

LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY

The Effects of Bullying-themed Literature on the Bullying Behavior of Upper Elementary
Students in Lebanon

By

Anissa Bazy

A thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements

for the degree of Master of Arts in Education

School of Arts and Sciences

January 2012



Thesis Proposal Form

Name of Student: Anissa Bazzy I.D.#: 199209440

Department: Education

On 12 November 2010 has presented a Thesis proposal entitled:

The Effects of Bullying-Themed Literature on the Bullying Behavior of Upper Elementary Students in Lebanon

in the presence of the Committee Members and Thesis Advisor:

Advisor	Ketty Sarouphim	[Redacted]
Committee Member	Samar Zebian	[Redacted]
Committee Member	Rima Bahous	[Redacted]

Proposal Approved on 12 November 2010

Date: 12/11/2010 Acknowledged by [Redacted]
(Dean, School of Arts and Sciences)

- cc: Dean
- Chair
- Advisor
- Student



Thesis Defense Result Form

Name of Student: Anissa Bazzi

I.D.#: 199209440

Program / Department: M.A. in Education, Department of Education

Date of thesis defense: January 20, 2012

Thesis title: The Effects of Bullying-Themed Literature on the Bullying Behavior of Upper Elementary Students in Lebanon

Result of Thesis defense:

- Thesis was successfully defended. Passing grade is granted
- Thesis is approved pending corrections. Passing grade to be granted upon review and approval by thesis Advisor
- Thesis is not approved. Grade NP is recorded

Committee Members:

Advisor Dr. Ketty Sarouphim, Ph.D. Educational Psychology

Committee Member Dr. Samar Zebian, Ph.D. Psychology

Committee Member Dr. Rima Bahous, Ph.D. Education

Advisor's report on completion of corrections (if any):

Changes Approved by Thesis Advisor: _____ Signature: _____

Date: _____ Acknowledged by _____
(Dean, School of Arts and Sciences)

cc: Registrar, Dean, Chair, Advisor, Student



Thesis approval Form

Student Name: Anissa Bazzi I.D. #: 199209440

Thesis Title : The Effects of Bullying-Themed Literature on the Bullying
Behavior of Upper Elementary Students in Lebanon

Program MA in Education

Department Education

School **School of Arts and Sciences**

Approved by:

Advisor: Dr. Ketty Sarouphim, Ph.D Educational Psychology

Committee Member Dr. Samar Zebian, Ph. D. Psychology

Committee Member Dr. Rima Bahous, Ph.D. Education

Date: January 22, 2012

THESIS COPYRIGHT RELEASE FORM

LEBANESE AMERICAN UNIVERSITY NON-EXCLUSIVE DISTRIBUTION LICENSE

By signing and submitting this license, you (the author(s) or copyright owner) grants to Lebanese American University (LAU) the non-exclusive right to reproduce, translate (as defined below), and/or distribute your submission (including the abstract) worldwide in print and electronic format and in any medium, including but not limited to audio or video. You agree that LAU may, without changing the content, translate the submission to any medium or format for the purpose of preservation. You also agree that LAU may keep more than one copy of this submission for purposes of security, backup and preservation. You represent that the submission is your original work, and that you have the right to grant the rights contained in this license. You also represent that your submission does not, to the best of your knowledge, infringe upon anyone's copyright. If the submission contains material for which you do not hold copyright, you represent that you have obtained the unrestricted permission of the copyright owner to grant LAU the rights required by this license, and that such third-party owned material is clearly identified and acknowledged within the text or content of the submission. IF THE SUBMISSION IS BASED UPON WORK THAT HAS BEEN SPONSORED OR SUPPORTED BY AN AGENCY OR ORGANIZATION OTHER THAN LAU, YOU REPRESENT THAT YOU HAVE FULFILLED ANY RIGHT OF REVIEW OR OTHER OBLIGATIONS REQUIRED BY SUCH CONTRACT OR AGREEMENT. LAU will clearly identify your name(s) as the author(s) or owner(s) of the submission, and will not make any alteration, other than as allowed by this license, to your submission.

Name: *Anissa Bazzz*

Signature: 

Date: *January 22, 2012*

PLAGIARISM POLICY COMPLIANCE STATEMENT

I certify that I have read and understood LAU's Plagiarism Policy. I understand that failure to comply with this Policy can lead to academic and disciplinary actions against me. This work is substantially my own, and to the extent that any part of this work is not my own I have indicated that by acknowledging its sources.

Name: *Anissa Bazy*

Signature: 

Date: *January 22, 2012*

To all children around the world

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I wish to extend my appreciation to my thesis advisor, Dr. Ketty Sarouphim, who after countless revisions graciously provided me with detailed and enormously helpful comments, thereby demanding quality work. This thesis would not have the insight and broad perspective that increases its quality without the enthusiasm, guidance, dedication, and unwavering support of Dr. Ketty Sarouphim. In addition, Dr. Sarouphim was always open to my questions and prompt with her responses.

I am also indebted to Dr. Samar Zebian and Dr. Rima Bahous, the rest of my thesis committee, for their positivity and encouragement throughout this process, as well as their revisions and feedback on this thesis to improve its quality.

Also, I have been blessed with a wonderful family that has contributed meaningfully to the completion of this study by encouraging me, placing stepping stones of success in front of me, and providing me the foundation to persevere throughout the last three years. I thank them for the love, wisdom, and pride they place in me every day.

I am forever grateful to my brother for the financial support and sacrifices he has made to enable me to pursue my Masters.

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess the impact of bullying-themed literature, namely picture books that address the problem of bullying on reducing bullying incidents and changing students' attitudes towards bullying and related incidents. The sample consisted of 165 students taken from upper elementary classes in two private schools in Lebanon. The bullying intervention program was implemented for a period of eight months in the two schools that participated in the study. To evaluate the outcome of the intervention, pretest-posttest data were collected using the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire and the Student Experience Survey. In the implementation phase of the intervention, follow-up activities pertaining to the seven multiple intelligences were incorporated into the literature-related learning process, thereby enhancing learning and active involvement of students in a supportive and non-threatening environment. The occurrence of a flaw in data collection limited the analysis to descriptive statistics. The literature-based intervention program achieved a slight victimization-reducing effect from pretest to posttest, but the students' bullying mean scores remained constant after the implementation of the program. Moreover, there was a slight decrease in the students' mean scores from pre- to post-test in the scales of perceived assertiveness and perceived adult responsiveness, relatively stable mean scores for bystander responsibility, and a slight increase in the students' mean scores from pre- to post-test in the scale on the acceptance of bullying. The implications are that due to the flaw in data collection, no claim could be made about whether or not the literature-based intervention program was effective.

Keywords: Anti-bullying intervention program, Bullying, Bullying-themed literature, Multiple-intelligences activities, and Post-reading comprehension quiz.

Table of Contents

Chapter	Page
I - Introduction	1-12
1.1 - Context of Problem	1
1.2 - Research Goals	2
1.3 - Purpose of Study	2
1.4 - Rationale and Significance	4
1.5 - Definitions of Bullying	6
1.6 - Operational Definitions of Variables	8
1.6.1 - Bullying-themed Literature	8
1.6.2 - Multiple Intelligences Activities	9
1.6.3 - Post-reading Comprehension Quiz	10
1.6.4 - Anti-bullying Intervention Program	11
1.7 - Ethical Considerations	11
II - Literature Review	13-34
2.1 - Introduction	13
2.2 - The Historical Development of the Construct of Bullying	14
2.3 - The Extent of Bullying	14
2.4 - The Downward Spiral of Bullying	15
2.5 - Direct and Indirect Bullying	18
2.6 - Types of Bullying	19
2.7 - Gender Differences	20
2.8 - Participants in the Bullying Process	22

2.9 - Anti-Bullying Interventions	28
2.10 - A Proposed Program as a Probable Solution	32
2.11 - Conclusion	34
III - Methodology	35-43
3.1 - Introduction	35
3.2 - Research Design	35
3.3 - Participants	36
3.4 - Instruments	36
3.5 - Procedure	38
3.6 - Validity and Reliability of Instruments	41
3.7 - Procedures for Reviewing the Literature	43
IV - Findings	44-48
4.1 - Introduction	44
4.2 - Descriptive Statistics	44
4.2.1 - Descriptive examination of the Revised OBVQ	44
4.2.2 - Descriptive examination analysis of the Student Experience Survey	45
4.3 - Conclusion	47
V - Conclusions and Recommendations	49-54
5.1 - Introduction	49
5.2 - Limitations of the Current Study	50
5.3 - Implications for Research and Practice	51
VI - References	55-65
VII – Appendices	66-72

Appendix I (Definition of Bullying in the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire)	66
Appendix II (Student Experience Survey)	67
Appendix III (Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire)	68
Appendix IV (Multiple Intelligences Activities)	70
Appendix V (Post Comprehension Quiz)	72

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Table Title	Page
Table 3.3	Participating Students in School A and School B	73
Table 4.2.1	Results for the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire	74
Table 4.2.2	Results for the Student Experience Survey	75

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Figure Title	Page
Figure 2.4	Downward Spiral of Bullying	16

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1 - Context of the Problem

Before the 1970s educators were acquainted with bullying, but this phenomenon was only studied systematically by researchers in the 1970s (Olweus, 2003). In 1983, when a severe bullying incident in Norway led three adolescent boys to commit suicide, Norway's Ministry of Education granted Professor Dan Olweus the authority to conduct a nation-wide campaign against school bullying (Olweus, 2003). This research on bullying intervention pioneered by Olweus, the founding father of research on bullying problems, laid the foundation for later development of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. The significant reduction (up to 50%) in rates of bullying incidents encouraged the adaptation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program to educational settings in other countries, such as the United Kingdom, Ireland, Japan, Belgium, Australia, Canada, and the United States (Stevens, Bourdeadhuij, & Van Oost, 2001).

The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program shed light on the multi-level social context outlook regarding bullying. Stevens et al. (2001) indicated that such a program operates at the following three levels: school-wide interventions, classroom-level interventions, and individual-level interventions. Developing anti-bullying school rules and training staff to intervene are examples of prevention activities at the school level. At the classroom level, classroom meetings about bullying and peer relations are held regularly. The individual level activity consists of one-to-one meetings between teachers and the students who bully and those who are bullied.

Bullying-themed literature does not constitute a component of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program nor is it a component of other well-known adapted interventions, such as the

DFE Sheffield Bullying Project, the Anti-bullying Intervention in Toronto Schools, and the Flemish anti-bullying project. Ferguson, Miguel, Kilburn, & Sanchez (2007) conducted a meta-analytic review to determine the effectiveness of school-based anti-bullying programs. Based on their findings, even though anti-bullying programs resulted in effects that were both positive and statistically significant, such programs demonstrated limited effectiveness because the indicated results were practically negligible. This provided an impetus for the inception of the current study; that is, the implementation of a bullying intervention program targeted to reduce the incidents of bullying in grades 4 through 6 in Lebanese schools by using bullying-themed literature as a major component.

1.2 - Research Goals

Based on the above overview, the purpose of the study was conducted to examine the effectiveness of a bullying intervention program that utilizes bullying-themed literature as its major component on reducing bullying behavior in upper elementary classes. It was assumed that the adoption of multiple intelligences post-reading activities during the learning process promoted the success of the intervention program. In essence, an answer to the following question was sought: would the inclusion of anti-bullying picture books, as part of a bullying intervention program in the upper elementary classes result in reduced incidents of physical, verbal, and relational bullying?

1.3 - Purpose of the Study

School bullying is an insidious behavior overlooked by many teachers and school officials, causing lifelong damage to students who bully, those who are bullied, and those who witness bullying incidents (Frey, Hirschstein, Snell, VanShoiack-Edstrom, MacKenzie, & Broderick, 2005). The relevance of the study is highlighted when schools fail to fulfill their one common

mission, that being the fostering of a safe and caring environment for the students. The mere fact that schools are a prime location for the emotionally scarring phenomenon termed bullying, a school's failure to deal with bullying endangers the safety of all its students by allowing a hostile environment to interfere with learning, thereby affecting the social well-being of the entire school community.

The current study explored whether a whole-classroom approach could tackle the pervasive problem of the three types of bullying, physical, verbal, and social/relational bullying, in upper elementary classes by adopting a developmentally appropriate literature-related bullying intervention program that incorporates multiple intelligences post-reading activities. In essence, the purpose of this study was to investigate the impact of bullying-themed literature on the bullying events in upper elementary classes. Sherill and Ley indicated that “the function of a piece of literature is first and always the transmission of the inner life and feelings of one individual to another” (as cited in Hillsberg & Spak, 2006, p. 276). So, it can be postulated that the utilization of bullying-themed literature, namely picture books that deal with bullying, could act as a springboard for providing the students with a “lived-through” understanding of the bullying experience. According to Hillsberg and Spak (2006), if the bullying-related literature deals with the detrimental consequences of bullying, the students will identify with the characters. As a result, the bullied students may be encouraged to mitigate the effects of bullying and make use of appropriate coping mechanisms whenever necessary because they relate to the problems that the characters encounter. As for those who witness the bullying incidents, they may be empowered to intercede actively, thereby preventing such incidents. Concerning those who bully, they may take feelings of the bullied into consideration and experience empathy, thus stopping their bullying behavior all together.

