacement, which, in turn, could lead to passive bystanding.

Attributional style and early attachment style. Several studies have found a positive correlation between insecure attachment and negative attributional style. In their study on attachment, self, and significant others in middle childhood, Clark & Symons (2009) found that securely-attached children made more positive attributions about the intentions of others than did insecurely-attached children. Similar results were reported by Zaccagnino et al. (2013), who found that insecurely-attached children displayed more hostile attributional bias, while securely-attached children showed more socially competent problem-solving strategies with

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

peers. Moreover, in their study on attachment security and parenting quality as predictors of children's problem-solving, attribution, and loneliness, Raikes & Thompson (2008) found that attachment security at 24 and 36 months was associated with enhanced social problem-solving skills, while early maternal depressive symptoms were positively associated with children's negative attributions at age 6. Additionally, Riggs (2010) found that insecure attachment in infancy can lead to poor social functioning characterized by a maladaptive interpersonal schema and biased negative attributions.

Although attributional style was not one of the personality variables tested by Ahmed et al. (2001) to be a characteristic of Shame Displacement, a positive relation between negative attributional style and Shame Displacement – as discussed above – seems logical. Moreover, existing literature indicates a positive association between early insecure attachment and negative attributional style. Thus, it can be reasonably argued that children with negative attributional bias as a result of early insecure attachment may be more likely to display Shame Displacement. Therefore, with negative attributional style acting as a partial conduit, there may be a connection between early insecure attachment and Shame Displacement, which, in turn, could lead to passive bystanding.

Discussion

Overview

In this review, I have demonstrated that a) Moral Disengagement and Shame

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Displacement are important factors in bystander behavior and victim-blaming, and b) the tendency to engage in either Moral Disengagement or Shame Displacement may be linked to early insecure attachment, thereby suggesting that passive bystander behavior and victim-blaming may be partially predicted by early insecure attachment.

It is important to emphasize, however, that this relation – if predictive – is only partially predictive. As mentioned earlier, other influential factors may include an individual's courage, and the specific circumstances in which an individual is placed (e.g., whether or not the Bystander Effect applies). Also, early attachment style is not the only factor that influences the development of Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement: Hyde, Shaw, & Moilanen (2009) found that neighborhood impoverishment was also positively correlated with the development of Moral Disengagement, and Ahmed et al. (2001) found that school variables were also associated with Shame Displacement (one's liking for school, experience of school hassles, and perceived control of bullying were all negatively correlated with Shame Displacement).

However, although this literature review does not provide evidence of an undeniable and solitary causal relationship between early attachment style and passive bystander behavior and victim-blaming, it does assert that a predictive relationship is very much possible.

Implications

Based on the two arguments I have made in this review, I will make two suggestions. First, as Harber et al. (2015) found, victim-blaming is a form of emotional coping that can be

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

prevented by engaging in emotional disclosure, as emotional disclosure provides witnesses with an alternative mechanism to cope with negative emotions. After demonstrating that victim-blaming hinges on Moral Disengagement and Shame Displacement, I recommend that teachers and parents have discussions with children and adolescents after they witness instances of bullying in order to help them express the distress they may be experiencing after their Just World beliefs have been threatened. By coping with their negative emotions through discussion, children and adolescents may be less inclined to cope through victim-blaming.

The second suggestion involves identifying children who are at particularly high risk for passive bystander behavior and victim-blaming, based on their attachment history, and intervening where possible. While it may be difficult to change the circumstances of a child or adolescent's home life, it may be possible to help them alter their locus of control or attributional style. By positively influencing a child or adolescent's personality variables, it may be possible to reduce their likelihood of developing Moral Disengagement or Shame Displacement, and thus increase their likelihood of coping with distress by sympathetically intervening when they witness instances of victimization.

Limitations and Future Research

One limitation of this literature review is that several of the sources cited are relatively old. Thus, though I believe that the information given here is accurate, more recent research would likely make my arguments more convincing. Also, my assertion that early attachment is

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

one influential factor in bystander behavior in childhood and adolescence depends heavily, at times, on stepwise connections, rather than direct connections, as that is what existing research allowed.

Future research should include longitudinal studies to determine with more certainty whether early insecure attachment may be predictive of passive bystander behavior and victim-blaming, as well as Moral Disengagement and Shame Management. Additionally, more research should be conducted on the role that courage plays in intervention, and how witnesses to victimization may garner more courage.

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

References

Ahmed. E. (2008). 'Stop it, that's enough': Bystander intervention and its relationship to school connectedness and shame management. Vulnerable Children and Youth Studies, 3, 203-213.

Ahmed, E., Harris, N., Braithwaite, J., & Braithwaite, V. (2001) Shame Management Through Reintegration. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Arend, R., Gove, F.L., & Sroufe, L.A. (1979). Continuity of individual adaptation from infancy to kindergarten: a predictive study of ego-resiliency and curiosity in preschoolers. Child Development, 50, 950-959.

Atlas, R.S. & Pepler, D.J. (2010). Observations of bullying in the classroom. The Journal of Educational Research, 92, 86-99.

Bierman, K.L. (2004). Peer rejection: Developmental processes and intervention strategies. New York: Guilford Press.

Bishof-Kohler, D. (2000). Empathy, prosocial behavior and attachment quality in two-year-olds. Psychology in Education, 47, 142-158.

Clark, S.E. & Symons, D.K. (2009). Representations of attachment relationships, the self, and significant others in middle childhood. Journal of the Canadian Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 18, 316-321.

Craig, W.M. & Pepler, D.J. (1997). Observations of bullying and victimization in the school

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

yard.

Canadian Journal of School Psychology, 13, 41-59.

