BULLY BUSTING: A TEACHER-LED PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL PROGRAM TO REDUCE BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

by

JENNY VAN OVERBEKE BROOKS

(Under the Direction of Arthur M. Horne)

ABSTRACT

The present study sought to examine the effectiveness of a bullying and victimization intervention and prevention program, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) manual (Horne, Bartolomucci, & Newman-Carlson, 2003), a manual intended to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills to work with their students to prevent and intervene in bullying related incidents. The program was implemented in two urban elementary schools in the southeastern region of the United States. A total of 15 third through fifth grade teachers and 220 of their students participated in this study.

Participating teachers (n=15) attended a staff development training on the foundation and use of the manual, implemented the 8 modules of the manual, and were involved in support groups. For evaluation purposes, teachers completed five instruments; the Behavior Assessment System for Children - Teacher Rating Scale – Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) – Screener Short-Form (Kamphaus et al., 2002), the BASC-TRS Aggression Scale (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992), Teacher Information, Skills and Knowledge – Elementary (TISK-E) (Horne et al., 2003), a report of frequency of bullying incidents, and the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure

(TEAM) (Horne, Socherman, & Dagley, 1998). The impact of the implementation of the Bully Buster program on the students was examined using a student self-report of bullying, victimization, and fighting (Bosworth & Espleage, 1999).

The research design for this study was an exploratory pre-test/post-test, non-randomized evaluation. A total of 17 null hypotheses were derived from the seven research questions developed to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Bully Busters invention and prevention program in positively impacting bullying. The overall results of the intervention for teachers produced positive results on the teachers' general development and use of bullying intervention and prevention skills and on their self-efficacy in working with bullies and victims. However, teachers indicated a trend towards an increase in observed bullying incidents. In addition, the general results of the intervention for students did not yield positive results across the overall student sample. Teachers' perceived an increase in aggressive behaviors and students perceived their own behaviors and perspectives as relatively constant in terms of their self-reports of victimization and their engagement in fighting behaviors, with the exception of an overall decrease in their own self-reports of engagement in bullying related behaviors. In general, the findings of the Bully Busters program indicate effectiveness in increasing teachers' knowledge and use of bullying prevention and intervention skills and their self-efficacy in working with bullies and victims; however the impact on student behavior was minimal.

INDEX WORDS: Aggressive Behavior, Bullying, Bully Prevention, Elementary School Student, Psychoeducational, School Violence, Teacher Support Groups, teacher Intervention, Victimization

BULLY BUSTING: A TEACHER-LED PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL PROGRAM TO REDUCE BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

by

JENNY VAN OVERBEKE BROOKS

B.S., Berry College, 1993

M.Ed., The University of Georgia, 1996

A Dissertation Submitted to the Graduate Faculty of the University of Georgia in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

ATHENS, GEORGIA

2004

BULLY BUSTING: A TEACHER-LED PSYCHOEDUCATIONAL PROGRAM TO REDUCE BULLYING AND VICTIMIZATION AMONG ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS

by

JENNY VAN OVERBEKE BROOKS

Major Professor: Arthur M. Horne

Committee: Linda F. Campbell
Randy W. Kamphaus
Pamela O. Paisley

Electronic Version Approved:

Maureen Grasso
Dean of the Graduate School
The University of Georgia
August 2004

DEDICATION

The accomplishment of this dissertation is dedicated to all of my wonderful family, friends, and mentors who have supported me and cheered me on during this journey: without you all in my life during these last four years I do not know that I could have persevered! Thank you for helping me make this dream come true and, more importantly, become a better person!

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First and foremost, I must thank Andy Horne, my major professor, for his never ending support of me. Andy you have been not only been my mentor, but my friend. Your encouragement and investment in me as a professional and as a person has greatly contributed to who I am to day and to what I am forever growing to become. Thank you for cheering me on and for your, oh so, kind way of giving me gentle nudges along the way when I needed them to push forward! Your guidance and inclusion in various projects has challenged me and helped me tap into different parts of myself. Thank you for helping me to become comfortable with the ambivalence of life and in turn letting go of being stuck in a need for structure and predictability!

To my dissertation committee, Dr. Andy Horne, Dr. Pam Paisley, Dr. Linda Campbell, Dr. Richard Hayes, and Dr. Randy Kamphaus, thank you for helping make this Bully Busters project and dissertation come to fruition. I greatly appreciate all of your support and guidance.

To my husband, Curtis, and my parents…thank you! You all have always believed in me and, at times, trusted me more that I trusted myself. Words can barely touch the amount of gratitude and appreciation I have for the support, guidance, and strength you have bestowed upon me during my doctoral career, the creation of this dissertation, and my professional and personal growth.

I would like to express my gratitude to "Czarina" Laurie Fleckenstein for always being my co-pilot! Without you, life and this project, I am sure, would have been calm and mundane. Thank you for always bringing your contagious energy and sunny presence to everything you do! You always put a smile on my face.

Cohort 2004, walking this road with you all has been an unbelievable experience! Each of you has touched my life in an amazingly special way. I look forward to continuing to nourish our relationships as Doctors!

Thank you to the schools, teachers, and students who willingly participated in the Bully Buster project. Having the opportunity to work with you all was truly a pleasure and an inspiration!

To all of you who helped me with all my data needs, thank you! To Dr. Necea Johnson, wow, thank you so much for all of your support and resourcefulness, you are a true friend. To Ellen Rowe, not only am I thankful for your statistical geniuses but for the impact your friendship has had in my life. To Martha Bustamante, thank you for your interested in this project and your willingness to engage in the joys of data entry. To Jackie Roberts, thank you for coming to my rescue and analyzing my data.

Finally, I would like to thank the University of Georgia, the College of Education, and the Department of Counseling and Human Development Service for the opportunity to pursue my doctorate! Dreams do come true!

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

LIST OF TABLES

Page

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

Statement of the Problem

Schools are intended to be safe, nurturing havens that facilitate student learning and development; however students may encounter barriers that impede their learning. One such barrier involves issues related to school violence and the safety of schools. Violence prevention continues to be of growing concern not only for schools but also for our society as a whole. Bullying behaviors and, thus, the resulting victimization are of primary concern when schools begin to address school violence.

The extensiveness of bullying continues to be researched and documented. According to the 2001 School Crime Supplement of the National Crime Victimization Survey, 8 percent of students surveyed, ages 12-18, reported being bullied at school in the last 6 months, this was up from 5 percent in 1999 (U.S. Department of Justice, 2001). Bullying is said to affect approximately 5,000,000 elementary and middle school students in the United States with approximately 282,000 students being physically attacked in secondary schools in America each month (Botsche & Moore, 2000). Thus, as the phenomenon of bullying persists, educators and school systems continue to be challenged and frustrated as they address the safeness of their schools and the learning environment. As a result, teachers, administrators, parents, and students are confronted with what to do to effectively intervene in bullying incidents and prevent future ones.

Not only can bullying and victimization be seen as a behavior problem that plagues schools, but it also ties into social justice issues and what students deserved as part of a democratic society. Olweus (1994) asserts "In my view, it is a fundamental democratic right for a child to feel safe in school and to be spared the oppression and repeated, intentional humiliation implied in bullying" (p. 1183). "Social justice issues involve intense feelings of oppression, prejudiced, and racism" (Portman & Portman, 2002, p. 16) and can be equated with social fairness and equity as defined by social conditions (Teasley & Rice, 1996). In thinking about the experiences of those students who are victims, those who are bystanders, and those who are the bullies, one can see how bullying would compromise and challenge the very foundation of social justice as it applies to students. Students who are afraid to go to school because of their fear of being victimized by a bully or those students who suffer as they watch the bullying occur are not being treated with fairness and may be oppressed or discriminated against.

Accordingly, "students, as the future American citizenry, must be aware of social justice as a basic value" (Portman & Portman, 2002, p. 17), if students are to be educated and empowered to be socially conscious and contributing citizens to our democratic society, then they must be taught prosocial ways of interacting with others. In Cochran-Smith's Walking the Road: Race, Diversity, and Social Justice in Teacher Education (2004), the author suggests that "if all free and equal citizens of a society are to have benefit of a democratic education, all teachers must have the knowledge, skills, and dispositions to teach toward the democratic ideal" (p. 22). Thus, it cannot be assumed that all teachers have the necessary personal resources and training to effectively address issues related to social justice nor can it be assumed that all children come to school with the skills necessary to relate effectively and safely with their peers.