1.4 - Rationale and Significance

Finger, Craven, Marsh, & Parada (2004) stipulated that the lessons which are part of anti-bullying programs, such as Expect Respect Project, Don't Laugh at Me Program, Second Steps Violence Prevention Program, Steps to Respect Program, and Responding in Peaceful and Positive Ways pertain to both conflict resolution and character education; the latter targeting core ethical values such as respect for self and others, caring, responsibility, compassion, trustworthiness, and self-discipline. These anti-bullying programs include formal instruction and activities as laid out in a social emotional skills curriculum. Since there is no single formula for effective character education, a methodological issue that has plagued anti-bullying research arises when the research team strives to solve a multitude of school issues, such as character education during the intervention for bullying (Finger et al., 2004). Hence, the underlying aim of bullying reduction is lost in the process because the focus of attention would no longer be on reducing bullying incidents.

The rationale for adopting multiple intelligences post-reading activities in the intervention is that in contrast to the formal instruction and activities that were used to teach conflict resolution skills and core ethical values to reduce bullying, the multiple intelligences post-reading activities provide the students with more chances to gain intrinsic interest and be engaged actively in the content area. Furthermore, the versatility of the multiple intelligences post-reading activities stimulate the learning process by using diverse activities as a means for learning and nurturing all the varieties of human intelligences. In addition, the school being the ultimate venue to address bullying, one possible solution is to make use of bullying-themed

literature as part of the subject matter to be read and discussed in the classrooms, thereby providing leeway to handle and tackle bullying issues (Hillsberg & Spak, 2006).

Intent is a fundamental aspect in many definitions of bullying. So, as argued by Carey (2003), it is imperative that when designing anti-bullying intervention programs, intent should be addressed in a systematic way. Otherwise, all efforts put during the implementation of an anti-bullying prevention program to change a bully's intent would be of no avail. In fact, the closer the alignment between the purposes of bullying and the bullying intervention programs, the more successful the program might be (Carey, 2003). In this study, after reading the picture book, the students responded to evaluative and therapeutic questions that have for aim to uncover the child's hidden intent behind bullying acts. The importance of this post-reading comprehension quiz is that it bridges the gap between the intent behind bullying and the anti-bullying program implemented.

In the process of improving the impact of anti-bullying intervention programs, a lack of close alignment between theory and practice might set the stage for another methodological concern, which is the inadequate implementation of a whole-school approach (Carey, 2003). As Finger et al. (2004) indicated the inherent difficulty lies in the failure to examine a theoretical background during the design process of the intervention. In other words, the theoretical background that underlies the concept of intent should be acknowledged, thereby giving it more specification. Pepler (2006) proposes a recent perspective that provides a theoretical framework for bullying research. When bullying is recognized as a relationship problem, new perspectives are enhanced, leading to the emergence of the developmental-systemic theory. This theory focuses on both the developmental and systemic aspects of bullying. With regard to the developmental component, the theory examines the change in behaviors, motivations, and

challenges of children who bully and those who are bullied when they grow older, thereby providing insight into the specific risk and protective processes in individual children's lives. As for the systemic aspect, it emphasizes the contribution of dynamics within the family, peer group, school, and neighborhood to healthy or troubled interaction patterns. In other words, the center of attention is the children's relationships. So, a holistic theory that merges both the developmental and systemic aspects enhances both an in-depth assessment of the problems faced by troubled children within their relationship contexts and the development of a more comprehensive program. Once again, the beneficial aspect of the therapeutic post-reading comprehension quiz is highlighted because the counselor can take the bully's intent behind bullying into consideration before deciding on how to intervene.

1.5 - Definitions of Bullying

There is no universally accepted operational definition of bullying. However, in order to grasp the concept of bullying, the multitude of definitions that have been constructed are as diverse as the school-based anti-bullying programs (Ferguson et al., 2007). One attribute that many definitions of bullying share in common is the intent or purpose behind the bullying (Carey, 2003). Olweus (1994), affirmed that "a person is being bullied or victimized, when he/she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other persons" (p.98), clarifying that when the actions of a person have an intended outcome of injury or discomfort, those actions are classified as negative (as cited in Carey, 2003). Australian bullying researchers, Slee and Rigby define bullying as the situation when the bully repeatedly makes use of his/her physical or psychological superior strength deliberately intending to hurt others (as cited in Carey, 2003).

Even though the definition by Olweus aforementioned stressed the overt type of bullying, which includes physical bullying (such as shoving) and verbal bullying (such as name calling), covert bullying was emphasized as well (Smith, Cowie, Olafsson, & Liefhoghe, 2002). Carey (2003) reports that Olweus differentiated between direct and indirect behaviors pertaining to bullying, such that direct behaviors were characterized by physical and verbal bullying while indirect behaviors encompassed social exclusion. According to Smith et al. (2002), the three core components of bullying were determined in a definition that was generally accepted by many researchers. These components are: (a) the intent to harm, (b) occurrence over time, and (c) a power imbalance between the bully and the bullied. Although this definition enhances the distinction between bullying, other forms of aggression, and acceptable behaviors, it is not ideal when applied in schools because researchers have not yet established the extent to which these types of behavior are interrelated (Smith et al., 2002). Thus, deciding where teasing ends and bullying begins is a major definitional problem.

Ferguson et al. (2007) contended that researchers have not yet reached a consensus on the clear-cut definition of bullying. These definitional constraints cause complications in bullying research, especially with respect to measuring the extent to which the phenomenon is occurring.

In this study, the definition adopted for bullying is in accordance with the explanation presented in both the Student Experience Survey (SES) and the revised version of the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire. The SES categorizes bullying into two elements, the attitude related to both the acceptance of bullying and the responsibility to intervene in bullying incidents, as well as the perception related to both the students' perceptions of their assertiveness skills and the school staff's responsiveness to bullying. The definition of bullying is presented on the second page of the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (Please see Appendix A).

1.6 - Operational Definitions of Variables

1.6.1 - Bullying-themed literature: According to Jalengo (1983), certain criteria have to be met for picture books to be classified as appropriate bullying-themed literature (as cited in Entenman, Muren, & Hendricks, 2005, p. 356). In other words, when choosing potential bullying-themed literature, the following important variables should be taken into consideration: a plot, setting, dialogue, and characters the students can identify with, the gender of the involved characters, the type(s) of bullying behavior presented, the setting of the bullying incident, the role played by adults/bystanders if they are involved in the situation, the adaptive coping strategies used by the victims to confront the bullies, and an ending wherein the problems of all parties are resolved in a realistic way. The three picture books used in this study were written by the same author, Trudy Ludwig, and are as follows: *My Secret Bully* (Tricycle Press, 2004), *Sorry* (Tricycle Press, 2006), and *Just Kidding* (Tricycle Press, 2006). In the first bullying-themed picture book, *My Secret Bully*, Monica enjoys being around her best friend since kindergarten, Katie, but only when she is nice. However, Monica doesn't understand why there are times when Katie uses bullying tactics, like name-calling and manipulation to humiliate and exclude Monica. The support that Monica receives from her mother enables her to persevere by confronting her fears and regaining power from her bully. In the second bullying-themed picture book, *Sorry*, after befriending Charlie, a mischief-maker who gets away with his inappropriate behavior by insincerely using the magic word, 'sorry', Jack's identity is enhanced by undergoing a transformation from a 'nobody' to a 'somebody'. But Jack doesn't like how he follows Charlie's lead with his cruel pranks, especially when Leena's science project is ruined. Consequently, Jack learns that there is a whole lot more to an apology than a simple 'sorry'. *Just Kidding* is the third bullying-themed picture book wherein D. J. encounters Vince, an

aggravating boy who resorts to using the words, ‘Just Kidding’, as a quick apology when he teases D. J. and hurts his feelings. D. J. does not complain because he fears the fact that his friends might consider him as someone who cannot take a joke. When D. J. discusses his problem with his dad, brother, and an understanding teacher, he takes a standpoint, undermining the painful reality of the two innocent words and making healthier friendship choices.

1.6.2. - Multiple Intelligences activities: Learning is at times narrowly confined to the traditional intelligences, namely verbal-linguistic and logical-mathematical. The mere fact that students benefit when taught beyond those two intelligences puts Multiple Intelligence, pioneered by Howard Gardner, in the spotlight. According to Gardner (as cited in Koksal & Yel, 2007), all human beings possess the following seven intelligences: verbal-linguistic, logical-mathematical, musical, visual-spatial, bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal, and interpersonal. After reading each of the three bullying-themed picture books, the students were given the opportunity to take part in curriculum-integrated post-reading activities that embrace each of the seven intelligences.

In a verbal-linguistic intelligence post-reading activity, the students completed a character study on one of the major characters in the bullying-themed picture book, wherein the students made a list of any two traits that the character possessed and provided a specific example of that trait as depicted on an indicated page of the picture book. The students then used the character study to write a short summary of the traits associated with the major character they had chosen. Concerning the intrapersonal intelligence post-reading activity, each student wrote a three-paragraphed book review for the bullying-themed picture book through reading reflection. In the first paragraph, the students wrote a brief summary of the picture book without giving away the ending. In the second paragraph, the students discussed their opinions or thoughts about the

book, describing why they did or did not like the picture book. The third paragraph is the part where the students either recommended or did not recommend the book to their friends, providing two justifying reasons for their opinion about the picture book. As for the logical mathematical intelligence post-reading activity, the students completed a story map designed by them, including the main characters, the setting, the problem/s, and the resolution/s. With regards to the visual-spatial post-reading activity, the students created a scrapbook, wherein five hand-drawn pictures or pictures found in magazines were included because these pictures were strongly tied to the events in the bullying-themed picture book. So, along with each picture, the students described in a few sentences the essence of the picture in relation to the story. When the students acted out a part of the story, this post-reading activity was an application of the bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. In this activity, the students focused on reading with expression. An interesting musical intelligence post-reading activity is one in which the students changed the words of an existing song such that it addressed the topic of bullying, teaching others not to tolerate the bullying behavior in any way whatsoever. One way the interpersonal intelligence can be incorporated into a post-reading activity is when the students analyzed interactively the message or moral of the bullying-themed picture book and reached a consensus.

When the learning outcomes support a combination of all the seven intelligences proposed by Gardner, these multiple intelligences activities enable the students to process information through their strengths and empower their weaker intelligences with time, thereby giving the students the chance to actively incorporate what they have learned.

1.6.3 - Post-reading comprehension quiz: The post-reading comprehension quiz is a therapeutic tool that contains exploratory, investigative, corrective, and reflective questions pertaining to the bullying-related picture book utilized. In exploratory questions, the researcher

seeks information, such as: ‘How is your behavior similar and/or different from that of X’s behavior (the bully) or that of Y’s behavior (the bullied)?’ Investigative questions ask who, why, when, where, and how: ‘How would you feel if you were to put yourself in X’s (the bully), Y’s (the bullied), or Z’s (the witness to the bullying) shoes? Explain why.’ Concerning corrective questions, the aim is to have students take a different course of action as shown in the following question: ‘If you were in Y’s (the bullied) or Z’s (the witness to the bullying) place, how would you have reacted to X’s behavior?’ As for reflective questions, an effort is made by the students to come up with solutions of their own: ‘What do you think made X (the bully), Y (the bullied), or Z (the witness to the bullying) act the way they did?’ The post-reading comprehension quiz served as a form of self-therapy for the bully, the bullied, and the students who witness the bullying. Having discovered the intent behind his/her bullying, the bully might reconsider his/her actions.

1.6.4 - Anti-bullying intervention program: The anti-bullying intervention program is a classroom-based bullying intervention program that embraces many aspects like the curriculum-integrated multiple intelligences activities after reading the bullying-themed literature, as well as teacher training which paves the way for active adult awareness and involvement (see section on Procedure for a description of the steps of the program). Consequently, the bullying-themed literature teaches bullying coping skills and bystander discouragement of bullying.

1.7 - Ethical Considerations

During this study, neither teachers nor students were placed under any physical or psychological harm, or discomfort. By assuring the students that the data to be collected was

held in confidence, the ethical principle of ensuring confidentiality with regards to research data was safeguarded. Before implementing the intervention, school consent was obtained.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 - Introduction

Bullying among children is a complicated and prominent social phenomenon that has existed in schools since the beginning of time. As a matter of fact, bullying is sometimes regarded as an inevitable aspect of development that has to be endured by children at school (Smith & Brain, 2000).

More often than not, bullying has been accepted by many adults as just a harmless rite of passage and a worthwhile experience encountered by children, wherein their courage to defend themselves against the bully enhances the development of their character. However, the opposite of this misconception is supported by research (Smith & Brain, 2000).

Based on evidence from recent research, the immediate and long-term detrimental effects of school bullying on the educational, psychological, and professional lives of students, both the victims of bullying and bullies themselves, has fostered the dominating influence of a concerned audience towards this pervasive problem (Rigby, 2003; Arseneault et al., 2006). Therefore, regardless of the existing views that school bullying is normative, providing tacit approval for such an aggressive behavior is no longer the corollary.