Cummings, E.M. & Davies, P.T. (2010). Marital Conflict and Children. An Emotional Security Perspective. New York: The Guilford Press.

Darley, J. & Latane, B. (1968). Bystander intervention in emergencies: diffusion of responsibility. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 8, 377-383.

Davis, W.L. & Phares, E.J. (1969). Parental antecedents of internal-external control of reinforcement. Psychological Reports, 24, 427-436.

Di Pentima, L. & Toni, A. (2010). Attributional styles and attachment in childhood and adulthood. Eta Evolutiva, 95, 42-58.

Diethelm, K. (1991). Mutter-Kind-Interacktion. Entwicklung von ersten Kontrolluberzeugungen [Mother-child interaction. Development of early control beliefs]. Bern, Switzerland: Huber.

Feldman, R. (2007). Parent-infant synchrony and the construction of shared timing; physiological precursors, developmental outcomes, and risk conditions. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 48, 329-354.

Hara, H. (2002). Justifications for bullying among Japanese schoolchildren. Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 5, 197-204.

Harber, K.D., Podolski, P., & Williams, C.H. (2015). Emotional disclosure and victim blaming. Emotion, 15, 603-614.

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Hawkins, D.L., Pepler, D.J., & Craig, W.M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer interventions in bullying. Social Development, 10, 512-527.

Houbre, B., Tarquinio, C., Thuillier, I., & Hergott, E. (2006). Bullying among students and its consequences on health. European Journal of Psychology of Education, 21, 183-208.

Hyde, L.W., Shaw, D.S., & Molilanen, K.L. (2009). Developmental precursors of moral disengagement and the role of moral disengagement in the development of antisocial behavior. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 38, 197-209.

Kestenbaum, R., Farber, E.A., & Sroufe, L.A. (1989). Individual differences in empathy among preschoolers: Relation to attachment history. New Directions for Child Development, 44, 51-64

Kokkinos, C.M. (2013). Bullying and victimization in early adolescence: Associations with attachment style and perceived parenting. Journal of School Violence, 12, 174-192.

Kremen, A.M. & Block, J. (1998). The roots of ego-control in young adulthood : links with parenting in early childhood. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 75, 1062-1075.

Laible, D.J. & Thompson, R.A. (1998). Attachment and emotional understanding in preschool children. Developmental Psychology, 34, 1038-1045.

Lerner, M.J. (1980). The Belief in a Just World: A Fundamental Delusion. New York: Plenum Press.

Obermann, M. (2011). Moral disengagement among bystanders to school bullying. Journal of

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

School Violence, 10, 239-257.

O'Connell, P., Pepler, D., & Craig, W. (1999). Peer involvement in bullying: insights and challenges for intervention. Journal of Adolescence, 22, 437-452.

Olson, S.L., Bates, J.E., & Bayles, K. (1990). Early antecedents of childhood impulsivity: the role of parent-child interaction, cognitive competence, and temperament. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 18, 317-334.

Ornstein, A. (1997). A developmental perspective on the sense of power, self-esteem, and destructive aggression. Annual of Psychoanalysis, 25, 145-154.

Raikes, H.A. & Thompson, R.A. (2008). Attachment security and parenting quality predict children's problem-solving attributions, and loneliness with peers. Attachment and Human Development, 10, 319-344.

Raikes, H.A. & Thompson, R.A. (2006). Family emotional climate, attachment security and young children's emotion knowledge in a high risk sample. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 24, 89-104.

Rigby, K., Slee, R., & Martin, G. (2007). Implications of inadequate parental bonding and peer victimization for adolescent mental health. Journal of Adolescence, 30, 801-812.

Riggs, S.A. (2010). Childhood emotional abuse and the attachment system across the life cycle: what theory and research tell us. Journal of Aggression, Maltreatment & Trauma, 19, 5-51.

Schneewind, K.A. (1995). Impact of family processes on control beliefs. In A. Bandura (Ed.),

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Self-efficacy in changing societies (pp.114-148).

Stams, G.J.M., Juffer, F., & Van IJzendoorn, M.H. (2002). Maternal sensitivity, infant attachment, and temperament in early childhood predict adjustment in middle childhood: the case of adopted children and their biologically unrelated parents. Developmental Psychology, 38, 800-821.

Tangey, J.P. (1990). Assessing individual differences in proneness to shame and guilt: Development of the self-conscious affect and attribution inventory. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59, 102-111.

Van der Watt, R. (2014). Attachment, parenting styles and bullying during pubertal years. Journal of Child & Adolescent Mental Health, 26, 251-261.

Yang, J.P. & Wang, X.C. (2012). Effect of moral disengagement on adolescents' aggressive behavior: moderated mediating effect. Acta Psychologica Sinica, 44, 1075-1085.

Zaccagnino, M., Cussino, M., Callerame, C., Actis Perinetti, B., Veglia, F., & Green, J. (2013). Attachment and social understanding in young school-age children: an investigation using the Manchester Child Attachment Story Task. Minerva Psichiatrica, 54, 59-69.

Undergraduate Research Journal
University of California, Merced

Roisin Shannon is graduating in the spring of 2018 with a major in Psychology and a minor in Community Research and Service. During her time as an undergraduate student at UC Merced, she worked as a research assistant in the UCM Family Development Lab and the UCM Interpersonal Development Lab. In the Family Development Lab, she worked on the Schoolchildren and Family Study, looking at displays of affect in family triads. In the Interpersonal Development lab, she helped examine the development of distinct helping behaviors in infancy. Roisin is very interested in the phenomenon of bullying (including the causes, the effects on victims, and role of bystanders), and would like to research it further in graduate school.