As a result, schools are then put in the precarious position of how to train teachers and staff in a manner that creates a school climate and culture that provides an environment in which children feel safe, and are able to learn the skills necessary to interact appropriately with others, all the while addressing academic needs.

When looking at the prevalence of bullying and considering its impact on bullies, victims, and bystanders, the prevention of bullying becomes essential from the standpoint of all the involved parties. Bullying is an epidemic that not only affects the victims, but the bullies and the bystanders who are victims in their own way as well. The detrimental psychological affects of being a bully and/or victim have been well documented (Fried & Fried, 1996; Hazler, 1996; Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001). The effects of bullying impacts students in emotional, social, and academic ways and without proper intervention are long lasting, affecting students throughout their school years and even lifelong.

Current research efforts are beginning to identify components of intervention and prevention programs that effectively diminish the extent and impact of bullying and victimization. One piece of effective programs is the importance of providing teachers and students with the means and tools with which to combat bullying incidents and prevent the occurrence of future ones. "The way in which adults react to bullying contributes to the ethos of the school and can help to make it more or less likely that bullying will happen in the future. Ignoring the problem encourages it to flourish" (Anti-Bullying Network, n.d., p. 2).

Teachers often do not respond to bullying for a variety of reasons. Sometimes teachers may not see it occurring, may chose to not respond, may not feel confident in their ability to effectively intervene, are not aware of the comprehensive definition of what constitutes bullying, or fear making things worse for the victim (Boulton, 1997; Craig, Pepler, & Atlas, 2000; Hazler,

1996; Horne & Socherman, 1996; Stephenson & Smith, 1989). This lack of response inadvertently reinforces the bully's behavior (Craig et al., 2000b). Not only do many teachers sometimes not know what to do, but neither do the students who are the recipients of the bullying nor the bystanders, who observe the incidents happen time and time again (O'Connell, Pepler, & Craig, 1999).

The problem investigated in the present study was the effect and effectiveness of a specific bully program, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne, Bartolomucci, & Newman-Carlson, 2003), in increasing teacher and students' knowledge and ability to prevent and intervene in bullying interactions.

Purpose of the Study

This study was an extension of previous studies that examined the effectiveness of the middle school version of a bully intervention program, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Newman, Horne, & Bartolomucci, 2000). Newman (1999) examined the effectiveness of the middle school program in four areas: (1) increasing teachers' knowledge of bullying intervention skills, (2) increasing teachers' use of bullying intervention skills, (3) increasing teachers' self-efficacy related to bullying, and (4) decreasing the amount of bullying occurring at school. The research findings supported the effectiveness of the program, finding an increase in teachers' knowledge, use, and efficacy as well as a decrease in disciplinary referrals. The findings of this study were also supported by a replication study by Howard, Horne, & Jolliff (2001). The present study examined an elementary version of the program.

The purpose of this study was to examine the effectiveness of Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne et al.,

2003), a program intended to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills to work with their students to prevent and intervene in bullying related incidents. This two month long project was aimed at examining the effectiveness of the program, which was specifically developed to reduce and prevent bullying and victimization in the classroom setting through the implementation of a teacher-led Bully Busters psychoeducational program. Participating teachers took part in an initial training on the use of the manual, implemented the program in their classrooms, and then were involved in support groups every two to three weeks as a means of supporting and assisting them as they utilized the manual. All students in participating classrooms were involved in learning about bullying, victimization, and intervention. This study examined the classroom climate from the perspective of both the teachers and students, student self-reports of bullying and victimization, the frequency of bullying incidents, and the teachers' knowledge and use of bully intervention skills as well as their self-efficacy in dealing with bullying.

The overall research question was: Does the elementary version of the Bully Busters program have a positive impact on decreasing bullying? The following specific questions were examined in this study:

Research Question One: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' behavior profiles?

Research Question Two: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of bullying?

Research Question Three: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of victimization?

Research Question Four: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of fighting?

Research Question Five: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers and students affect the frequency of teacher reported classroom incidents of bullying?

Research Question Six: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers affect teachers' knowledge and use of bully intervention skills?

Research Question Seven: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers affect teachers' self-efficacy in working with and their attributions regarding bullies and victims?

Theoretical Background

This research project is based on the following points: (1) it is important to increase teachers' knowledge and use of effective intervention strategies for the prevention of bullying, (2) teachers are the most appropriate people in the school to teach prevention and intervention skills to their students, (3) it is important to target elementary school-aged students, and (4) follow-up support for the teachers is essential for effective implementation of the Bully Busters program. At the foundation of the abovementioned ideas are three critical pieces: not only should teachers be educated about bullying, but programs should include all students; the intervention utilized in this project is based on a deliberate psychoeducational model; and the implementation of the program using a psychoeducational model is most appropriate.

Not only is it essential that teachers respond to bullying, but it is important that teachers teach the skills necessary for students to respond and intervene in bullying situations, in order to better equip students in dealing effectively with bullying incidents and interpersonal relationships as a whole. A variety of factors are associated with bullying incidents, including personal, socio-cultural, policy, and physical-environmental factors (Sallis & Owen, 2002). It is thus believed that the most effective way to target bullying is to involve the entire school

community, which includes all students, teachers, and the administrative team in prevention and intervention efforts (Olweus, 1994; Rigby, 2001). Bullying is a social process, thus, targeting all students, not just the bully or the victim is essential for bullying prevention and intervention (Olweus, 1994; Olweus, Limber, & Mihalic, 1999; Orpinas & Horne, in press; Rigby, 2001; Salmivalli, 1999; Thompson, Arora, & Sharp, 2002). "It exists as part of the patterns of social life, and just as bullying emerges as part of this, the social life of the group can be effective in replacing bullying with other patterns of relationships" (Thompson et al., 2002, p. 137). Therefore, "interventions must aim to change attitudes, behaviors, and norms around bullying for all children in school" (Garrett, 2003, p. 134).

In 1971, Mosher & Sprinthall highlighted the need for schools to not only focus on academics, but that schools needed to make "personal development a central focus of education" (p. 3). One of the assumptions that formed their view was the belief that students are experiencing a strong, but existential psychological education already that affects how a student views his/herself in terms of competency, self-worth, and prospects of what it means to be a human being. Their long-term objective was that schools needed to provide "a developmental framework of growth stages, education programs which address the major aspects or personal, moral and ethical domains," including the theories of Piaget, Kohlberg, and Erikson (Mosher & Sprinthall, 1971, p. 10). Thus, Mosher & Sprinthall (1971) assert that this "means deliberately personalizing developmental experiences in education" (p. 77), so that school experiences are tailored to the developmental needs of students in a way that integrates their emotional or psychological development with the "academic" curriculum in order to address all aspects of a child's development. Therefore, teachers must be empowered and assisted in intentionally addressing these aspects of a child's development.

One such way to provide a deliberate psychological education for students is through the use and integration of a curriculum. Thompson et al., (2002) assert that "the curriculum is one of the most effective vehicles for teaching students how to prevent and manage aggression in violence in their relationships" (p. 128). Thompson et al., (2002) state that not only can the curriculum be used for increasing awareness about bullying but it can also be used to intervene in bullying incidences and teach students how to effectively manage relationships

Teachers are with students for a significant amount of time during the child's day, thus, teachers are in a key position to teach students the skills that will enable them to appropriately and effectively deal with bullying as well as prevent such incidents from occurring. Part of helping teachers increase their ability to educate their students and handle bullying incidents is to increase their own awareness of the definition and problem of bullying as well as increase their repertoire of strategies for intervention and prevention. It is important to educate teachers about the definition of bullying, as some teachers are uncertain or have a limited view of what constitutes bullying and do not view social exclusion or teasing as forms of bullying (Boulton, 1997).

In addition to uncertainty as to what constitutes bullying, Horne et al. (2003) identified several beliefs that teachers hold that contribute to maintaining bullying: (1) bullying is just a normal part of childhood, (2) children outgrow bullying, (3) some children are just born rough, (4) teachers cannot intervene in bullying situations because they lack adequate training and skills, (5) it is pointless for teachers to intervene because they can't change the way bullies are treated at home, where they learn to be aggressive, (6) frustrations at school cause bullies to behave aggressively, (7) intervening will only result in continued or increased bullying, (8) it is best to ignore bullying incidents, and (9) it is okay to intervene once in a while (p. 74-75). The

perplexity of what bullying is, combined with unhelpful beliefs about bullying, restricts teachers from responding to bullying, even when they want to.