This review of the literature presents a brief account on the development of the construct of bullying and explores a relatively comprehensive overview of bullying in schools. In addition, different types of anti-bullying interventions are discussed. Furthermore, the review provides information on the current anti-bullying approaches, the programs that have applied bullying-

themed literature to reduce bullying behaviors, and a probable resolution pertaining to the proposed literature-based bullying intervention program.

2.2 - The Historical Development of the Construct of Bullying

At the beginning of the twentieth century, the establishment of the juvenile court in Cook County, Illinois, resulted in a plenitude of research that investigated aggression in youth (Eddy, Reid, & Fetrow, 2000). Consequently, psychologists were intrigued to determine the reasons behind the aggressive acts of these youth. Even though the psychologists' interests were at low ebb during 1910-1942, it gradually developed in the 1950's due to the increased rate of criminal offences by minors (Eddy et al., 2000). As a result, several intervention and prevention studies were conducted to examine the association between aggression and anti-social behavior, conduct disorders, and oppositional defiant disorders (Domitrovich & Welsh 2000; Eddy et al., 2000).

Not only did this plethora of studies materialize the construct of bullying, it also enhanced its recognition in 1978, especially after Olweus published his book, "Aggression in Schools: Bullies and Whipping Boys", which is believed to be the provenance of bullying research (Smith, 2004). The successive research studies were concerned with the development of the bullying behavior, the consequences of the behavior on children, and successful bullying intervention and prevention strategies. As such, the study of bullying proliferated, and the typical body of literature that evolved distinguished it from aggression (Griffin & Gross, 2003).

2.3 - The Extent of Bullying

When discussing the issue of bullying, it is essential to be cognizant of its prevalence in schools. Research on the extent of bullying has been conducted in various countries, including Norway, Sweden, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Spain, Italy, England, Scotland, Ireland, Australia, Japan, Canada, South Africa and the United States (Stevens et al., 2001). According to

Dulmus and Sowers (2004), estimates of bullying incidents cannot be determined with precision because the recent data about the extent of bullying victimization ranges from 5 % to greater than 80 %. Nevertheless, studies carried out in diverse settings have revealed empirical evidence that students' daily experiences of being bullied by peers are increasing (Oyaziwo, 2006). For instance, in the United States, there are roughly 2.1 million bullies and 2.7 million victims of bullying in schools. Typically, among the 20 students in an average American classroom, three are expected to be either bullies or victims (Crockett, 2003) and the remaining 85% of students play the role of bystanders (Elsea et al., 2004; Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2002).

Sullivan (2000) indicated that not only does bullying occur in all schools, but its extent is beyond the scope of people's comprehension. The results from studies examining the prevalence of bullying victimization among students in grades one to five ranged from a low 11.3 percent in a sample of school children from Finland (Olafsen & Vimero, 2000) to a high 49.8 percent in a nationwide sample from Ireland (Dake, Prince, & Telljohann, 2003).

2.4 - The Downward Spiral of Bullying

According to The Australian Institute of Professional Counselors (2008), bullying is not an act that just occurs instantly at the spur of the moment. In other words, it is impossible for a child to be exempt from a bullying attack one day and then be exposed to the most extreme form of bullying the next. If bullying happens suddenly, the victims of bullying would be in a position to take a proactive stance to oppose the bullying behavior. Sullivan (2000) considers the proposition which requires the victims of bullying to have the courage to defend themselves as both unjust and nonsensical. The mere fact that the victims of bullying cannot stand up for themselves, robs them from any power to react. In the quest for power, the bully goes through a series of dynamic steps until the victim becomes totally subdued.

Sullivan (2000) has formulated a model that provides a clear and detailed account of the bullying aspect, which he termed “The Downward Spiral of Bullying”. The model which is shown below displays the five phases that result in the emergence of bullying, as well as the distinguishing features of bullies, victims, and bystanders within each phase:

FIGURE 2.4 : The Downward Spiral of Bullying

Stage:	The Person Bullying:	The Victim of Bullying:	The Bystander:
Stage 1: Watching and waiting.	Getting a sense of classroom dynamics and identifying potential victims.	Settling in and unaware that they may be targeted for bullying.	Settling into school, gives indications (body language or other signs) that he or she is not prone to bullying.
Stage 2: Testing the waters.	Small symbolic acts of bullying occur and the bully begins to enlist the support of others.	Does not handle the symbolic act well. Is embarrassed, feels uncomfortable, and hopes things will not get worse.	Feels uncomfortable. May withdraw or support the bully.

Stage 3: Something more substantial occurs.	The bullying becomes more serious, the victim is devalued.	Feels useless, responsible for being bullied and guilty for not standing up to the bully. Believes that he or she will eventually be left alone.	Feels a sense of powerlessness and guilt, feels responsible for not intervening.
Stage 4: The bullying escalates.	The bullying becomes worse and the victim is hounded outside the school situation. The bully is not stopped and develops an unrealistic sense of their power.	The bullying is clearly mean and intended. The victim experiences a growing sense of hopelessness and low self-esteem.	Feels bullying is part of life and that it's best to protect yourself first. Believes that it is best to ignore the bully and not support the victim.
Stage 5: The bullying becomes fully established.	The bullying is extended into the wider world. Bullying is not tolerated and often ends in criminal offending and imprisonment.	Victim views the world as a horrible and unsafe place. Their extreme and ultimate response is to attempt suicide.	Bystander believes that individuals in society are powerless and that it is important to look after yourself.

Source: Sullivan (2000, p. 38).

According to The Australian Institute of Professional Counselors (2008) “The Downward Spiral of Bullying” confirms the following four significant factors:

1. The bullying act is a progressive process, wherein the bully has power and the victim does not.
2. The responsibility for the bullying act should not be ascribed to the victims. On the contrary, these individuals require much comfort and security.
3. The victims should not be expected to stand up for themselves while experiencing the bullying attacks.
4. The bullying behaviors can negatively impact the bully, the victim, and the bystander.

2.5 - Direct and Indirect Bullying

Bullying is manifested in a wide range of ways. The bullying behaviors experienced by the victims can assume a variety of actions such as beating, booting, shoving, taunting, using offensive language, cruel gossiping, being rejected or left out, sabotaging of social relationships among peers, and being blackmailed by students who are older, tougher, and mightier (Dulmus & Sowers, 2004). Sullivan (2000) stated that horizontal bullying occurs when the target is victimized by a bully of a similar age, while vertical bullying occurs when the victim is bullied by older peers.

The forms of bullying are classified as direct or indirect. Direct forms of bullying are associated with overt abusive behaviors that are executed by the bully while boldly facing the victim. Indirect forms of bullying involve covert and insidious abusive behaviors that are followed through by the bully without ever coming face to face with their victim (Boulton, Trueman, & Flemington, 2002). Lee (2004) believes that in indirect forms of bullying there is

usually a third-party audience, namely the bystanders, engaged in the spectacle. Similarly, Boulton et al. (2002) stipulated that indirect bullying entails behaviors like social isolation and exclusion from a group. Even though most bullying behaviors are labeled as either direct or indirect bullying, some bullying could be a mixture of the two forms.

2.5 - Types of Bullying

Three types of bullying prevail; these are: physical bullying, verbal bullying, and social or relational bullying.

Physical bullying involves actions such as slapping, jabbing, tripping, nipping, shoving, scratching, spitting, hair pulling or any other behavior that inflicts physical pain on the victim (Sullivan, 2000). These actions are explicit and can be easily detected by both adults and children (Smith et al., 2002). Lee (2004) claims that some bullying behaviors of the physical type can also be labeled as indirect forms, such as destruction or theft of property, as these inflict psychological rather than physical pain on the victims. According to Coloroso (2003), wresting anything from the victim by an undue exercise of power and making threatening or obscene gestures to terrify the victim are also considered forms of indirect physical bullying.

Verbal bullying is generally designated as emotional or psychological bullying and may occur in both direct and indirect forms depending on the bullying behaviors that are manifested. When bullying behaviors, like the use of abusive names and offensive language to belittle or humiliate the victim are made while the bully is facing the victim, they are labeled as direct verbal bullying. In contrast, indirect verbal bullying is associated with bullying behaviors like cruel gossiping and spreading of false or malicious rumors, which are executed behind the victim's back and may have a negative consequence on the victim's self-esteem (Wang, Iannotti,

& Nansel, 2009). Sullivan (2000) asserts that abusive behaviors like taunting, demanding servitude or money, deterrence, and vicious mocking pertain to verbal bullying as well.

Social or relational bullying is characterized by abusive behaviors wherein the victim is purposefully rejected by a social group (Lee, 2004) or ostracized from group activities (Pauw, 2007). Oyawizo (2008) believes that this type of bullying strives for the sabotage of social relationships among peers, as well as involves indirect abusive behaviors such as cruel gossiping, and direct abusive behaviors like creating ratings of victims' personal characteristics or disregarding the victim. Threatening gestures, suspirations, scowls, leers, smirks, and offensive body language are additional examples of the social type of bullying (Wang et al., 2009).

According to Sullivan (2000), the three types of bullying, physical, verbal, and social share in common the following:

1. The physical injury or psychological hurt caused by the bully is deliberate.
2. The bully has power and the victim has less perceived power.
3. The bullying behavior is often dynamic and organic.
4. The bullying behavior is persistent, continually recurring, or at times fortuitous and executed by a bully who is dreaded by the victim.

2.6 - Gender Differences

Bullying behaviors are not restricted to one gender. Although both male and female bullies may employ different bullying procedures, it is evident that both genders possess identical abilities to engage in bullying behaviors (Felix & McMahon, 2006) in both forms of direct or indirect bullying (Jankauskiene, Kardelis, Sukys, & Kardeliene, 2008). Male bullies aim for both male and female targets, whereas female bullies tend to target other females only (Felix &

McMahon, 2006). From a historical perspective, a majority of the existing literature on bullying has emphasized same gender bullying, mainly the victimization of males by male bullies; yet there is an increasing body of research that examines the victimization strategies, particularly physical violence and relational bullying, adopted by female bullies (Hammel, 2008).

In order to inflict anguish on their victims, male bullies generally resort to both the physical and verbal types of bullying. Typically, the male bully is more prone to perpetrate abusive and aggressive bullying behaviors that are of physical nature (Steffenmeier, Schwartz, Zhong, & Ackerman, 2005). In contrast, indirect forms of bullying are also executed by male bullies to safeguard their empowerment among supporters within the social group and gain both power and dominance over the victim (Dake et al., 2003; Salmivalli & Isaacs, 2005). Moreover, according to Chapell et al. (2006), the male bully engages in the bullying act openly in social groups within the social context. The male bully likes to have an audience because it is their presence that feeds the bully's superior sense of self, thereby creating the fear that they could be next.

Female bullies tend to give priority to creating close connections and associations within the social group than to achieving dominance (Crothers, Field, & Colbert, 2005). Cruel gossiping and spreading of false or malicious rumors are the verbal or relational types of bullying that the female bully engages in to hurt powerless and timid females (Hammel, 2008; Marini, Dane, Bosacki, & YLC-CURA, 2006). Marini et al. (2006) believe that female bullies use covert strategies to oppress their targets without putting their actions in the spotlight. Their possession of distinguishing qualities, such as leadership skills and excellent academic potentials, enhance the success of female bullies in deflecting the attention of teachers and adults from their abusive actions. Female bullies are usually widely favored by both students and teachers, and

interestingly enough regardless of the fact that they terrify their victims, they are still admired for their superior social caliber (Hammel, 2008).

Brinson (2005) stipulates that the bullying of boys by girls is an indulgently ignored facet of bullying. In essence, by relying on behavioral constraints imposed by society, female bullies occasionally bully boys knowing in advance that their targets will not counterattack. Since boys grow up learning that they have more power than girls and should not hit them, boys tend to disregard the capabilities of a female bully. So, regardless of gender, both male and female bullies should be held accountable for their actions (Steffensmeier et al., 2005).

2.7 - Participants in the Bullying Process

In one way or another, almost every student has participated in one or more of the three key roles (bully, victim, and bystander) that are associated with the dynamic and gradual process of bullying during elementary, middle, or high school years. The bullying typology that is discussed in the bullying literature is presented below, thereby providing a detailed outlook of the underlying elements pertaining to the bullying process.

The first role is that of the person who engages in the act of bullying. According to the American Psychological Association (2009), some of the similar character traits that the students who constantly bully their peers share are that bullies are likely to be impetuous, tormented with ease, identified as leaders who exercise the most influential control within the social context, exhibiting positive attitudes toward violence, noncompliant with regulations, and friendly with other bullies. In addition to having a high self esteem, individuals who bully are widely-liked and universally admired by their peer group (Oyaziwo, 2008). Pellegrini, Bartini, and Brooks (1999) point out that violence is the bully's avenue to mightiness and a higher social status with the peer group.

According to Rigby (2002), the way children think, feel, and behave, with family members, school staff and peers is influenced to a great extent by the home environment. Accordingly, children who are exposed to coercive child-rearing techniques by their parents, wherein physical abuse is a permissible discipline strategy tend to engage in aggressive behavior (Sullivan, 2000). Furthermore, when children are brought up by a family that employs inconsistent parental discipline strategies, they become predisposed to acquiring relentless and non-empathetic attitudes, manifested in the way they treat their peers.

