

Table 1.

Bivariate Correlations among Variables at Time 1 (fall) and Time 2 (spring)

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
1. T1 overt bullying	–						
2. T1 relational bullying	.15	–					
3. T1 cyberbullying	-.17	.53***	–				
4. T1 child disclosure	-.12	-.19	-.18	–			
5. T1 parent-teacher connection	.10	.05	-.22*	.37***	–		
6. T2 overt bullying	.67***	.16	-.13	-.18	-.05	–	
7. T2 relational bullying	.16	.48***	.25**	.02	-.33***	.34***	–
8. T2 cyberbullying	-.12	.20*	.43***	.01	-.52***	-.03	.37***

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$ *** $p < .001$

Table 2.

Longitudinal Associations Between Child Disclosure and Parent-Teacher Connection and Bullying Perpetration

T1 predictor	T2 Overt bullying					T2 Relational bullying					T2 Cyberbullying				
	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> value	ΔR^2	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> value	ΔR^2	β	<i>B</i>	<i>SE</i>	<i>t</i> value	ΔR^2
1. Grade	-.01	-.01	.20	-.04		-.05	-.08	.21	-.38		.12	.20	.15	1.33	
Ethnicity	-.09	-.35	.19	-1.83		.02	.07	.23	.31		-.01	-.04	.43	-.10	
Gender	.07	.12	.22	.56	.04	.13	.19	.12	1.64	.03	-.15	-.25	.14	-1.81	.04
2. Overt bullying	.63	.70	.07	9.74***		.14	.13	.10	1.36		-.02	-.02	.15	-.16	
Relational bullying	.04	.05	.06	.80		.41	.44	.20	2.19*		.06	.06	.12	.52	
Cyberbullying	-.04	-.05	.06	-.81	.42	.06	.06	.16	.40	.24	.39	.46	.12	3.82***	.20
3. Disclosure	-.10	-.14	.15	-.93		.31	.38	.09	4.03***		.36	.44	.14	3.21**	
Connection	-.06	-.08	.18	-.42	.02	-.53	-.58	.10	-5.85***	.22	-.63	-.72	.13	-5.71***	.30
4. Disclosure*	-.03	-.06	.24	-.24	.06	-.25	-.43	.10	-4.23***	.09	-.29	-.49	.20	-2.43*	.10
Connection															

Note. Although included in the last step of the hierarchical regression model, results of the two-way interactions between the specific perpetration type, disclosure, and connection were nonsignificant in predicting bullying and therefore not presented in the table.