Boulton (1997) conducted a study examining teachers' attitudes about bullying and found that teachers feel a strong responsibility to prevent bullying, but that they have a relatively low level of confidence in their ability to do so. In addition, often times teachers do not intervene in bullying due to lack of awareness that such student interactions are occurring, they may not see the incident as bullying, or may not know how to appropriately and effectively respond to the bully or the victim (Hazler, 1996; Stephenson & Smith, 1989). Craig et al. (2000b) observed bullying on the playground and in the classroom and found that teachers only intervened in 15% of the bullying incidents on the playground and in 18% of the incidents in the classroom. This lack of response inadvertently reinforces the bully's behavior (Craig et al., 2000b). Also teachers may not respond due to fear of making the situation worse for the victim (Horne & Socherman, 1996).

Society often thinks of bullying as middle school or adolescent issue and even though bullying incidents peak around the sixth grade, "bullying among primary age children has become recognized as an antecedent to more violent behavior in later years" (Garrett, 2003, p. 13). Thus, the elementary school years are a prime time in which to begin the prevention of bullying and the teaching of alternate patterns of relating to others because it is an appropriate time in a child's development of interpersonal and prosocial skills. According to the Surgeon General's (2000) report "the start of school is a milestone in children's continuing social and intellectual development" (Koplan, Autry III, & Hyman, 2001, Chap 4, p. 2). During the elementary school years, children begin to develop knowledge about what is right verses what is wrong, empathy for others, problem-solving skills, and social skills (Koplan et al., 2001; Berger,

1991). These skills are all skill areas that need to be taught and cultivated and that by "eliminating teasing and bullying in the early grades, schools can encourage positive relationships and mutual respect among students" (Froschl & Gropper, 1999, p. 72).

Another support for the implementation of anti-bullying projects for elementary aged students is that during childhood "children will be beginning to show signs of frequent and increasingly inappropriate use of aggression in social relationships, and it is possible that some children may be on the receiving and more than would be expected from a random distribution of aggressive actions around the class" (Thompson et al., 2002, p. 166-167). As students move from elementary school to middle school, Pellegrini & Long (2002), found that "boys, more than girls, view aggression and bullying more positively as they progress through the early phases of adolescence" (p, 273) and "self-reported bullying increased from 5th to 6th grade" (p. 274). Thus, "intervention programees (sic) based on increasing social skills to develop friendships and on managing group interactions without undue use of aggression, would be effective both to minimize exposure to bullying and to support the development of emotional and social competence in schools" (Thompson et al., 2002, p. 167). Roberts (2000) stresses that:

> "Bullies must learn two important facts about interactions with others. First, they must learn that aggression as a means of normal interaction with peers is not acceptable and that alternative means do exists for dealing with everyday frustrations. They must be given the opportunity to learn what theses alternative means are and, more importantly, be given the chance to actively practice and experience success in these alternative-to-violence activities and programs." (p. 153)

Students also may not know exactly what is considered bullying (O'Connell et al., 1999). Often students do not respond in helpful ways to the bullying that they witness or are a part of

because may not know exactly what is considered bullying, may not have the necessary strategies to respond or if they do they may lack confidence in their own ability to use nonviolent strategies, such as talking out a disagreement (Bosworth & Espelage, 1999; Craig et al., 2000b; O'Connell et al., 1999). Students' lack of use of nonviolent strategies has been found to be associated with higher levels of bullying (Bosworth & Espelage, 1999). If students are present during a bullying interaction and do not intervene, their lack of intervention can reinforce the bully's behaviors (Craig et al., 2000b). Further, it has been found that peers only intervene 19% of the time when they see bullying occur (Hawkins, Pepler, & Craig, 2001). Thus, the role of teachers in helping students learn nonviolent ways of dealing with conflict is essential and reduces the likelihood of bullying (Espelage, Bosworth, & Simon, 2002). The role of the teacher is to not only provide punishment and consequences but also teach students more effective alternatives to bullying (Horne, Glaser, & Sayger, 1994).

The importance of actively addressing bullying behaviors cannot be underestimated because if they are not addressed; aggression tends to escalate with age (Horne & Socherman, 1996). In addition, students in the younger grades tend to report more bullying than students in higher grades (Olweus, 1994). Hence, the elementary school years are a perfect time to begin teaching students about nonviolent ways of interacting and developing anti-bullying behaviors, as these years are a time when habits are being taught and formed, whether they are violent ways of interacting or peaceful ones (Hazler, 1998).

In addition to the project's focus on teachers and all students and the desire to provide deliberate psychological education, the intervention with classroom teachers is based intentionally on the principals underlying a psychoeducational group model, particularly the elements of: member homogeneity (i.e., students within the classroom), focused goals (i.e.,

decreasing bullying, developing prosocial skills), led activities (i.e., teacher facilitated set of activities), and a focus oriented to the here-and-now (Conyne, Wilson, & Ward, 1997). The purpose of a psychoeducational intervention is to educate the involved individuals in a deficit area in an effort to prevent future difficulties as well as "promote personal and interpersonal growth and development" (ASGW, 2000, p. 11). A psychoeducational model focuses on the principles of human development and functioning (ASGW, 2000) and meets both the psychological and educational needs of those involved (Portman & Portman, 2002). Psychoeducational groups "emphasize cognitive, affective, and behavioral skills development through the incorporation of a structured and sequenced set procedures or exercises within and across group sessions" (Conyne et al., 1997, p. 149).

Thus, for the purpose of the present study not only was the development and functioning of the teachers considered but also that of the students with whom they will be working. Therefore, the training activities and strategies for both the teachers and the students were educationally and developmentally based with a focus on improving coping skills. Psychoeducational interventions are offered to "people who may be at risk for the development of personal or interpersonal problems or who seek enhancement of personal qualities and abilities" (ASGW, 2000, p. 11).

Definition and Operational Terms

Below is a list of the operational definitions of the terms used in this study:

Psychoeducational Intervention. The treatment program used in this study is Bully Busting for Elementary Schools. The intervention was structured around promoting skill development that addressed student and teachers. Teachers attended two training sessions and 3 teacher support

groups to facilitate the implementation of this treatment program. In addition, teachers delivered the bully busting material and lessons to their students.

Teacher Support Group. This team was comprised of a group of teachers who meet together with the researchers to support one another in the implementation of the program.

Bullying Behaviors. Bullying behaviors are those behaviors that a student or group of students engage in that inflicts harm on another student(s). Such behaviors can be physical, relational, and emotional and include, hitting, kicking, pushing, shoving, spreading rumors, social exclusion, name calling, etc.

Victimization. Victimization refers to the students who are physically, emotionally, and/or socially harmed by bullying behaviors. Such behaviors can be physical, relational, and emotional and include, hitting, kicking, pushing, shoving, spreading rumors, social exclusion, name calling, etc.

Teacher Knowledge. Teacher knowledge refers to teachers' knowledge of bullying intervention skills. Such skills include identifying bullies and victims, the prevention of bullying, helping the victims, and increasing students' awareness of bullying and victimization. Teacher knowledge was defined using their scores on the Teacher Information, Skills and Knowledge – Elementary (TISK-E).

Teacher Use. Teacher use refers to teachers' utilization of bullying intervention skills. Such skills include identifying bullies and victims, the prevention of bullying, helping the victims, and increasing students' awareness of bullying and victimization. Teacher use was defined using their scores on the Teacher Information, Skills and Knowledge – Elementary (TISK-E).

Teacher Self-Efficacy. Teacher efficacy refers to teachers' beliefs about their own ability to deal with students who engage in bullying behaviors or who are victimized. Teacher efficacy will be measured using the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM).

CHAPTER 2

Review of Related Literature

In order to understand the phenomenon of bullying, and thus victimization, we must have a definition from which to work. Several definitions of bullying exist. According to Olweus (1994), bullying or victimization is defined, as "a student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students" (p. 1173). In using Olweus' definition, bullying can be characterized using three criteria: the aggressive behavior is intentional, repeated and over time, and the relationship is characterized by an imbalance in power (Newman et al., 2000). In addition, other research efforts have looked not at categorizing bullies and victims, but examined bullying behavior along a continuum using the definition that bullying is a set of behaviors that are "intentional and causes physical and psychological harm to the recipient" (Bosworth & Espelage, 1999; Espelage et al., 2002; Smith & Thompson, 1991, p. 1). For the purposes of this study bullying was defined using the "Double I/R" criteria that bullying occurs when the behavior is **I**ntentional, **I**mbalanced, and **R**epeated (Horne et al., 2003). Intentional refers to the intent of the bully to harm the victim physically, emotionally, or socially, which separates it from similar actions such as a child who gets overly excited about something and accidentally knocks another student down while expressing his/her excitement. Imbalanced represents the imbalance of power that exists between the bully and the victim, with the power being perceived as being on the side of the bully. Repeated has do to with the bullying behavior toward the victim being executed repeatedly and over time.