Oprinas and Horne (2006) identified three types of bullies: aggressive, passive, and relational bullies. The bully who exerts power over weaker peers by resorting to overt hostility is an aggressive bully. A passive bully, also called a follower, refers to an individual who is encouraged to become an enthusiastic participant after the commencement of the bullying interaction. Instead of initiating the bullying, these followers keep their distance until a bullying incident is already in progress, their ultimate goal being the achievement of social status (Olweus, 1993). The bully who utilizes indirect or covert forms of bullying, thereby gaining power through the exclusion and manipulation of the target is called the relational bully (Oprinas & Horne, 2006).

Since children who bully others are subject to social and emotional problems, they suffer from many negative effects. The effects of bullying among students in the elementary school may be a denotation of more excruciating behavior, which is carried into middle and high school (De Wet, 2007). According to Piskin (2002), bullies have a natural tendency towards other bullies and are more likely to hang out with gangs who engage in criminal acts. Moreover, the bullies' academic performance and future potential in the workplace tend to be below expectations (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). Based on research, adults who were bullies during

school years tend to exhibit violent acts toward their spouses and are more likely to enforce harsh forms of discipline on their own children (De Wet, 2007). Bullies may also lack the fundamental skills that are required to attain success in the real world because they fall short of acquiring skills like dealing successfully with problems and difficulties, regulating their emotions constructively, and communicating effectively. Furthermore, the lack of any bullying intervention generally hinders the bully's emotional growth and the development of empathy (Kuther, 2006).

The second role associated with the bullying process is that played by the target or the victim. The child who is exposed to the bullying behavior is referred to as the victim. Individuals who are subdued, become fearful, and are not self-assured may be considered victims (Pelligrini et al., 1999). Victims tend to avoid requiting and speaking out against their perpetrators (Griffin & Gross, 2004). They also tend to have a physical or mental handicap, be excessively fat, or constrained in an unspecified manner (Glover, Gough, Johnson, & Cartwright, 2000). In addition, they may display passive and submissive behaviors (Eslea et al., 2004), be less confident, and less friendly (Androue, 2001). In addition, victims are also more likely to have a poor personal rapport with their peers and have difficulties overcoming obstacles (Kumpulainen & Rasanen, 2000). To compound matters, one common trait shared by all victims is that each and every one of them is excluded from a social group to be a target of extreme contempt and hence the recipient of all three types of bullying (Coloroso, 2003).

Typically, victims of bullying belong to enmeshed families and are subjected to intrusive and overprotective parenting (Unnever, 2005). Since victims tend to be overprotected, they are predisposed to bullying because they lack the skills of independently protecting themselves. In some instances, families of children who are victims undergo excessive stressful events such as

separation or immigration (Rigby, 2002). As the result of living through such exasperating events, these children become unhappy and introverted, or violent and ferocious, and as such are vulnerable to bullying (Sullivan, 2000). A noteworthy point is that the sons of overprotective mothers end up by being male victims, whereas the daughters who are rejected by their mothers end up by being female victims (Finnegan, Hodges, & Perry, 1998).

Olweus (2001) identified three types of victims: passive victims, provocative victims, and bully-victims. The first type seldom speaks out against the perpetrators, is less powerful, and does not invite abuse by bullies (Kurther, 2006). The passive or submissive behaviors of these victims reveal their insecurity, anxiety, depression, and negative self-image. The passive victims' initial reactions to bullying in lower elementary classes include weeping and pulling out with purposeless anger. In upper elementary and later grades, passive victims are inclined to stay clear from bullying situations or even slip away from the bullies by not attending school (Olweus, 2001). According to The Kansas State Department of Education (2009) the largest category of victimized children is comprised of this type of victim.

On the other hand, the aggressive temperament of the second type of victim provokes bullies into responding negatively. The annoying, agitating, antagonizing, and disruptive behaviors of the provocative victims tend to disturb the order in the classroom and result in being discarded from the social group because they are perceived by their peers as worthless or useless (Olweus, 2001). Borresen (2007) believes that provocative victims are tremendously pugnacious, cranky, have low tolerance for frustration, and tend to retaliate when they are bullied.

As for the third type of victim, Dulmus and Sowers (2004) stipulate that some victims play the roles of both a target and a bully. The child who is a bully/victim often displays the characteristics of bullies, such as high levels of aggression, as well as characteristics associated

with victims, such as high levels of depression (Veenstra et al., 2005). When this type of victim is bullied, the weakness and incompetence of bully/victim is revealed, thereby providing the incentive to bully others with less power (Coloroso, 2003). These victims use their infuriating and obnoxious behaviors as a camouflage against bullies to conceal their feeling of utmost susceptibility to attack (Sullivan, Cleary, & Sullivan, 2004).

Like bullies, children who are victimized suffer from emotional, social, and educational problems. De Wet (2007) asserts that some of the psychological complications manifested as a result of victimization include sleep disturbances, psychosomatic complaints, eating disorder, irritability, increased frequency of illness and diseases related to chronic stress, and reversion to a less mature pattern of behaviors such as enuresis and nail biting. Adult victims are also at greater risk for mood swings, psychosomatic illness, persistent feeling of incompetence, and inadequate social skills that deprive them from establishing healthy and secure social relationships in adulthood (Matthiesen & Einarsen, 2004). Within the school environment, due to the social anxiety experienced by children who are victimized, the victims may concentrate less in class, underachieve, become truants, and cut out certain classes or extracurricular activities at school (De Wet, 2007). Moreover, since the victims' parents are most likely incognizant of their children's victimization at school, the victims tend to take out their frustrations at school on the parents, thereby resulting in impaired family relationships (Selekman & Vessey, 2004). In addition, the psychological pain that often accompanies bullying causes victims to contemplate or commit suicide (Rodkin & Hodges, 2003).

The third and final key role that is associated with the bullying process is that of the bystander. The number of bystanders who participate in the bullying process far exceeds the number of both victims and bullies (Bonds & Stoker, 2000). Sullivan (2000) stipulates that

bullies maintain their control over their social circle by publicly displaying their bullying behavior in front of a reinforcing audience. Sullivan also stated that when the bullying behavior is put into action, the bystanders are inclined to be passive observers and abandon the bullying scene callously disregarding the victim's distress, or to take action against the bullying incident and hinder the bully's behavior.

Parsons (2005) describes four types of bystanders: the bully bystander, the victim bystander, the avoidant bystander, and the ambivalent bystander. In order not to be held responsible for their bullying acts, bully bystanders stimulate other children to execute such acts. The children who dread the idea of stepping in to put an end to the bullying act are categorized as victim bystanders. Avoidant bystanders are those members of the school staff who conform to the notion that the educational institution in which they are employed is bully-free. The ambivalent bystanders are most likely to take a stand against the bullying act.

Whitted and Dupper (2005) assert that the drastic outcomes of bullying are not only confined to the bullies and victims alone, but encompass bystanders who might experience feelings of irritation, insecurity, low self-esteem, and a loss of control. According to Chikobvu, Flisher, King, Lombard, & Townsend (2008), bystanders who are too fearful to intervene when the bullying act occurs, may endure incessant guilt feelings. There are times when the huge sense of guilt reaches a climax and becomes too much to handle, thereby causing a major shift from the bystander's feeling of empathy for the victim to the mere acceptance of bullying as a norm. As a result, that influential shift enables them to put those guilt feelings under control in the future.

2.8 - Anti-Bullying Interventions

The various types of school-based interventions carried out during the last thirty years of the bullying research are as follows: interventions targeting individual bullies or victims, curriculum-based interventions, and interventions that adopt a whole-school approach.

The first type of school-based anti-bullying intervention consists of teaching techniques through cognitive-behavioral groups, social skills groups, psycho-education, assertiveness training, anger management, and individual therapy (Carney & Merrel, 2001; Wilson, Lipsey, & Derzon, 2003). This kind of intervention targets males because the main goal is the reduction of physical bullying. Females are typically not included because social or relational bullying is often overlooked in this kind of intervention (Wilson et al., 2003).

The S. S. Grin intervention developed by DeRosier (2004) is an example of the first type of intervention. In addition to social learning, the treatment includes the use of cognitive-behavioral techniques. The intervention targets children who are friendless, socially anxious, and bullied. The aim is to equip them with cognitive and behavioral skills, pro-social attitudes, and enhance their coping skills to deal with bullying problems adequately. The small-group social skills intervention focused on third graders who were experiencing difficulties with peer relationships. For three consecutive years, these students were administered the loneliness and social anxiety screening instrument, and the resulting sample of 49 third graders was then determined based on the students' low scores on the administered instrument (Bostick & Anderson, 2009). Research showed that this kind of intervention was successful. The children gained self-confidence and were able to form friendships with their peers. A meta-analysis revealed that aggressive behavior was reduced by 7% (Wilson et al., 2003). However, this kind

of intervention that targets individuals only does not combat the peer culture of bullying (Greene, 2004).

The second type of anti-bullying intervention is embedded in the academic curriculum. The intervention targets the acquisition of empathy, as well as background knowledge and skills pertaining to bullying (Rigby, 2002). Also, in this approach, peers play an essential role against bullying.

The Bully Buster program is one example of such intervention (Newman-Carlson & Horne, 2004). The program is devised for teachers and targets all involved in bullying: bullies, victims, and bystanders. In essence, the intervention has two aims: the first is to increase children's awareness about the occurrence of bullying and the different forms it can take, and the second is to teach children adaptive strategies to cope with bullying incidents. This program was implemented by 52 teachers who received in-service training about the tenets of the program in a public middle school in the United States. A total of 488 middle school students in grades six, seven, and eight participated in this study (Bell, Raszynski, & Horne, 2010). The results showed that bullying incidents were minimized and a strong teacher-student bond was formed, as reported by teachers. Although this type of intervention is considered successful, one of its shortcomings is its reliance on reducing physical bullying only, excluding social bullying all together (Rigby, 2002).

The third and last type of anti-bullying intervention, the systemic approach, deals with the problem of bullying by utilizing a multilayered approach that targets individual, classroom, and school levels, thereby incorporating individual interventions, curriculum-based interventions, training for teachers, whole-school policies that urge the adoption of anti-bullying actions, and the involvement of parents and the community (Karna et al., 2011). According to Karna et al.

(2011), school-wide approaches that include a variety of intervention components may reduce bullying problems in schools. One major component deals with universal actions that target the individual, class, and school levels. At the individual and class levels, the knowledge and skills imparted by the trained teachers participating in the intervention provide the students with beneficial problem-solving options to deal with bullying. As for the school level, the students may be observed closely by the playground supervisors during recess. The other essential component includes indicated actions, wherein an anti-bullying committee constituting of four members is formed. One of the members must be a classroom teacher, while the other three members may be teachers or other faculty members. It is the role of this committee to handle individual ongoing bullying cases by discussing them either individually or in small groups together with the victimized students and with the perpetrators. It is also the role of this committee to meet regularly in order to follow-up on those cases.

One example of the systemic approach that was developed specifically to target bullying is the Bergen Anti-Bullying Project (Olweus, 1996). The main objective of the program is to bring about fundamental changes in the entire social context (Carney & Merrel, 2001). Data were collected in fourth through ninth grades, including approximately 2,500 students, at 42 primary and secondary schools in the Bergen area of Norway (Rigby, 2002). The program entails setting firm rules at school and at home, and training teachers and parents to be supportive of children who report bullying incidents. There was also an increased awareness among the teachers, children, and the parents, such that those locations where the bullying occurred occasionally were regularly supervised. Then, the rules for each class were set by the students who prevented bullying incidents all through the year. Any occurrence of bullying instigated serious talks with the involved students. The ongoing success of the program was contingent on a committee of

concerned staff members that managed the implementation of the program and involved the parents via organized PTA meetings (Carney & Merrel, 2001).

The school-based anti-bullying intervention efforts world-wide have yielded mixed results (Smith, 2004; Smith & Ananiadou, 2003). Since the rate of both perpetration and victimization were reduced by 50% (Stevens et al., 2001), the Bergen Anti-Bullying Project, developed by Olweus in Norway, is considered to be the most efficacious anti-bullying intervention program, in that country (Smith & Ananiadou, 2003; Stevens et al., 2001). Having been recognized as a model anti-bullying intervention program, the Bergen Anti-Bullying Project was adapted to the educational settings of other countries, but these efforts did not demonstrate similar and significant success as they did in Norway (Smith & Ananiadou, 2003).

In a meta-analysis on 16 studies published from 1980 to 2004 on the impact of anti-bullying programs, the results were discouraging because they showed that the changes in bullying behavior were negligible (Swearer, Espelage, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010). The sample of this meta-analysis comprised more than 15,000 students (Grades K-12) from Europe, Canada, and the United States. The results from another recent meta-analysis that included 30 bullying intervention programs were mixed. On one hand, when compared with control schools, there was a 17% to 23% decrease in bullying and victimization in experimental schools. Given that 13 of the 30 studies were based on the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, the results showed that this program was the most effective. On the other hand, the results also showed that bullying intervention programs that pertain to studies that are limited in scope, like those conducted in Europe were more effective than those conducted in the United States (Swearer et al., 2010). Since this variation in outcomes across schools and countries highlights the lack of a specific program that can be used by all schools, the creation of positive and connective school

climates across cultures could counteract the effects of negative influence that might trigger bullying.