As previously mentioned, the phenomenon of bullying is of foremost concern for schools and students. According to the School Survey on Crime and Safety (U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics, 2004), 29% of the schools surveyed selected student bullying as of serious concern that interferes with teachers teaching and students learning over other discipline issues which included student acts of disrespect for teachers (19%), undesirable gang activities (19%), student verbal abuse of teachers(13%), undesirable cult or extremist group activities (7%), student racial tension (3%), and widespread disorder in classrooms (3%). A study by Boulton & Underwood (1992) examined bullying in 2nd and 3rd graders in the U.K. and found that 45.9% of the students in their study reported being bullied several times a week, 16.2% were bullied once or twice, 10.1% were bullied sometimes, and 27.7% said that they were never bullied. It was also found that reports of bullying were fairly stable from one year to the next.

A recent study by Nansel et al (2001) examined the prevalence of bullying in grades 6-10 in the United States and looked at the relationship between bullying, being bullied, and psychosocial adjustment from the standpoint of those who bully, those who are the ones bullied, and those who are both. Nansel et al. (2001) found that "a total of 29.9% of the sample reported moderate or frequent involvement in bullying, as a bully (13.0%), one who was bullied (10.6%), or both (6.3%)" (p. 2094). Their findings also indicated that "both bullying and being bullied were associated with poorer psychosocial adjustment; however, there were notable differences among those bullied, bullies, and those reporting both behaviors" (p. 2098).

The phenomenon of bullying is a problem that affects all students. Although bullies are the ones instigating the interaction, all students play a role, whether that of victim or bystander. Students who are bystanders are in a unique position. Students can indirectly reinforce the bully

by passively watching and not intervening. O'Connell & colleagues (1999) found that unintentional reinforcement of the bully by bystanders occurs in 54% of the time when students witness a bullying interaction occur. This attention is positively reinforcing to the bully, thus, underscoring the importance of helping all students to see their role and responsibility in decreasing bullying. Atlas & Pepler (1998) found that peers were involved in 85% of the bullying incidents observed in the classroom in some capacity, whether as onlookers or actively participating. While, Henderson & Hymel (2002), they found that 93% of the elementary students they surveyed has witnessed bullying occur in their school during the past week. Of the 93%, over half indicated that they did something to discourage the bullying behavior, one-third reported that they responded in a passive manner, and 5-9% reported that they actively encouraged the bully (Henderson & Hymel, 2002). Students who witness bullying may not respond to bullying due to a lack of awareness of their responsibility to do so, a lack of empathy for the victim, or a lack of effective intervention strategies (O'Connell et al., 1999). Thus, bystanders often inadvertently encourage or perpetuate bullying (Craig et al., 2000b; Henderson & Hymel, 2002).

Bullying can also be examined in terms of direct and indirect bullying (Craig et al., 2000b). Direct bullying involves those actions that are more explicit, like hitting, kicking, and teasing, whereas indirect bullying is more implicit, like gossiping and social exclusion. "Teachers often do not view social exclusion as a form of bullying; a form which is less likely to be observed (Craig, Henderson, & Murphy, 2000). Direct bullying occurs more on the playground than in the classroom, whereas indirect bullying occurs more in the classroom than on the playground due to the different contextual demands as well as students own social learning process as to what they can engage in and where. The direct and indirect forms of

bullying highlights the importance of increasing students own sensitivity to the feelings of others, reducing peer reinforcement for inappropriate peer interactions, and teaching students about bullying while providing them with the skills to intervene.

In examining the characteristics of bullies and their role within the social order of schools, it is critical to consider the influence that they have within the school and classroom environment. Bullies have a direct effect on their peers (O'Connell et al., 1999). O'Connell & colleagues (1999) found that when observing a bullying episode peers spend one-fifth of their time (21%) actively joining in with the bullies to inflict harm on the victim, thus becoming accomplices to the bullying incident, inadvertently aligning themselves with the bully. This again highlights the importance of not just targeting the bully with intervention and prevention efforts but including all students, because almost all bullying occurs within a social context as reflected in findings that revealed that 88% of the time peers are present during a bullying episode (Hawkins et al., 2001). Salmivalli (1999) states that "if we are to help an individual change his/her behaviour (sic) in the group, we should be able not only to motivate the individual and provide him/her with the necessary skills, but also make other group members allow- preferably even encourage- that change" (p. 455). Below is a discussion of the effect of bullying on the bullies themselves as well as the victims and bystanders who are an integral part of bullying interactions and their teachers. In addition, the descriptions below will highlight the manner in which the members of the school environment perpetuate bullying.

Bullies

The affect bullying has on the bullies themselves is an extremely important piece to recognize when looking at the effects of bully interactions on the individuals who are involved. Research has indicated that bullies lack empathy and remorse and are less likely to recognize

pro-social responses to threatening situations (Hazler, 1996). Although they may have problems with relationship skills, they do not tend to be socially isolated, and usually have friends who endorse their bullying and negative behaviors (Nansel et al., 2001). Bullies tend to see anger as justified (Fried & Fried, 1996) or have a more positive attitude regarding violence (Shellard, 2002). Pelligrini, Bartini, & Brooks (1999), found that bullies admitted to having less negative views of bullying than their non-bullying classmates. According to Crick & Dodge's, "A Review and Reformulation of Social Information-Processing Mechanisms in Children's Social Adjustment" (1994), it is hypothesized that children who bully and/or who are aggressive evaluate socially maladaptive behaviors in a favorable manner. This alternate attitude regarding violence is reinforced because successful bullying behavior, meaning bullying others without intervention, teaches bullies that bullying pays; thus, through intimidation, violence or blackmail they get what they want and get away with it (Kilpatrick, 1997).

Not only may bullies find that bullying pays off, but other perspectives indicate that children bully because they lack the necessary skills for a reciprocal exchange of ideas, therefore having limited collaboration skills and an inability to effectively resolve differences with others (Fried & Fried, 1996). In order to change the behaviors of the bully, the behavior must be replaced by another behavior; otherwise the bullying, aggressive behavior will continue (Thompson et al., 2002).

Bullies are more likely to drop out of school and work at a job below their skill level, to be abusive to spouses, and to use harsh punishment with their children (Fried & Fried, 1996). Finally, in looking at the impact of bullying behaviors on the bullies themselves it is important to recognize that "children who are bullies by age 8 are three times more likely to be convicted of a crime by age 30" (Garrett, 2003, p. 13). They are also more likely to be involved in problem

behaviors such as drinking and smoking as well as have a more negative perception of school climate (Nansel et al., 2001).

Victims

How victims are chosen has been of some debate; it has been previously believed that victims are chosen by bullies due to physical traits, like wearing glasses or being overweight, however Garrett asserts that victims are more often singled out due to psychological traits, like being sensitive or creative (Garrett, 2003). Regardless of how victims are chosen, the effects of bullying on victims cannot be ignored. When looking at the impact of bullying on the victims, it is important to recognize that one hundred and sixty thousand students miss school each day out of fear (Botsche & Moore, 2000).

Victims of bullying have difficulty adjusting to middle school, are more likely than their non-victimized peers to have academic difficulties, and are more likely than their non-victimized peers to drop out of school (Fried & Fried, 1996). Female victims of bullying are more prone to depression than their non-victimized peers (Fried & Fried, 1996). Victims have feelings of frustration from being hurt, humiliated, and controlled by another, which often produces deep feelings of anger and a desire for revenge (Hazler, 1996). Victims have significantly lower self-esteem than their counterparts who are not bullies (Garrett, 2003; O'Moore, 1997). In addition, victims often experience feelings of isolation, inadequacy, failure, and vulnerability (Hazler, 1996). The negative labels associated with victims remind victims of their feelings of weakness and their lack of power, they may engage in self-destructive behaviors, have a sense of learned helplessness, lack communication skills, and have ineffective social skills (Hazler, 1996). Victims also have poorer relationships with their non-bullied peers, Nansel et al. (2001) report

that the "ability to make friends was negatively related to being bullied" (p. 2097), thus victims are likely to have difficulty fitting into the peer culture and structure of their classroom or school.

In study on victims responses to bullying, Salmivalli, Karhuen, & Lagerspetz (1996), found that not only do victims respond submissively, as is often suspected, but that the victims may also respond in a nonchalant manner or a helpless manner and even a counteraggressive manner.

Bystanders

As aforementioned, the effect of bullying is far reaching not only affecting the students who bully others and their victims, but the students who witness bullying incidents occur. Thus, the role of they bystanders cannot be ignored. Salmivalli (1999) notes that regardless of how bystanders respond to the bullying that they witness, they have an effect on the outcome of the bully-victim interaction. The dynamics of the bystander witnessing a bullying interaction and not intervening in some way can inadvertently (Craig et al., 2000b) or intentionally reinforce the bullying behaviors exhibited by the bully (Garrett, 2003). Bystanders may not respond for a variety of reasons as previously mentioned (O'Connell et al., 1999), but bullies may also not respond because they may see bullying of their peers with lower status in the classroom or school as justified (Garrett, 2003).

The Maine Project Against Bullying (2000) suggests that exposure to "violence and maltreatment (including verbal abuse) of others is significantly associated with increased depression, anxiety, anger, post-traumatic stress, alcohol use, and low grades" (p. 20). Students who witness others being bullied also suffer; they might felt anger, rage, or a sense of helplessness at the bullying they see occurring (Elliott, 1997).

Teachers

As discussed earlier a variety of reasons exists that inhibit teachers from intervening in bullying incidents, including not having a complete definition of bullying, fear of making a situation worse, low confidence in their ability to intervene effectively, and a lack of awareness (Boutlon, 1997; Hazler, 1996; Stephenson & Smith, 1989; Horne & Socherman, 1996). Other important dynamics that affect the rate at which teachers intervene in bullying, include findings that teachers frequently underestimate the amount of bullying occurring within their classroom or school (Craig et al., 2000; O'Moore, 1997) as well as the impact of their own beliefs about bullying" (Craig et al., 2000a).

In consequence, teachers may not intervene due to lack of awareness or well-intended yet faulty and harmful beliefs. For example, teachers may expect that students can or should be able to work out social problems, like bullying on their own (Horne et al., 2003: Shellard, 2002). Other beliefs or myths include that bullying is not a problem at their school, that if they ignore bullying it will stop, that only boys are bullies, that bullying occurs more frequently off school grounds than on, that victims just need to stand up for themselves and the bullying will stop, or that the victim deserved it (Garrett, 2003).

Interventions

Research thus far has targeted gathering information about the frequency, effects, and characteristics of bullying as it applies to bullies, victims, bystanders, and teachers but research efforts across the world have paid minimal attention to program evaluation. Programs must be evaluated so that their level of effectiveness can be determined and components of what makes a program successful are identified. Thus, as a result the best practices in bully reduction and prevention can be recognized and utilized. It cannot be assumed that programs are effective and

carry out the goals that they set out to accomplish, thus researchers have been encouraged to focus more attention to evaluating the effectiveness of bullying intervention and reduction programs. Anti-bullying and anti-violence programs have been implemented across the world, but very few have been evaluated for effectiveness.

The first known bully prevention and intervention program evaluated for effectiveness, was that of Scandinavian researcher, Dan Olweus. As pioneer in the arena of bullying prevention and intervention programs, Olweus developed a Bully Prevention Program. Olweus' Bully Prevention Program, which was initially implemented and examined for effectiveness in Norway, has been replicated in the United States, England, and Germany. The initial evaluation of Olweus' school-based Bully Prevention Program began in 1983 and ran through 1985 in grades 4-7 with 2500 students participating (Olweus, 1994; Olweus et al., 1999). One of the foundational principles of this program is that "given the considerable stability of aggressive behavior over time and the generally low or modest success in reducing such behavior with a number of individual-oriented approaches, an important premise of the Bullying Prevention Program is that bullying behavior can be checked and redirected into a more prosocial direction through a systematic restructuring the social environment" (Olweus et al., 1999, p. 16). Thus, the focus of this program is on changing the school environment with the adults in the school as the crusaders. Interventions were targeted at the school level, classroom level, and individual level with an effort to impact teachers, other school personnel, students, and parents. The central goals of the program were: "to reduce, if not eliminate, existing bully/victim problems among elementary, middle and junior high school children in and outside of the school setting; to prevent the development of new bully/victim problems; and to achieve better peer relations at

school and create conditions that allow in particular, victims and bullies to get along and function better in and outside of the school setting" (Olweus et al., 1999, p 23).

The program was evaluated using the Olweus Bully/Victim Questionnaire, a self-report measure pertaining to student engagement in antisocial behaviors, a classroom climate measure, and student and teacher ratings regarding the level of classroom bully/victim problems. The fundamental findings were positive: students' report of bullying and victimization decreased by at least 50 percent; a reduction in general antisocial behavior; improvements in school climate; and a reduction in victimization as well as in the number of new victims indicating primary and secondary prevention effects (Olweus et al., 1999). Olweus' Bully Prevention Program has since been replicated and evaluated in the United States, England, and Germany as well as in elementary, middle, and high schools. Replication studies have also produced positive results, although not as significant as the original study (Olweus et al., 1999). Even though Olweus' program has produced significant and positive results, little is known about the level of effectiveness for each level of intervention; of particular importance to the current project is that of the impact of trainings on teacher efficacy, knowledge, and skills as they relate to bully/victim prevention and intervention.

In an article by Twemlow, Fongay, Sacco, Gies, Evans, & Burbank (2001), entitled "Creating a peaceful school learning environment: A controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence," Twemlow et al. (2001) evaluated the impact of a violence reduction project on the schools' learning climate. This four components program included: "1) zero tolerance for behavioral disturbances such as bullying, victimization, and standing by during violent acts, 2) a discipline plan for modeling appropriate behavior, 3) a physical education plan deigned to teach self-regulation skills, and 4) a mentoring program for adults and children to

assist children in avoiding one for the three preceding roles" (e.g., victims, victimizers, and bystanders) (p. 808). The program took place in two inner-city elementary schools, matched for demographic variables, with a high frequency of discipline problems. One school received all four components of the intervention program and the second school served as a control and only received psychiatric consultation. The project began in October of 1994 with a teacher in-service training and was implemented through the 1996-1997 school year.

Based on the disciplinary and academic achievement data collected by Twemlow et al. (2001), the "experimental school showed significant reductions in disciplinary referrals and increased in scores on standardized academic achievement measures" (p. 808). Disciplinary referrals for physical aggression decreased from 74 referrals in 1994-1995 to 34 in 1995-1996 to 36 in 1996-1997 while reports of other types of disciplinary infractions decreased from 162 infractions in 1994-1995 to 97 in 1995-1995 to 93 in 1996-1997. Out-of-school Suspension rates at the experimental school also declined. As for the effects on academic achievement, both comparisons for year-by-school and year-by-individual, showed significant improvement, with school performance increasing from 40th percentile in 1995 to 58th percentile in 1998 and individual performances increasing on their composite and reading scores, but not on their mathematic scores. Academic performance was based on the Metropolitan Achievement Test. At the control school, there remained little change in both areas. Although the significant improvements shown are impressive, the study did not evaluation various the various program components, thus it cannot be determined which components were beneficial.

Even though much research has been conducted regarding the dynamics of bullying and victimization, much of the research has focused on violence reduction as a whole of which bullying is a very substantial component, there still remain many unanswered questions about the

most effective approaches to bully prevention and intervention. In Espelage & Swearer's (2003) review of the research on bullying and victimization, they maintain that more comprehensive research is necessary to fully evaluate bullying prevention and intervention programs.

Components of Successful Bully Reduction Programs

In Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General (Koplan et al., 2001), violence prevention strategies were evaluated and identified for effectiveness. According to the findings, effective primary prevention strategies are ones that target a universal population and include skills training, behavior monitoring and reinforcement, behavior techniques for classroom management, building school capacity, continuous progress programs, cooperative learning, and positive youth development programs.