2.9 - A Proposed Program as a Probable Resolution

When teachers address bullying behaviors through bullying-themed literature, the students' access to a safe channel of communication is enhanced (Enteman et al., 2005). Enteman et al. (2005) argue that when developmentally appropriate bullying-themed literature falls in the hands of informed and compassionate teachers, these teachers sense and seize a fleeting opportunity to offer the victims and bystanders the necessary insight and determination to confront bullying confidently and overcome it.

Anecdotal evidence indicates that bullying-themed literature is being used as a productive tool to handle bullying issues. Hillsberg and Spak (2006) created a bullying intervention program, the central feature of which was the use of bullying-themed literature to minimize bullying incidents in school. Being a non-scientific study, the lack of quantitative data did not provide evidence for the program's efficacy, but according to the authors the program was generally approved by and was beneficial to the participating students. Danielson and LaBonty (2009) designed another non-scientific anti-bullying project that involved third and fourth graders discussing and responding to bullying-themed literature. At the end of the project, the authors concluded that the support and insight provided by caring teachers resulted in the bully's development of empathy skills, the victim's acquisition of assertive skills, and the bystanders' awareness of the crucial role they can play in preventing the bullying behavior.

Research has shown that when all members of a school community take responsibility and become involved, such efforts tend to be met with the beneficial outcome of reduction in bullying (Quinn, Barone, Kearns, Stackhouse, & Zimmerman, 2003). However, Hillsberg and

Spak (2006) suggest that for these efforts to demonstrate efficacy in undercutting bullying, bullying-themed literature should be at the center of any anti-bullying program because the knowledge and skills imparted provide the students with beneficial problem-solving options to deal with bullying. Moreover, an intervention program that tackles the problems associated with bullying through bullying-themed literature seems to be an effective approach to minimize the bullies' power and presence at school (Hillsberg & Spak, 2006). According to Whitted and Dupper (2005), research supports the notion that the use of children's literature in the classroom could constitute a powerful tool to initiate in depth classroom discussions of bullying and build positive character traits, thereby countering the predisposition for any bullying behavior at an earlier age.

While some school-wide strategies do not address the role of the bystander (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Greene, 2004), other bullying interventions pay particular attention to the role of bystanders in reducing bullying behavior. Swearer et al. (2010) argue that the disregard of peer norms, a major aspect in the dynamics of bullying, is one of the possible critical reasons that led to the less-than-satisfactory results yielded by anti-bully intervention programs. Thus, bullying behaviors will be uncontrollable in schools where no initiative to amend these group norms is taken. By making use of encouraging strategies to modify group norms, it is possible for anti-bullying interventions to instigate assertive bystander responses. These programs were found to be more effective with elementary school students than with secondary school students because younger children are more predisposed to support and defend the victim (Swearer et al., 2010). Moreover, Salmivalli (2010) contends that the efforts exerted by anti-bullying interventions that make use of adult sanctions to influence the perpetrators are often of no avail. On the other hand, even though those interventions that resort to influencing the bystanders can be very demanding,

practical results can be achieved when bystanders are stimulated to put their anti-bullying attitudes into action.

According to Karna et al. (2011), when the bystanders refrain from intervening, they actually aid in perpetuating the bullying behavior, thereby rewarding the bully who attains the desired position of power. But, when the bystanders step forward and act on behalf of the victim, the rewards gained by the bully are curtailed because the pursuit of a powerful position becomes a somewhat impossible mission and consequently the bullying behavior is regulated.

2.10 - Conclusion

In summary, this literature review first portrayed the development of the construct of bullying and addressed the parameters of bullying in schools. After providing evidence-based research data on how widespread the problem of bullying is, the dynamic steps that lead to the emergence of bullying were explained. Then followed by a discussion of the two forms of bullying and the three types of bullying behavior, the gender differences pertaining to bullying were explored. The different roles assumed in bullying was the next facet of bullying that was reviewed, which focused on the characteristics of the three participants involved in the bullying situation (the bully, the victim, and the bystander), their home environment, the categorization of each participant, and the negative consequences bullying has on them. Furthermore, the different types of anti-bullying interventions were evaluated, the successful school-wide anti-bullying programs were examined, and the existing intervention strategies were critically assessed. Finally, the foundations of the proposed bullying intervention program, a major component of which is bullying-themed literature, were laid by presenting its attributes that may qualify it to alleviate the problem of bullying in schools.

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

3.1 - Introduction

The current study examines the impact of bullying-themed literature, as a major component of a bullying intervention program, on reducing bullying incidents among upper elementary students. This review of the literature identified the prevalent problem of bullying in schools, the different types of bullying that occur, the different roles assumed in bullying, the negative impact bullying has on children involved in the aggressive act, the different types of anti-bullying interventions, and the successful school-wide anti-bullying programs that have implemented effective strategies to reduce bullying. The proposed bullying-themed literature intervention program is intended to have a positive impact on decreasing bullying incidents among students in upper elementary classes by targeting the peer group and changing peer norms withheld by bystanders. As a result, the persistence of bullying is inhibited because the bullies receive negative feedback when the bystanders challenge their power and take sides with the victim.

This chapter provides a description of the research design used to determine the effectiveness of the proposed bullying intervention program, the sample used in this study, the instruments administered to collect data, and the procedures used for collecting the data.

3.2 - Research Design

The design of this study is an exploratory pretest/posttest, non-randomized evaluation of the effectiveness of a bullying-themed literature intervention program in reducing bullying in schools.

3.3 - Participants

The sample of this study consisted of students in fourth through sixth grades enrolled in two private schools in Lebanon. The location of School A is Greater Beirut and the location of School B is Kfarshima. Both schools cater to students from middle socio-economic status, whose age ranges between nine and twelve years. Criteria for participation were as follows: (a) the schools had a counselor as a member of faculty, (b) the schools refrained from introducing similar interventions during the study, (c) and all fourth-through sixth-grade English teachers agreed to implement the bullying-themed literature to prevent bullying.

Since in School A, grade six is considered in middle school, only the fourth and fifth graders participated in the study. As for School B, data were collected in fourth through sixth grades. So, the sample consisted of a total of 165 students, 57 fourth and fifth graders enrolled in School A and 108 upper elementary students in School B. Of the 57 students in School A, there were 28 fourth graders and 29 fifth graders. In School B, the 108 students were comprised of 40 fourth graders, 32 fifth graders, and 36 sixth graders (See Table 3.3). On the day the posttest was administered, seven students were absent in School A, therefore data for these students were not counted in the analysis.

The upper elementary school English teachers attended training workshops and prepared lesson plans for the bullying-related literature program in collaboration with the school counselors (see section on Procedure).

3.4 - Instruments

In order to determine the effectiveness of the school-based bullying-themed literature intervention program two surveys, the Student Experience Survey (SES) and the Revised Olweus

Bully/Victim Questionnaire, were administered to all students before and after the implementation of the bullying intervention program.

The SES assesses both the students' perceptions and their attitudes toward the bullying behavior. This 21-item instrument (see Appendix B) was chosen because it is recommended for use with third through sixth grade (Frey et al., 2004). The first five items assess the students' self-assertiveness. Items 6, 7, 8, and 10 address students' perceptions of whether adults intervene during bullying incidents. Students were asked about bystander responsibility in items 9, 11, 12, 13, and 14. As for the last seven items, they were specific to the students' acceptance of the bullying behavior.

Even though the SES could be helpful in assessing the effects of the bullying-themed literature intervention program because it measured student attitudes towards bullying behavior, an outcome evaluation could only be yielded by including an assessment of bullying and victimization behaviors. Therefore, the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire was administered simultaneously with the SES as a pretest/posttest measure before and after the implementation of the program. This questionnaire was developed in 1966 by Dan Olweus and was revised in 2004.

The junior format of the questionnaire (suitable for elementary school students) was a 39-item self-report measure, the first part of which (Items 5 to 23), also called the victim items, referred to the perpetration of the bullying act against the child who is answering the questionnaire, whereas the second part (Questions 25 to 39), also called the perpetrator items, referred to this child's engagement in bullying behaviors against others. The questionnaire included clear instructions on how to respond to the questions, as well as a detailed definition of bullying (See Appendix A) that incorporated the three types of bullying and addressed the three

important criteria for a comprehensive definition of bullying, these being purposefulness, repetitiveness, and power imbalance aspects of bullying. The students were requested to keep in mind the aforementioned definition while providing answers to questions about their perceptions, observations, and participation in bully-related behavior. The questions referred to a specific period of time, the past two months, considered a suitable length of time for students to remember their experiences (See Appendix C). By choosing from a response set consisting of five response choices (the incident of being bullied or bullying others happening several times a week, once a week, two or three times a month, once or twice in the last two months, or not taking place at all in the last two months), the students filled out the answers anonymously. The students were promised anonymity in order to encourage them to answer truthfully and in accordance with the American Psychological Association's ethical guidelines. This survey was used to investigate the following aspects: the frequency of bullying, the types of bullying, the location where bullying takes place, the person who does the bullying, the frequency with which the students report bullying to teachers or parents, and the actions that teachers take to stop bullying when they intervene (Crothers & Levinson, 2004).

3.5 - Procedure

The bullying intervention program was implemented in different phases. In November, the researcher conducted training workshops for the participating teachers. The training took place on two consecutive Saturdays (from 9:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.) at the school campus. The training was based on Gardner's theory of multiple intelligences (Gardner, 1993) and provided an overview of the program goals and content. The training focused on the definition of bullying, types of bullying, prevalence of bullying, consequences of bullying, and potentially useful bullying-themed literature that could be used to combat bullying problems. Also, teachers were

trained in the use of multiple intelligences activities. Following this overview, the researcher read the picture book *Crow Boy*, by Taro Yashima (Penguin Group, 1983) in which the main character, Chibi, was taunted by his friends because he was different; the shy Japanese boy withdrew from his classmates until an understanding teacher nurtured his special talents. Next, the teachers were divided into seven groups, such that each group chose one of the seven intelligences. The task of each group was to develop a post-reading activity that pertained to the type of intelligence assigned to that particular group. The teachers were then divided into three groups, according to the grade level they taught. Then each group was assigned a picture book that deals with bullying and the teachers were asked to develop cooperatively post-reading activities for the designated picture books. During the implementation phase, the trained teachers applied these activities in their respective classroom after reading and discussing the bullying-themed literature together with their students.

In the first week of December, the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire and the Student Experience Survey were administered as a pretest measure. The school counselor administered the pretest and the posttest during regular school times in collaboration with the class teachers. After handing out the questionnaire and asking the students to fill out the name of the school, their grade, and the date, the counselor briefly informed the students that the purpose of the study was to collect data about bullying in order to establish the best and safest environment for the students to grow and learn. Then, the school counselor reviewed the instructions for each survey and encouraged the students to respond truthfully assuring them that their identity will remain anonymous. Next, the school counselor seated the students separately in order to avoid any copying or sharing of information. Then, she read the questions out loud, informing the students that they might choose to follow along or go ahead and work at their own pace. For accuracy

purposes, the school counselor clarified the meaning of any question at the request of the students.

One week later, the teachers read the first bullying-themed picture book to the students. During the week of the implementation phase of the bullying-related literature, the teachers established seven learning centers for students of varying academic abilities to work in groups of four. The task at hand was related to one of the seven intelligences and consisted of one of the seven post-reading multiple intelligences activities (See Appendix D). The teachers implemented these activities in their respective classrooms for four days, after which students were given the post-reading quiz (See Appendix E). The students spent 20 minutes at each center; when all seven activities were completed, the students were given the opportunity to share their work with the other groups. The second bullying-themed literature was applied in March and the third in June following the same procedures. The Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire and the Student Experience Survey were then administered as a posttest measure in June.

An essential tenet of this literature-based intervention program is the post-reading activities. The driving force behind these post-reading activities was the resulting reflection from the students, wherein after taking part in such activities and sharing their input with their classmates in a safe environment, they became empowered to feel that they were a part of the solution. Students worked in groups in the seven stations established by the teachers and compiled their completed work in a portfolio. Milsom and Gallo (2006) contended that the incorporation of instructional activities into the literature-related learning process, as part of an anti-bullying program, is an approach that could have considerable impact on developing the children's schema to cope with bullying.

The aim to minimize bullying incidents was reinforced all through the phases of implementing the bullying-themed literature intervention program by displaying two relevant quotes in the targeted classrooms. The first quote is by the French playwright Moliere, as indicated in Hillsberg and Spak (2006), “We are not only responsible for what we do, but also for what we do not do.” The second quote is based on the words of Thom Harnett, a Civil Right Attorney, as mentioned in Danielson and LaBonty (2009), “One person speaking up makes more noise than a thousand people who remain silent.” After reading each of the three bullying-themed picture books together with the participating students, the teachers discussed how these two quotes related to the role of bystanders during bullying incidents. The aim was to elicit the bystanders’ empathy and enhance their self-efficacy and assertiveness skills. The mere fact that schools are a prime location for the emotionally scarring phenomenon termed bullying, a school’s failure to deal with bullying endangers the safety of all its students by allowing a hostile environment to interfere with learning, thereby affecting the social well-being of the entire school community. Therefore, the proposed bullying-themed literature intervention program strives to decrease anti-bullying attitudes by hindering the bystanders’ alliance with the bully and providing support for the victim, which buffers against further bullying attacks. As a result, schools fulfill one common mission, that being the fostering of a safe and caring environment for the students.

3.6 - Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

The Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire (OBVQ) is the most widely used instrument to measure bullying, but little research was conducted to assess its construct validity. In a study that was conducted by Kyriakides, Kaloyirou, and Lindsay (2006), the revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire was analyzed using the Rasch measurement model.

The rationale for using the Rasch measurement model was its ability to provide diagnostic information on how well the items on the questionnaire work to measure the bullying behavior. The following two interval-level measures were created: one scale was related to the students' responses to the 8 items about the extent to which they are being bullied (items 6 to 13), and the second scale was based on their responses to the other 8 items concerning the extent to which students bully others (items 26 to 33). The results showed that the OBVQ had satisfactory psychometric properties; namely, construct validity and reliability. The researchers concluded that the instrument is psychometrically sound and can measure two separate aspects of bullying. The results revealed that the reliability for the whole sample was greater than 0.85. Thus, the ability to separate each scale A and B, 'Being Victimized' and 'Bullying Others' respectively, was relatively satisfactory. With regard to validity of the OBVQ, Pearson correlation coefficient between the two scales was negative and significant, thus, indicating that each of the two scales measures a different construct and consequently, providing support for the validity of the instrument ($r = -0.78$, $N = 335$, $p < .001$).

Research also revealed that the numerous analyses that were made on the reliability of the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim questionnaire on large representative samples of more than 5000 students yielded the following results: With the school as the unit of analysis, when the items for being victimized or bullying others were combined respectively, the internal consistency reliability coefficients (Cronbach's alpha) were in the 0.90's. When the validity of self-reports dealing with variables related to bully/victim problems was investigated, the results showed in the early Swedish studies that composites of 3-5 self-report items on being bullied or bullying and attacking others, respectively, correlated in the .40-.60 range (Pearson correlations) with reliable peer ratings on related dimensions.

3.7 - Procedures for Reviewing the Literature

The purpose of the current study was to explore whether the adoption of a developmentally appropriate literature-related bullying intervention program that incorporated multiple intelligences post-reading activities could have a positive impact on bullying events, thereby reducing bullying in upper elementary classes. Therefore, the review of literature provided information on the current anti-bullying approaches, the programs that have applied bullying-themed literature to reduce bullying behaviors, and a probable resolution pertaining to the proposed literature-based bullying intervention program. All reviewed literature sources were research articles, books, and electronic databases.

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

4.1 - Introduction

This study was conducted to examine the effectiveness of a bullying intervention program that utilized bullying-themed literature as its major component for reducing bullying behavior in upper elementary classes. This chapter presents results related to the analysis of data collected in grades 4, 5, and 6 from two different schools in Lebanon. It is worth mentioning that due to the lack of student identifying codes, a between-group design was used to statistically analyze the data of this study.

4.2 - Descriptive Statistics

The data collected from this study were analyzed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS). Due to the lack of student identifying codes, the only analysis that could be done is a group level pretest and posttest descriptive analysis. Originally, pre and post test scores for each student were supposed to be matched through identifying codes; but, the teachers who collected data did not follow instructions properly. The consequences were that group, rather than individual data were collected. As a result, within-subjects analyses could not be performed as was originally intended. In other words, collected data violated the ANOVA assumption of independence, thus making it impossible to run this test. The occurrence of such a flaw in data collection prevented the use of statistical tests of significance in the data analysis, thus limiting quantitative analyses to descriptive statistics.

4.2.1 - Descriptive examination of the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire:

From the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire the following two interval-level measures

were established: one scale was related to the students' responses to the 9 items about the extent to which they are being bullied (items 5 to 13), and the second scale was based on their responses to the other 9 items concerning the extent to which students bully others (items 25 to 33).

The 9 items of the victimization scale and those of the bullying scale were answered on a 1-5 point scale, with 1= "It hasn't happened to me in the past couple of months," 2= "It has only happened once or twice," 3= "It has happened two or three times a month, 4= "It has happened about once a week," and 5= "It happened several times per week."

As seen in Table 4.2.1, the participants' pretest mean score on the variable "being victimized" was 1.72 with a standard deviation of 0.66. The posttest mean score of this variable was 1.55 with a standard deviation of 0.61. Also, the participants' pretest mean on the variable "being bullied" was 1.37 with a standard deviation of 0.53. The posttest mean score of this variable was 1.37 with a standard deviation of 0.65. Thus, these results indicate a low level of "being bullied" and "being victimized" at both pretest and posttest administration. The results also indicate that there was a slight decrease in the mean scores of victimization, but since tests of significance could not be performed, it is impossible to verify whether this decrease was due to chance or to a statistically significant difference. The result also showed that reductions in being bullied were unaccompanied by reductions in bullying others. In other words, even though the anti-bullying intervention program resulted in a slight decline in victimization, self-reported bullying behaviors remained constant.

4.2.2 - Descriptive examination of the Student Experience Survey (SES): The SES includes the following four scales:

- Perceived Assertiveness: items 1-5

- Perceived Adult Responsiveness: items 6,7,8 and 10
- Bystander Responsibility: items 9,11,12, 13, and 14
- Acceptance of Bullying: items 15-21

The 21 items of the SES were answered on a 1-4 point scale, with 1= “Not hard at all,” 2= “A little bit hard,” 3= “Pretty hard”, and 4= “Really hard,” for items 1-5 (Perceived Assertiveness). As seen in Table 4.2.2, the participants’ pretest mean score on the scale “perceived assertiveness” was 2.22 with a standard deviation of 0.82. The posttest mean score of this scale was 2.17 with a standard deviation of 1.02. The results showed that for the first scale, Perceived Assertiveness, the slightly lower mean score at posttest indicates less difficulty reported by students in responding assertively to bullying. This trend of upper elementary students responding assertively with less difficulty is encouraging because one aim of the bullying-themed intervention program was to enhance the students’ assertiveness skills. However, once again, due to lack of statistical tests of significance, it is not possible to draw solid conclusions.

Concerning items 6-14 (Perceived Adult Responsiveness and Bystander Responsibility), 1= “Very true,” 2= “Pretty true,” 3= “A little true”, and 4= “not true.” The participants’ pretest mean score on the scale “perceived adult responsiveness” was 2.18 with a standard deviation of 0.68. The posttest mean score of this scale was 2.15 with a standard deviation of 0.79. These results indicate that the students’ perceived adult responsiveness decreased slightly between the pre- and post-survey administrations, thus reflecting a minor positive improvement in their perceptions of the teachers’ involvement in attempting to counteract bullying. Also, the participants’ pretest mean score on the scale “bystander responsibility” was 2.08 with a standard deviation of 0.76. The posttest mean score of this scale was 2.09 with a standard deviation of

0.80. There were six items that solicited the upper elementary students' input on responding to bystander responsibility. By comparing the pre- and post- intervention mean scores, the students' actions intended to ameliorate peer bullying remained relatively stable, in spite of the intervention which attempted to increase the students' pro-social attitudes. The average responses provided by students leaned toward the positive second choice, "pretty true", with the responses ranging from "very true" to "not true".

As for items 15-21 (Acceptance of Bullying), 1= "Agree a lot," 2= "Agree some," 3= "Agree a little", and 4= "Don't agree." The participants' pretest mean score on the scale "acceptance of bullying" was 2.70 with a standard deviation of 0.88. The posttest mean score of this scale was 2.88 with a standard deviation of 0.94. With reference to the mean scores of the items that pertain to the scale, Acceptance of Bullying, there was a modest increase between pre- and post- survey administrations. Thus, most students responded with "agree a little", with the responses ranging from "agree a lot" to "don't agree".

4.3 - Conclusion

From the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire the results of the findings for the scales Being Bullied and Bullying Others revealed that the mean scores of victimization decreased slightly at post-intervention when compared to the pre-intervention in School A and School B. In addition, the results showed that the reductions in being bullied were unaccompanied by reductions in bullying others.

From the SES, starting with Perceived Assertiveness, since there was a slightly lower mean score at posttest the students reported a slightly reduced difficulty in responding assertively to bullying. Concerning the scale, Perceived Adult Responsiveness, the students' mean scores for perceived adult responsiveness between the pre- and post-survey administrations decreased

slightly. By comparing the pre- and post- intervention mean scores of the third scale, Bystander Responsibility, the students' bystander responsibility remained relatively stable, in spite of the intervention which attempted to increase the students' pro-social attitudes. As for the fourth scale of the SES, Acceptance of Bullying, the modest increase in the students' mean scores for acceptance of bullying between pre- and post- survey administrations indicates a slight reduction in the students' tolerance of bullying.

CHAPTER FIVE

Discussion

5.1 - Introduction

The purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of a literature-based intervention program in minimizing bullying incidents among students in upper elementary classes. A second purpose was to investigate whether the bullying-themed intervention program would also impact positively the students' assertiveness skills, perceptions of adult responsiveness, pro-social attitudes, and tolerance of bullying.

It was hypothesized that the students' self-reported victimization and bullying scores as measured by the Revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire would decrease from pretest to posttest. The key findings were that the literature-based intervention program achieved a slight victimization-reducing effect from pretest to posttest, while contrary to the purpose of the study the students' bullying mean scores evidenced no change after the implementation of the program.

It was further assumed that the students' mean scores for perceived assertiveness, perceived adult responsiveness, and bystander responsibility would decrease, while the students' mean scores for acceptance of bullying would increase as measured by the SES. In essence, there was a slight improvement in the students' perceived assertiveness and perceived adult responsiveness, as well as a slightly lower tolerance of bullying by students in the upper elementary classes. As for bystander responsibility, since the students' mean scores did not differ significantly, this scale did not favor the intervention.

5.2 - Limitations of the Current Study

Several limitations pertain to this study. Some of these limitations are centered around methodological weaknesses.

Due to the flaw in data collection aforementioned, it was not possible to assess the efficacy of the bullying-themed literature intervention program. In other words, no claim could be made about whether or not the literature-based intervention program is effective.

The study also lacked implementation measures; that is the researcher did not monitor the teachers' adherence to program procedures and to the lesson components of the bullying-themed literature. These measures could have given a true oversight as to program fidelity by providing additional data about the instructional clarity, student responsiveness, classroom management, and emotional tone. In other words, without these measures it would be impossible to know whether the participating teachers were implementing the instructional material correctly.

Another limitation pertains to the sample size of this study which was limited to 165 upper elementary students in two private schools. Thus, the results of this study cannot be generalized to the student population in Lebanon. Further research must include larger samples from different grade levels and across the regions of the country.

Rather than following a school-wide approach, this intervention program followed a whole-classroom approach because only the students in the upper elementary classes of School A and School B received the intervention. According to Stevens et al. (2001), a multi-level program includes actions that operate at the level of individual students, classrooms, and schools. Developing anti-bullying school rules and training staff to intervene are examples of prevention

activities at the school level. As indicated by research, bullying behavior can be controlled most efficiently by applying the most influential prevention strategies, those that follow whole-school approaches (Greene, 2004; Rodkin & Hodges, 2003; Sutton & Keogh, 2000).

In addition, this anti-bullying intervention lacked a control condition, a group of upper elementary students (from two comparison schools) who did not receive the bullying-themed intervention, thereby creating an uncertainty as to whether the reported slight decrease in victimization is attributed to the literature-based intervention program or to some extraneous factor. The presence of a control group gives validity to the experimental design by establishing cause-effect relationship. The absence of a control group in this study constitutes a serious limitation that must be avoided in further investigations.

5.3 - Implications for Research and Practice

The mere fact that schools are a prime location for the emotionally scarring phenomenon termed bullying, a school's failure to deal with bullying endangers the safety of all its students by allowing a hostile environment to interfere with learning, thereby affecting the social well-being of the entire school community. Bullying is also considered a silent crime because research shows that many school shooters haven been victimized persistently by their peers (Leary, Kowalski, Smith, & Phillips, 2003). In fact, children from all cultures, bullies or victims, suffer from emotional, social, and educational problems due to the presence of bullying in schools. Therefore, schools should not only strive to minimize bullying, but also prevent it in the best way possible.

Ferguson et al. (2007) contend that researchers have not yet reached a consensus on the clear-cut definition of bullying. These definitional constraints cause complications in bullying research, especially with respect to comparing studies (Griffin & Gross, 2004), as well as

measuring the extent to which the phenomenon is occurring. So, the students' interpretations of the provided definitions may not match the researcher's intentions (Sharkey, Furlong, & Yetter, 2006). By extending efforts on educating both teachers and students regarding the definition of bullying, the accuracy of the instruments utilized may be improved. Moreover, when a peer-report is used in conjunction with a self-report, the students' understanding of the provided definition of bullying may be judged tentatively by comparing both reports. For example, if it happens that certain students are nominated by peers as victims but fail to self-report victimization, it may be inferred that these students do not understand the definition of bullying clearly or lack objectivity when reporting about incidents experienced by them.