According to Orpinas & Horne (in press) the following strategies have been identified as the most effective ones for reducing bullying:

1. A strong commitment from the administration and teachers to prevent bullying and take seriously bullying interactions that do occur (Kelder et al., 1996, Hoover & Hazler, 1991).
2. Increasing awareness about the extensiveness of bullying. Teachers and students need to be aware of the pervasiveness of bullying in their own schools (Peterson & Skiba, 2001).
3. Developing clear policies. Schools must develop clear anti-bullying policies that include physical, verbal, relational, and sexual aggression. Such policies need to include a protocol for dealing with bullying that addresses how such situations will be handled and the resulting consequences.
4. The provision of a reporting system. Students must have a means by which to anonymously report the bullying that they see occurring or are the targets of, such as a

reporting box. Thus, schools must provide students with a system through which they can make reports that will be followed up on by school personnel.

5. Bullying Prevention Team. Such a team is comprised of school personnel who respond to bullying incidents (Kelder, Orpinas, McAlister, Frankowski, Parcel, & Friday, 1996) and develop guidelines for intervention.
6. Support for the victims from the teachers and the school. Victims need to feel as though they will be listened to and that their reports will be taken seriously.
7. Positive school climate. The importance of teachers modeling respect is essential to creating a positive school climate and developing positive relationships with students (Bear, 1998).
8. Supervision. According to Olweus (1993) adult supervision is key to stopping bullying. Bullying often occurs out of the sight of adults; like on the playground, in the bathrooms, on the bus, and in the hallway, thus the more teachers can increase their supervision of students the less likely there will be opportunities for bullying behaviors. Teacher involvement and awareness is essential to stopping bullying (Peterson & Skiba, 2001).
9. Educate students. Students need to aware of the school's position on bullying and the consequences for such actions. Students also need to understand their role in bullying interactions and what they can do to intervene and prevent future situations.
10. Educate parents. Parents must be informed about school anti-bullying policies, informed as to what they can do to prevent bullying and steps to take if their child reports being bullied.

In addressing the abovementioned strategies by Orpinas & Horne for the effective reduction of bullying, the current project under investigation focused primarily on three of the

ten steps: a strong commitment from the administration and teachers to prevent bullying and take seriously bullying interactions that do occur, increasing awareness about the extensiveness of bullying, and educating students. These strategies are also supported by Rigby (2001), who identified four areas in which teacher's can funnel their energies to decrease bullying in their school: help to create a social ethos in which bullying is less like to happen, actively discourage bullying, provide support and advice to victims of bullying, and educate students about bullying. It is believed by the researchers as well as other researchers in the field, prevention and intervention efforts must be universal so that all members of the school environment are targeted (Koplan et al., 2001; Olweus, 1994; Olweus et al., 1999; Orpinas & Horne, in press; Rigby, 2001; Salmivalli, 1999; Thompson et al., 2002).

CHAPTER 3

Method

The present study examined the effectiveness of an elementary school bully intervention and prevention program, Bully Busters. The project intended to have a positive impact on decreasing the number of bullying incidents occurring in classrooms, increasing teachers' knowledge and use of bullying intervention and prevention, increasing teachers' efficacy in working with bullies and victims, and decreasing students' self-reports of bullying behaviors and victimization.

This chapter provides a description of the sample used in this study, the treatment program implemented, the instruments administered, the research design, the statistical analyses, and the research questions and hypotheses.

Sample

Data was collected in third through fifth grades at two elementary schools in an urban town in the southeastern region of the United States with a diverse population.

Teachers

Teacher consent forms were given to all teachers in third through fifth grade (n~ 15). Teachers were informed about the program during a meeting with the researchers and were invited to participate in the Bully Busting staff development training, program implementation, and the follow-up teacher support groups. Participation was voluntary.

At School A eight of the nine teachers invited to be involved in the Bully Busters project consented to participate, one fourth grade teacher declined. At School B seven of the twelve

teachers invited to take part in the Bully Busters project consented to participate, one third grade teacher and the fourth grade team of teachers chose not to participate. Of the 15 teachers participating in this project, 10 teachers were Caucasian and 5 were African-American. It is also important to note that one of the consenting fifth grade teachers at School A (Teacher 1) began maternity leave mid-way through the project, thus the professional school counselor implemented the remaining modules and the substitute teacher completed the post-BASC-TRS-C screeners.

Students

Parent consent forms were sent home to all students in third through fifth grade, through the use other their weekly folder system. Teachers informed their students about the program during class time prior to the consent forms going home. Student participation in the research study was voluntary; however, all students in the participating classrooms were taught the eight modules of the Bully Busting program.

Two hundred and twenty students consented to participate in the Bully Busters research project; 77 (35%), 30 (13.6%), and 113 (51.4%) of the children were from grades three through five, respectively. Ages ranged from 7.5 to 12.7 years with a mean age of 10.5 (median=10.7) and a standard deviation of 1.13 years. Of the 220 students participating in the research project: 110 (50%) were male, 110 (50%) were female, 135 (61.4%) were African American/Black, 46 (20.9%) were Caucasian, 32 (14.5%) were Hispanic, 3 (1.4%) were Pacific Islander/Asian, and 4 91.8%) were Multi-Racial. 138 (62.7%) of the students were from School A and 82 (37.3%) were from School B. Demographic information for the participating students is presented in Table 1.

Table 1

Baseline Demographics for the Students

Demographic Variable	Category	Frequency	Percent
Gender	Male	110	50.0
	Female	110	50.0
Race	African-American/Black	135	61.4
	Caucasian	46	20.9
	Hispanic	32	14.5
	Pacific Islander/Asian	3	1.4
	Multi-Racial	4	1.8
Grade	Third	77	35.0
	Fourth	30	13.6
	Fifth	113	51.4
School	A	138	62.7
	B	82	37.3

Treatment Program

Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne et al., 2003) was the treatment program examined in the present study. This manual was developed following the development and examined effectiveness of the middle school version, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders. The manual has been developed to incorporate current practices of aggression reduction in schools and extends the research to an elementary population.

The current program being investigated, Bully Busters, was aimed at providing teachers with the knowledge and skills necessary to educate students to be more effective in and prepared for dealing with the bullying that they witness or are a part of, as well as providing teachers with an increased knowledge base of the skills necessary for the prevention and intervention of bullying in their classrooms. The use of teacher training and support groups as described below was based on the belief that if the program was to be implemented appropriately, teachers needed both appropriate training and continued support in their efforts (Dwyer & Osher, 2000). Salmivalli (1999) suggests that in order to change the roles of bullies, victims, and bystanders, intervention and prevention programs should include "(1) general awareness-raising, (2) chance for self-reflection, and (3) possibilities to rehearse behaviors different from previous ones" (p. 455). The researchers believe that this also extends to the teachers.

Teachers participated in a four-hour training that addressed the foundation and components of the Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) manual. During training, the researchers provided an overview of each of the eight modules, which included a review of pertinent information (i.e., statistics, definitions) and a discussion of the foundational elements of each module (i.e., contributing

factors, characteristics and of bullies and victims). During the training teachers were asked to participate and share their own reflections, beliefs, and experiences with regards to the related topic. In addition, the implementation of one of the core activities was facilitated for role modeling purposes.

In addition to the eight modules, two additional chapters are included in the manual to (1) assist teachers in setting themselves and their students up for success in the utilization of this bully prevention and intervention program and (2) a chapter on developmental assets and emotional intelligence as they relate to reducing and preventing bullying and victimization. These chapters were addressed at the beginning of the training.

Below is a list of the modules and activities available in each module:

Module 1: Increasing Awareness of Bullying. The goals of this module attend to: the various definitions of bullying and the development of a personal definition; understanding and applying the PIC criteria (Purposeful, Imbalance of Power, Continual) for bullying; learning that behavior exists on a continuum; identifying common bullying locations; and considering aspects of the teacher's role in the prevention and remediation of bullying. There are four activities that teachers can use to increase their students awareness of bullying:

1.1: What a Feeling (Grades K-5)

1.2: Story Time (Grades K-5)

1.3: That's Garbage (Grades K-5)

1.4: Wanted: Reward Given! (Grades 3-5)

Module 2: Preventing Bullying in Your Classroom. This module covers: understanding the importance of prevention in eliminating bulling; becoming aware of school and teacher characteristics that affect bullying and learning ways to establish a positive relationship with

children who bully; understanding the importance of preventing bullying through establishing and enforcing clear rules; and becoming aware of what kind of responses to conflict can increase and decrease bullying behavior. This module includes five activities:

2.1 Room Rules (Grades K-5)

2.2 No Bullying Here (Grades K-5)

2.3 The Drop Box (Grades 3-5)

2.4 One for All (Grades 3-5)

2.5 Identifying Others' Feelings (Grades 3-5)

Module 3: Building Personal Power. This module focuses on: understanding the importance of personal power for students; learning how personal power relates to anger in bullies, victims, and bystanders; considering the importance of effective conflict resolution and problem solving; and understanding how using school families and appropriate laughter can enhance personal power. Four activities are included in this module for the promotion of personal power:

3.1: Name That Feeling (Grades K-2)

3.2 What Would You Do? (Grades K-2)

3.3 Can You Hear Me Now? (Grades K-5)

3.4: My Gift To You (Grades 3-5)

Module 4: Recognizing the Bullying. The goals of this module include: understanding differences between the bully and the well-adapted child; learning how bullying behaviors develop and influences; understanding the relationship of learning and behavioral consequence to bullying; identifying three types of bullies (aggressive, passive, and relational); and becoming

aware of typical differences between male and female bullying. There are four activities from which teachers could select:

4.1 The Bully Bust (Grades K-5)

4.2 Bully? Who, Me? (Grades K-5)

4.3 Bullies at Work (Grades 3-5)

4.4 Caught on Camera (Grades 3-5)

Module 5: Recognizing the Victim. This module focuses on defining victimization and challenging common myths about victims; recognizing victim characteristics and the signs of victimization; understanding the impact of victimization and where it takes place; identifying the four types of victims (passive, provocative, relational, and bystander); and increasing awareness of the victim role and the bully-victim cycle. This module is comprised of four activities:

5.1 Bye, Bye, Bully (Grades K-2)

5.2 Bully, Be Gone! (Grades K-5)

5.3 Who Is the Victim? (Grades 3-5)

5.4 Does It Count? (Grades 3-5)

Module 6: Recommendations and Interventions for Bully Behavior. This module covers: learning how to use an invitational approach to develop a working relationship with bullies; learning the "Four Rs" of bully control (Recognize the problem, Remove yourself if you need time to calm down before you intervene, Review the situation, and Respond); understanding basic principles of behavior change with regards to bullying; considering the various roles students may assume in the bully-victim interaction; learning specific developmental assets that can be addressed in bullies to help them change their behaviors: and learning the importance of

changing bullies' reputations and behaviors. Five activities are provided in this module for teacher use:

6.1 Anger Busters (Grades K-2)

6.2 Caught the Feeling (Grades K-2)

6.3 The Turtle Club (Grades K-5)

6.4 Knowing My Anger (Grades 3-5)

6.5 Act One (Grades 3-5)

Module 7: Recommendations and Interventions for Helping Victims. The goals of this module included recognizing the importance of teachers' ability to offer victims support; learning direct strategies to support victimized children; empowering children to avoid the victim role though encouragement and social skills training; learning about interventions for different types of victims; and understanding various victim responses to bullying and their relative effectiveness. Six activities are provided for use in this module:

7.1 The Magic Box (Grades K-2)

7.2 People Puppets (Grades K-2)

7.3 My Boiling Point (Grades K-5)

7.4 Hand Talk (Grades 3-5)

7.5 The Puppets Go to Broadway (Grades 3-5)

7.6 My Toolbox (Grades 3-5)

Module 8: Relaxation and Coping Skills. This module focused on helping teachers becoming aware of stress and its effects; understanding the role of thoughts, beliefs, and behavior in maintaining or eliminating stress; increasing awareness of stress management skills:

and helping students apply relaxation techniques to reduce stress. Teachers had four activities to select from:

8.1 Keeping Calm (Grades K-2)

8.2 My Magic Place (Grades K-5)

8.3 Balloon in My Belly (Grades 3-5)

8.4 Body Game (Grades 3-5)

Each module contained educational information for the teachers based on the modules' topic, which included a rationale, relevant research, and prevention and intervention strategies as well as activities that the teacher may implement in the classroom. The activities were designed to help increase students' awareness of bullying and skills in handling bullying situations. Teachers were asked to implement and teach the eight modules of the manual in their classroom, using preferably two activities per module. Each teacher received a copy of the manual.

As a follow-up to the initial training on the program, teachers participated in three support groups, which occurred every 2-3 weeks after the initial training workshops, depending on the school calendar. The support groups were facilitated by the researchers. The follow-up teacher support groups were of particular importance due to fear that only providing an initial workshop would not allow for sufficient training and implementation of the project (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Thies-Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987). Bernard & Goodyear (1998) state that "unless practice is accompanied by the systemic feedback and reflection that supervision provides, supervisees can be assured of gaining no more than the *illusion* that they are developing professional expertise" (p. 2). In this case the support groups provided the element of supervision.

In a study on the use of support groups with teachers, Jackson (2002) found that of the teachers who participated "92% reported that they had developed a deeper understanding about the meaning of behavior; 88% felt that they had developed their skills in working with challenging and disruptive youth; 88% said they had found it had been helpful to share their work both with colleagues and with an outside professional; 72% reported that they felt less stressed after discussing concerns/pupils with whom they were struggling" (p. 142-143).

As a result, the support groups were intentionally designed to serve as a medium through which the teachers gained additional training as well as provided one another with the support and feedback necessary for effective implementation of the program. Perhaps the most important aspect of the support group experience is that it offers participants the opportunity to feel close to and to be understood by their peers (Kirk & Walter, 2001, p. 148). "The empathy and support generated by fellow teachers (in a support group) serves to provide a base from which to (1) feel less isolated, (2) received positive feedback and constructive criticism in a non threatening environment, (3) offer productive encouragement to fellow teachers, and (4) participate in a communal and creative problem-solving process" (Kirk & Walter, 2001, p. 148). Such follow-up support groups have been found to increase teachers' use of the skills and information learned in training (Shapiro, DuPaul, Bradley, & Bailey, 1996). It was, thus, expected that ongoing support meetings with the trainers and colleagues would help to create a sense of accountability and team collaboration.

Attending the support groups was part of the commitment the teachers made to participating in the project; however, due to scheduling conflicts within the school, attendance varied between 6 -8 at School A and 5-7 at School B. The format of the support groups remained relatively stable and included:

(1) Check-In. During this time teachers were asked to share challenging issues that they would like to have discussed during group as well as successes they wanted to share. Challenges shared included managing parents, intervening in bullying interactions, and dealing with different types of victims. Successes included things like how a teacher modified a lesson to meet the needs of their class, a teachable moment a teacher was able to capture and utilize the Bully Busting material, or how a teacher integrated the bully busting information into another subject area.

(2) Module/Activity Implementation. During this time a discussion of what activities the teachers has selected to implement (i.e., what activities, how was it implemented, how did it go) was processed.

(3) Group Process. This was a time for group discussion and brainstorming surrounding the issues that the teachers asked for help with. The topics that the teachers brought up for discussion varied, for example dealing with parents of both the bully and the victim and working within the limitations of the school. As issues were discussed the researchers worked to keep the group conversation solution-focused, using the BIG Questions: (1) What is my goal? (2) What am I doing? (3) Is what I am doing helping me achieve my goal? (4) (If not) What can I do differently?

(4) Didactic. Due to time constraints during the initial training additional didactic information was addressed. At School B Module 8 was not covered and at School A Modules 7 and 8 were not covered. Thus, during the first or second support group sessions, the additional module(s) were covered.

(5) Closure. At the end of support group, teachers were asked to respond to a prompt for continued attention to the project. For example, by the next time we meet, what module(s) will you have implemented?

Student research participants participated in the module activities as taught by their teacher(s). During lessons, students were asked to participate in activities and discussions that were aimed at increasing their awarness of bullying and victimization, helping them to recognize their role in prevention, and decreasing bullying behaviors in the classroom through skill building in areas such as empathy training, conflict resolution, and asking for help.

Instrumentation

In order to evaluate the effectiveness of the treatment intervention program, Bully Busters, three measures were given to the teachers and one measure was given to the students to address the research questions. Students completed a self-report of bullying and victimization experiences (Bosworth & Espleage, 1999). Teachers completed the Behavior Assessment System for Children - Teacher Rating Scale – Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) – Screener Short-Form (Kamphaus, Thorpe, Winsor, Kroncke, & Dowdy, 2002), the BASC-TRS Aggression Scale (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992), Teacher Information, Skills and Knowledge – Elementary (TISK-E) (Horne et al., 2003), a report of bullying incident frequency, and the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) (Horne, Socherman, & Dagley, 1998).

Self-Report of Bullying and Victimization Experiences

This scale is based on student self-reports regarding bullying behaviors, victimization, and fighting behaviors along a continum as opposed to identifying bullies and victims categorically. This measure was developed by Bosworth & Espleage (1999). Students

responded to specific behaviors and experiences therefore staying away from the students' subjective perception of what constitues bullying (Bosworth & Espelage, 1999).