One important recommendation that stems from this study concerns the data collection process. The researcher's vigilance in the data collection process is one essential aspect that needs further investigation, such that data collection, as well as the implementation of the procedure should be followed exactly as planned. Therefore, since the whole study depends heavily on the accuracy of data collection and classroom implementation, the researcher should make sure to be present during both procedures. Better yet, it is the researcher's responsibility to perform these tasks.

One other implication of this study entails the utilization of multi-method and multi-informant outcome measures rather than just self-report methods to assess the efficacy of anti-bullying intervention programs, and to identify both the bullies and the victims. Taking into consideration that there are many advantages in utilizing self-report, bullying research should not depend solely on self-report measures because of their subjectivity and proneness to bias (Cornell & Brockenbrough, 2004). By utilizing a peer-report, the students are asked individually to nominate their classmates, according to the provided described behaviors, as either a bully or a

victim. Current anti-bullying intervention programs that relied primarily on self-report measures only influenced the beliefs and intentions of students, but not their behavior (Merrell, Gueldner, Ross, & Isava, 2008). Hence, by using peer-report in conjunction with self-report, the students are given the opportunity to report an actual change in the behavior of their classmates based on their prolonged observation, thereby resulting in beneficial intervention effects.

Furthermore, the re-examination of the psychometric properties of the SES (Thompson, 2009), is an indication that it is necessary to further develop this instrument and validate its psychometric properties prior to subsequent use in research. According to Thompson (2009), the assessment of the SES's factorial validity resulted in viewing the two scales "Perceived Adult Responsiveness" and "Bystander Responsibility" as a single entity because of similar elements that clustered around some items in both scales.

Another implication is related to the crucial factor of time. In this study, the entire intervention lasted around 7 months. Such a short time might not be sufficient to effect significant change in students' behaviors and attitudes. Therefore, a longer duration of anti-bullying interventions must be considered to create a school culture that has no tolerance for bullying. Another possible effective method is to integrate anti-bullying within the curriculum. In essence, when anti-bullying interventions are ongoing and become incorporated as an integral part of the school's organizational system and curriculum, these interventions may lead to a more effective school climate, which in turn might result in lasting positive effects (Limber, 2004; Salmivalli, Kaukiainen, & Voeten, 2005). In fact, the intervention should be continuous and woven into the fabric of the school environment because overcoming the ongoing issue of bullying with just a single effort is an unrealistic expectation. In other words, if a strong

commitment on the schools' part does not exist, long-term improvements might not be maintained.

Even though teachers are not always aware of all bullying incidents that occur on school premises, useful information can be obtained from them about the social climate that exists at school and in the classroom. Therefore, a teacher-report can be a valuable supplement measure to the self- and peer-report (Cornell & Brockenbrough, 2004).

When providing training workshops for teachers before the implementation of an anti-bullying intervention program, it is of extreme importance to organize hands-on training for participating teachers. The purpose of such training is to enhance the teachers' adoption of appropriate procedures and discussion techniques for tackling bullying issues through simulation exercises. On the other hand, teachers' perceptions and knowledge about bullying could be modified if teachers were to learn about bullying as part of a core-requirement course having to do with school-related problems. Taking such a course may enhance the teachers' understanding of the bullying behavior in depth, as well as to develop the ability to confront bullying incidents at school.

By taking into consideration the limitations aforementioned and investigating further about other complexities that might be barriers to effective intervention, necessary refinements can be made to the current literature-based intervention program for the purposes of reducing bullying and victimization. Since bullying in schools around the world is a growing concern for school administrators, teachers, and parents, anti-bullying interventions that are effective at reducing bullying behavior and instigating assertive bystander responses are a necessity that schools can no longer afford to ignore.

References

- American Psychological Association (2009). Bullying. *APA Government Relations: Public Interest Policy*. Retrieved from <http://www.apa.org/ppo/issues/bullying.html>.
- Androue, E. (2001). Bully/victim problems and their association with coping behavior in conflictual peer interactions among school-age children. *Educational Psychology, 21*, 59-66.
- Arsenault, L., Walsh, E., Trzesniewski, K., Newcomb, R., Caspi, A., & Moffitt, T. E. (2006). Bullying victimization uniquely contributes to adjustment problems in young children: A nationally representative cohort study. *Pediatrics, 118*, 130-138.
- Bell, C. D., Raszynski, K. A., & Horne, A. M. (2010). Bully Busters Abbreviated: Evaluation of a Group-Based Bully Intervention and Prevention Program. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice, 14*(3), 257-267.
- Bonds, M., & Stoker, S. (2000). *Bully proofing your school: A comprehensive approach for middle schools*. Colorado: Sopris West.
- Bostick, D., & Anderson, R. (2009). Evaluating a small-group counseling program: A model for program planning and improvement in the elementary setting. *Professional School Counseling, 12*(6), 428-433.
- Borresen, L. (2007). *A guide for understanding bullying*. Illinois, IL: Jewish Child & Family Services. Department of Psychological Services.
- Boulton, M. J., Trueman, M., & Flemington, I. (2002). Associations between secondary school pupils' definitions of bullying, attitudes towards bullying and tendencies to engage in bullying: Age and sex differences. *Educational Studies, 28*(4), 353-370.
- Brinson, S.A. (2005). Boys don't tell on sugar-and-spice-but-not-so-nice girl bullies. *Reclaiming Children and Youth, 14*(3), 169-174.
- Carey, T. A. (2003). Improving the success of anti-bullying intervention programs: A tool for matching programs with purposes. *International Journal of Reality Therapy, 12*(2), 16-20.
- Carney, A.G., & Merrell, K. W. (2001). Bullying in schools: perspectives on understanding and preventing and international problem. *School Psychology International, 22*(3), 364-382.
- Chapell, M. S., Hasselman, S. L., Kitchin, T., Lomon, S., MacIver, K. W., & Sarulla, P. (2006). Bullying in elementary school, high school, and college. *Adolescence, 41*, 633-648.

- Chikobvu, P., Flisher, A.J., King, G., Lombard, C., & Townsend, L. (2008). The relationship between bullying behaviours and high school dropout in Cape Town, South Africa. *South African Journal of Psychology*, 38(1), 21-32.
- Coloroso, B. (2003). *The bully, the bullied, and the bystander*. New York, NY: Harper Collins.
- Cornell, D. G., & Brockenbrough, K. (2004). Identification of bullies and victims: A comparison of methods. *Journal of School Violence*, 3, 63-87.
- Crockett, D. (2003). Critical issues children face in the 2000s. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 18(4), 446-453.
- Crothers, L. M., Field, J. E., & Kolbert, J. B. (2005). Navigating power, control and being nice: Aggression in adolescent girls' friendships. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 83, 349-354.
- Crothers, L. M., & Levinson, E. M. (2004). Assessment of bullying: A review of methods and instruments. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 82, 496-503.
- Dake, J. A., Price, J. H., & Telljohann, S.K. (2003). The nature and extent of bullying at school. *The Journal of School Health*, 73(5), 173-180.
- Danielson, K. E., & LaBonty, J. (2009). Reading and responding to children's books about bullying. *Ohio Journal of English Language Arts*, 49(1), 31-36.
- DeRosier, M.E. (2004). Building relationships and combating bullying: effectiveness of a school-based social-skills group intervention. *Journal of Clinical Child and Adolescent Psychology*, 32, 551-563.
- De Wet, C. (2007). Educators' perceptions on bullying prevention strategies. *South African Journal of Education*, 27(2), 191-208.
- Dulmus, C. N., & Sowers, K. N. (2004). *Kids and violence: The invisible school experience*. New York: Haworth Social Work Practice Press.
- Eslea, M., Menesini, E., Morita, Y., O'Moore, M., Mora-Merchan, J.A., Pereira, B., & Smith, P.K. (2004). Friendship and loneliness among bullies and victims: Data from seven countries. *Aggressive Behavior*, 30, 71-83.
- Enteman, J., Muren, T. J., & Hendricks, C. (2005). Victims, bullies, and bystanders in K-3 literature. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(4), 352-364.
- Felix, E. D., & McMahon, S. D. (2006). Gender and multiple forms of peer victimization: How do they influence adolescent psychosocial adjustment? *Violence and Victims*, 21(6), 707-724.

- Ferguson, C. J., Miguel, C. S., Kiburn, J. C., & Sanchez, P. (2007). The effectiveness of school-based anti-bullying program: A meta-analytic review. *Criminal Justice Review*, 32(4), 401-414.
- Finger, L. R., Craven, R. G., Marsh, H. W. & Parada, R. H. (2005). *Characteristics of effective anti-bullying interventions: What research says (2005)? Is categorization best practice for school bullying research? An investigation into the process of dichotomization*. Paper presented at the University of Western Sydney College of Arts, Educational and Social Sciences Research Conference, October, 2005, Sydney.
- Finnegan, R. A., Hodges, E. V. E., & Perry, D. G. (1998). Victimization by peers: Associations with children's reports of mother-child interaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1076-1086.
- Frey, K. S., Dietsch, B. J., Diaz, M., MacKenzie, E. P., VanSchoiack-Edstrom, L., Hirschstein, M. K., & Snell, J. L. (2004). *The student experience survey: What school is like for me?* Seattle, WA: Committee for Children.
- Frey, K. S., Hirschstein, M.K., Snell, J.L., VanSchoiack-Edstrom, L., MacKenzie, E.P., & Broderick, C. (2005). Reducing bullying and the beliefs that support it: An experimental trial of the Steps to Respect Program. *Developmental Psychology*, 41, 479-491.
- Gardner, H. (1993). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (10th Anniversary Edition)*. New York, NY: Basic Books.
- Glover, D., Gough, G., Johnson, M., & Cartwright, N. (2000). Bullying in 25 secondary schools: incidence, impact and intervention. *Educational Research*, 42(2), 141-156.
- Greene, M. B. (2004). Counseling and climate change as treatment modalities for bullying in school. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 25, 293-302.
- Greif, J. L., & Furlong, M. J. (2006). The Assessment of school bullying: Using theory to inform practice. *Journal of School Violence*, 5(3), 33-50.
- Griffin, R. S., & Gross, A. M. (2004). Childhood bullying: Current empirical findings and future directions for research. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 9, 379-400.
- Hammel, L. R. (2008). Bouncing back after bullying: The resiliency of female victims of relational aggression. *Mid-Western Educational Researcher*, 21(2), 3-14.
- Hawkins, D. L., Peplar, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer interventions in bullying. *Social Development*, 10, 512-527.
- Hillsberg, C., & Spak, H. (2006). Young adult literature as the centerpiece of an anti-bullying program in middle school. *Middle School Journal*, 38(2), 23-28.

- Hirschstein, M. K., VanSchoiack-Edstrom, L., Frey, K. S., Snell, J. L., & MacKenzie, E. P. (2007). Walking the talk in bullying prevention: Teacher implemented variables related to initial impact of Steps to Respect Program. *School Psychology Review, 36*(1), 3-21.
- Jankauskiene, R., Kardelis, K., Sukys, S., & Kardeliene, L. (2008). Associations between school bullying and psychosocial factors. *Social Behavior and Personality, 36*(2), 145-162.
- Karna, A., Voeten, M., Little, T. D., Poskiparta, E., Kaljonen, A., & Salmivalli, C. (2011). A large-scale evaluation of the KiVa anti-bullying program. *Child Development, 82*(1), 311-330.
- Koskal, M. S., & Yel, M. (2007). The effect of multiple intelligences theory (MIT)-based instruction on attitudes towards the course, academic success, and permanence of teaching on the topic of 'respiratory systems'. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice, 7*(1), 231-239.
- Kumpulainen, K., & Rasanen, E. (2000). Children involved in bullying at elementary school age: Their psychiatric symptoms and deviance in adolescence, an epidemiological sample. *Child Abuse and Neglect, 24*, 1567-1577.
- Kuther, T. L. (2006). Understanding Bullying. *American Academy of Experts in Traumatic Stress*. Retrieved from <http://www.aaets.org/article175.htm>.
- Kyriakides, L., Kaloyirou, C., & Lindsay, G. (2006). An analysis of the revised Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire using the Rasch Measurement Model. *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 76*, 781-801.
- Leary, M. R., Kowalski, R. M., Smith, L., & Phillips, S. (2003). Teasing, rejection and violence: Case studies of the school shootings. *Aggressive Behavior, 29*, 202-214.
- Lee, C. (2004). *Preventing bullying in schools: A guide for teachers and other professionals*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Limber, S. (2004). Implementation of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program in American schools: Lessons learned from the field. In D. Espelage & S. Swearer (Eds), *Bullying in American schools: A social-ecological perspective on prevention and intervention* (pp. 351-363). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum.
- Marini, Z. A., Dane, A.V., Bosacki, S. L., & YLC-CURA (2006). Direct and indirect bully-victims: Differential psychosocial risk factors associated with adolescents involved in bullying and victimization. *Aggressive Behavior, 32*, 551-569.
- Matthiesen, S. B., & Einarsen, S. (2004). Psychiatric distress and symptoms of PTSD after bullying at work. *British Journal of Guidance and Counseling, 32*(3), 335-356.

- Merrell, K., Gueldner, B., Ross, S., & Isava, D. (2008). How effective are school bullying intervention programs? A meta-analysis of intervention research. *School Psychology Quarterly*, 23, 26–42.
- Milsom, A., & Gallo, L. (2006). Bullying in middle schools: Prevention and intervention. *Middle School Journal*, 37(3), 12-19.
- Newman-Carlson, D., & Horne, A. M. (2004). Bully Busters: A psycho-educational intervention for reducing bullying behavior in middle schools students. *Journal of Counseling and Development*, 82, 259-263.
- Olafsen, R. N., & Viemro, V. (2000). Bully/victim problems and coping with stress among 10-to-12 year old pupils in A land, Finland. *Aggressive Behaviour*, 26, 56-65.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: What we know and what we can do*. Oxford: Blackwell Publishers.
- Olweus, D. (1996). Bullying at school: Knowledge base and an effective intervention program. In C. F. Ferris & T. Grisso (Eds.) *Understanding aggressive behavior in children* (pp. 265-276). New York, NY: New York Academy of Sciences.
- Olweus, D. (2001). Peer Harassment: A critical analysis and some important issues. In J. Juvonen & S. Graham (Eds.) *Peer harassment in school: The plight of the vulnerable and victimized* (pp. 4-72). New York, NY: Guilford Press.
- Olweus, D. (2003). A profile of bullying. *Educational Leadership*, 60, 12-17.
- Orpinas, P., & Horne, A.M. (2006). *Bullying prevention: Creating a positive school climate and developing social competence*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association.
- Oyaziwo, A. (2006). Bullying in schools: A form of child abuse in schools. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 30(1), 37-49.
- Oyaziwo, A. (2008). *A review of the extent, nature, characteristics and effects of bullying behaviour in schools*. Retrieved from http://findarticles.com/p/articles/mi_m0FCG/is_2_35?pnun=11&opg=n27914349.
- Parsons, L. (2005). *Bullied teacher, bullied student: How to recognize the bullying culture in your school and what to do about it*. Canada: Pembroke Publishers.
- Pauw, I. (2007). *Bullying on the playground*. Retrieved from <http://www.health24.com/child/Abuse/833-859,36766.asp>.
- Pellegrini, A., Bartini, M., & Brooks, F. (1999). School bullies, victims and aggressive victims: Factors relating to group affiliation and victimization in early adolescence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 9, 216-224.

- Piskin, M. (2002). School bullying: definition, types, related factors and strategies to prevent bullying problems. *Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice*, 2, 555-562.
- Pepler, D. J. (2006). Bullying interventions: A binocular perspective. *Social Development*, 15(1), 16-20.
- Quinn, K. S., Barone, B., Kearns, J., Stackhouse, S. A., & Zimmerman, M. E. (2003). Using a novel unit to help understand and prevent bullying in schools. *Journal of Adolescent & Adult Literacy*, 46(7), 582-592.
- Rigby, K (2002). Consequences of bullying in schools. *The Canadian Journal of Psychiatry*, 48(9), 583- 590.
- Rodkin, P. C., & Hodges, E.V.E. (2003). Bullies and victims in the peer ecology: Four questions for psychologists and school professionals. *School Psychology Review*, 32, 384-400.
- Salmivalli, C. (2010). Bullying and the peer group: A review. *Aggression and Violent Behavior*, 15, 112-120.
- Salmivalli, C., & Isaacs, J. (2005). Prospective relations among victimization, rejection, friendlessness, and children's self- and peer-perceptions. *Child Development*, 76, 1161–1171.
- Salmivalli, C., Kaukiainen, A., & Voeten, M. (2005). Anti-bullying intervention: Implementation and outcome. *British Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75, 465-487.
- Selekman, J., & Vessey, J.A. (2004). Bullying: It isn't what it used to be. *Pediatric Nursing*, 30, 246-249.
- Sharkey, J., Furlong, M. J., & Yetter, G. (2006). An overview of measurement issues in school violence and school safety research. In S. R. Jimerson & M. J. Furlong (Eds.) *Handbook of school violence and school safety: From research to practice* (pp. 121-134). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Smith, P. K. (2004). Bullying: recent developments. *Child and Adolescent Mental Health*, 9, 98-103.
- Smith, P. K., & Ananiadou, K. (2003). The nature of school bullying and the effectiveness of school-based interventions. *Journal of Applied Psychoanalytic Studies*, 5, 189-209.
- Smith, P. K., & Brain, P. (2000). Bullying in schools: Lessons from two decades of research. *Aggressive Behavior*, 6, 1-9.
- Smith, P. K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R. F., & Liefoghe, A. P. (2002). Definitions of bullying: A comparison of terms used, and age and gender differences, in a fourteen-country international comparison. *Child Development*, 73(4), 1119-1133.

- Smokowski, P. R., & Kopasz, K.H. (2005). Bullying in schools: An overview of types, effects, family characteristics and intervention strategies. *Children & Schools, 27*, 101-110.
- Steffensmeier, D., Schwartz, J., Zhong, H., & Ackerman, J. (2005). An assessment of recent trends in girls' violence using diverse longitudinal sources: Is the gender gap closing? *Criminology, 43*, 355-405.
- Stevens, V., De Bourdeaudhuij, I., & Van Oost, P. (2001). Anti-bullying interventions at school: Aspects of program adaptation and critical issues for further development. *Health Promotion International, 16*(2), 155-167.
- Sullivan, K. (2000). *The anti-bullying handbook*. United Kingdom: Oxford University Press.
- Sullivan, K., Cleary, M., & Sullivan, G. (2004). *Bullying in secondary schools*. London: Paul Chapman Publishing.
- Sutton, J., & Keogh, E. (2000). Social Competition in School: Relationships with Bullying, Machiavellianism, and Personality, *British Journal of Educational Psychology, 70*, 443-56.
- Swearer, S. M., Espelage, D. L., Vaillancourt, T., & Hymel, S. (2010). What can be done about school bullying? Linking research to educational practice. *Educational Research, 39*, 38-47.
- The Australian Institute of Professional Counselors (2008). *Counseling Connection: The Downward Spiral of Bullying*. Retrieved from <http://www.counselingconnection.com/index.php/2008/05/20/how-did-this-happen>.
- The Kansas State Department of Education (2009). *Definitions/Characteristics of bullying*. Retrieved from http://www.ksde.org/KS_SCHOOLS_RESOURCE_CENTRE/dc_bvb.htm.
- Thompson, C. (2009). *Re-examination of the psychometric properties of the Student Experience Survey*. (Doctoral Dissertation). Retrieved from: http://books.google.com.lb/books/about/Re_examination_of_the_psychometric_prope.html?id=a4s1CEH4eJQC&redir_esc=y (UMI Number: 3363142)
- Unnever, J. D. (2005). Bullies, aggressive victims, and victims: Are they distinct groups? *Aggressive Behavior, 31*, 153-171.
- Veenstra, R., Lindenberg, S., Oldehinkel, A. J., De Winter, A. F., Verhulst, F. C., & Ormel, J. (2005). Bullying and victimization in elementary schools: A comparison of bullies, victims, bully/victims, and uninvolved preadolescents. *Developmental Psychology, 41*, 672-682.

- Wang, J., Iannotti, R., & Nansel, T. (2009). School bullying among adolescents in the United States: Physical, verbal, relational, and cyber. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 45*(4), 368–375.
- Whitted, K. S., & Dupper, D. R. (2005). Best practices for preventing or reducing bullying in schools. *Children & Schools, 27*(3), 167-175.
- Wilson, S. J., Lipsey, M. W., & Derzon, J.H. (2003). The effects of school-based intervention programs on aggressive behavior: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 71*, 136-149.

Appendix I

About being bullied by other students

Here are some questions about being bullied by other students. First we define or explain the word bullying. We say a student is being bullied when another student, or several other students

- say mean and hurtful things or make fun of him or her or call him or her mean and hurtful names
- completely ignore or exclude him or her from their group of friends or leave him or her out of things on purpose
- hit, kick, push, shove around, or lock him or her inside a room
- tell lies or spread false rumors about him or her or send mean notes and try to make other students dislike him or her
- and other hurtful things like that.

When we talk about bullying, these things happen repeatedly, and it is difficult for the student being bullied to defend himself/herself. We also call it bullying, when a student is teased repeatedly in a mean and hurtful way.

But we don't call it bullying when the teasing is done in a friendly and playful way.

Also, it is not bullying when two students of about equal strength or power argue or fight

Appendix II

STUDENT EXPERIENCE SURVEY

What School Is Like For Me

2. Kids at school are ganging up on you. How hard would it be to calmly tell them to stop?

not hard at all a little bit hard Pretty Hard REALLY HARD

3. Kids at school are teasing you. How hard would it be to calmly tell them to stop?

not hard at all a little bit hard Pretty Hard REALLY HARD

4. Kids at school are telling lies about you. How hard would it be to calmly tell them to stop?

not hard at all a little bit hard Pretty Hard REALLY HARD

5. Kids are passing mean notes about you in class. How hard would it be to calmly tell them to stop?

not hard at all a little bit hard Pretty Hard REALLY HARD

© 2004 Committee for Children

Appendix III

OLWEUS BULLY/VICTIM QUESTIONNAIRE

Have you been bullied at school in the past couple of months in one or more of the following ways? Please answer all questions.

5. I was called mean names, was made fun of, or teased in a hurtful way

- it hasn't happened to me in the past couple of months
- only once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- about once a week
- several times a week

6. Other students left me out of things on purpose, excluded me from their group of friends, or completely ignored me

- it hasn't happened to me in the past couple of months
- only once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- about once a week
- several times a week

7. I was hit, kicked, pushed, shoved around, or locked indoors

- it hasn't happened to me in the past couple of months
- only once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- about once a week

- several times a week

8. Other students told lies or spread false rumors about me and tried to make others dislike me

- it hasn't happened to me in the past couple of months
- only once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- about once a week
- several times a week

9. I had money or other things taken away from me or damaged

- it hasn't happened to me in the past couple of months
- only once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- about once a week
- several times a week

10. I was threatened or forced to do things I didn't want to do

- it hasn't happened to me in the past couple of months
- only once or twice
- 2 or 3 times a month
- about once a week
- several times a week

Appendix IV

Multiple Intelligences Activities

Verbal-linguistic Intelligence

- Write a poem against bullying
- Write a journal from the point of view of a character in a story

Mathematical-logical Intelligence

- Conduct a survey about bullying and describe the results in a table
- Make a graph of your survey results

Visual-Spatial Intelligence

- Make a book cover for the story you are reading
- Make a poster of the story you are reading

Musical Intelligence

- Create a cover for a bullying music CD
- Add sound effects to the poem against bullying

Interpersonal Intelligence

- Create a 'no bullying' recipe
- Present the poem against bullying with sound effects as a group to the class

Intrapersonal Intelligence

- Express likes and dislikes for a major character in the story
- Make a Venn diagram that compares ‘the you’ now after reading the story with ‘the you’ before reading the story

Bodily-Kinesthetic Intelligence

- Invent sign language to tell bullies to stop bullying and teach it to the class
- Create a bully box

Appendix V

Post Comprehension Quiz for My Secret Bully

1. How is your behavior similar and/or different from that of Katie's behavior?
2. How would you feel if you were to put yourself in Monica's shoes? Explain.
3. What do you think made Katie act the way she did with Monica?
4. Why did Sarah not do anything to help Monica?
5. If you were in Sarah's place, how would you have reacted to Katie's behavior?
6. How did Monica overcome her problem with Katie?

Post-reading Comprehension Quiz for Sorry

1. What made Charlie draw a mustache on his sister's favorite school picture? Could Jack have made a difference?
2. When Charlie said "sorry," did he mean it? Why or why not?
3. Even though Jack knew it was wrong to throw a water balloon at his neighbor Mike, he still did it. Why do you think he agreed to do it? Would you have acted the similarly or differently? Explain.
4. If you were in Jack's place, what could you have said or done to prevent the destruction of Leena's project by Charlie?
5. How would you feel if you were to put yourself in Leena's shoes? Explain.
6. If Charlie and Jack were your classmates, who would you want to be friends with? Why?

Table 3.3

Participating Students in School A and School B

	School A	School B	Total
Fourth Grade	29	40	69
Fifth Grade	28	32	60
Sixth Grade	-	36	36
Total	57	108	165

Table 4.2.1

Results for the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire

Variable	Mean (M)	Standard Deviation (SD)
Being Victimized (Pretest)	1.72	0.66
Being Victimized (Posttest)	1.55	0.61
Bullying Others (Pretest)	1.37	0.53
Bullying Others (Posttest)	1.37	0.65

Table 4.2.1**Results for the Student Experience Survey**

Variable	M	SD
Perceived Assertiveness (Pretest)	2.22	0.82
Perceived Assertiveness (Posttest)	2.17	1.02
Perceived Adult Responsiveness (Pretest)	2.18	0.68
Perceived Adult Responsiveness (Posttest)	2.15	0.79
Bystander Responsibility (Pretest)	2.08	0.76
Bystander Responsibility (Posttest)	2.09	0.80
Acceptance of Bullying (Pretest)	2.70	0.88
Acceptance of Bullying (Posttest)	2.88	0.94