This measure asks students to rate the frequeny in which they have engaged in or been the target a specific behavior. This survey is comprised of 18 items that identify specific behaviors and asks students to indicate the number of times they have engaged in the target behavior or had the target behavior happen to them in the last 30 days. Students selected from the folloing responses: Never, 1 or 2 Times, 3 or 4 Times, 5 or 6 Times, or 7 or More Times. Scores were calculated using mean scores to get total scores. The higher the student's score the more indicative their behavior was of bullying others, engaging in fighting or being victimized.

Behavior Assessment System for Children – Teacher Rating Scale (BASC-TRS) Screener Short-Form

The Behavior Assessment System for Children – Teacher Rating Scale – Child (BASC-TRS-C (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992) is composed of 148 items and asks teachers to rate each student on a 4-point response scale of frequency (Never, Sometimes, Often, or Almost Always). Three teacher forms are available depending on age: preschool (ages 4 to 5), child (ages 6 to 11), and adolescent (ages 12 to 18).

Recently a screener short-form measure of the BASC-TRS-C is in the process of being developed. Therefore, the screener used was a research edition and is it not suitable for clinical assessment purposes at this time, although it shows great promise. According to (Kamphaus et al., 2002), the BASC –TRS-C screener short-form has been developed, using the full-length BASC-TRS-C. The BASC-TRS-C Screener items were chosen empirically by conducting a principal component analysis. This analysis identified the weight and contribution that an item made to the overall Behavior Symptom Index (BSI), the BSI is the overall BASC composite

score. When items were ranked in terms of their contribution to the overall BSI, twenty-three items made the most significant contributions to the BSI. These twenty-three items were then selected for the BASC-TRS Screener. Although 23 items was an arbitrary cut-off, the decision point was based on designing a screener that was brief yet an instrument that still represented the integrity of the original BASC-TRS-C. Zero coefficients were computed and the 23 item cut-off was judged to be short enough in length, while continuing to account for 90% of the variance. In addition, a Receiver Operating Characteristic Curve (ROCC) analysis was utilized to determine the sensitivity and specificity of the screener in predicating behavioral, emotional, and academic adjustment problems of children in schools, thus the usefulness of identifying at-risk children. "The empirical screener development method created a screener with an internal consistency coefficient of .97, thus creating a scale that has the potential to discriminate between children of low and high behavior risk status" (Kamphaus et al., 2002, p. 4)

The BASC-TRS-C Screener score is computed by summing the raw scores of the 23-items. The cut-off score is 33. Scores falling above 33 are considered at-risk for behavior problems that would interfere with student performance in school as rated by their teachers.

Participating teachers completed the BASC-TRS-C Screener Short-Form along with the BASC-TRS Aggression Scale for all students with consent. The BASC-TRS-C Screener was chosen due to teacher familiarity. The BASC-TRS-C is an instrument commonly used in the schools that participated in the study and allowed for general behavioral information on the participating students. It was believed by the researchers that utilizing the BASC-TRS-C Screener Short-Form would provide useful information about student behavior, while at the same time being a time efficient and teacher friendly instrument.

Teacher Information, Skills and Knowledge – Elementary (TISK-E)

The TISK-E was developed specifically for use with the Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) manual and reflects the information disseminated in the manual. The TISK-E (see Appendix A) is a 65-item self-report measure of a teacher's knowledge and use of bullying intervention skills, highlighting the essential concepts, skills, and strategies from each of the eight modules. Teachers were asked to respond to the frequency with which they understood and utilized targeted Bully Busting interventions skills by responding N (Never), S (Sometimes), O (Often), or A (Almost Always).

Upon completion of the TISK-E, the participants' responses for each item were organized into intervention sets for each module, so that items related to each module were categorized as to assess the teachers knowledge and use of the goals outlined in each module (see Appendix B). The responses were then calculated for each module set, by totaling the number of responses for each level of frequency (i.e., never, sometimes, often, or almost always). Participants received 9 scores; an overall composite score of responses to determine general knowledge and skills and one for each of the eight modules.

This is the first time that the TISK-E was used for research purposes so there is no previous data available at this time on internal consistency and reliability.

Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM)

The Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) used for this study included two vignettes; one describing a child who engages in bullying-type behaviors and one who is a victim. This version is an adaptation of the original TEAM (Horne et al., 1998), which is a vignette-driven survey containing seven different vignettes. The vignettes describe seven different types of students corresponding with the seven behavior typologies of the BASC: Well-

Adapted (Type 1), Average (Type 2), Disruptive Behavior Problems (Type 3), Learning Problems (Type 4), Physical Complaints/Worry (Type 5), General Problems – Severe (Type 6), and Mildly Disruptive (Type 7) (Kamphaus, Huberty, DiStefanno, & Petoskey, 1997; Huberty, DiStefano, & Kamphaus, 1996; Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992). Upon reading each vignette teachers are asked to rate their level of agreement about the degree to which they attribute such behaviors in children (i.e., biological, personality or temperament, family influences, community influences and cultural factors) and rate their level of confidence in their ability to work with students who behave in the manner described. The original TEAM was used for the research project examining the effectiveness of Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Newman et al., 2000) and the analysis of internal consistency yielded Cronbach's alpha coefficients of .84, .94, .89, .88, .91, .95, and .93 for the seven typologies, respectfully (Newman, 1999).

The TEAM used for this study included two vignettes; one describing a child who engages in bullying-type behaviors and one who is a victim. For the questions pertaining to efficacy, teachers were asked to rate their level of confidence, using a likert scale of 1 (Not Confident) to 5 (Very Confident), in working with students like the victim or bully described in the vignette. For the questions pertaining to attributions, teachers were asked to rank their level of agreement, using a likert scale of 1 (Completely Disagree) to 5 (Completely Agree) with statements pertaining to the behaviors or progress they believe the bully or victim descried in the vignette would engage in or make during the school year.

Research Design

The design for this study is an exploratory pre-test/post-test, non-randomized evaluation of the effectiveness of a bully reduction program (Table 2). The treatment group consisted of

teachers in third through fifth grade that consented to participate in the Bully Busters program as well as students in participating classrooms who consented to take part in the study. Prior to the outset of the initial teacher training, teachers were asked to sign an informed consent (Appendix D). Once teachers consented to participate they were asked to complete the pre-test TISK-E and the TEAM and identify the frequency of bullying in their classroom's over the past two weeks. Following the initial teacher training session, teachers were provided with student/parent consent forms (Appendix E) to be distributed to their students. Teachers were asked to describe the program to their students prior to sending home the consents in the students' weekly folder. Once student/parent consent forms returned, teachers were asked to complete BASC-TRS-C Screener and either BASC-TRS-C (for students up to age 11) or BASC-TRS-A (for students 12 and older) Aggression Scale on students whose parents consented for them to participate. A week after the training, the researchers scheduled a 30-minute time block in which to administered the pre-test student survey to all students with consent. In an effort to avoid having teachers potentially influence students' responses on the student survey, it was determined that the researchers would administer the student surveys. Once the student survey was administered, teachers were instructed to begin utilizing the Bully Busters manual in their classrooms. Teachers were given the freedom to decided when and how they wanted to teach the eight modules. During the implementation period, teachers attended the support group sessions.

During the last two weeks of the school year, once the Bully Busters intervention project concluded, post-testing began. Teachers were again asked to complete the TISK-E, TEAM, and BASC-TRS forms along with their rating of the frequency in which bullying occurred in their classroom over the past two weeks. The researchers then scheduled another 30-minute time block to administer the student surveys.

Table 2

Timeline of Research Design

Pre-Test	**Teacher Training**	**Intervention Student**	**Implementation**	**Post-Test**
TISK-E TEAM BASC-TRS Screener Report of Frequency	4-hours Training	Student Surveys	Psychoeducation Intervention Support Groups (Once every 2 - 3 weeks, total of 3 meetings)	TISK-E TEAM BASC-TRS Screener Report of Frequency Student Surveys

Statistical Analysis

There were 17 null hypotheses developed to answer the researcher's questions regarding the effectiveness of the teacher-led psychoeducational Bully Busters project. Paired t-tests were used to test for differences in pre verses post intervention scores. In addition, Bowkers test of symmetry was utilized to test for differences in the distributions of teacher's reported incidents of bullying pre and post intervention. All statistical analyses were produced using SAS version 8.0. Data analysis was a pre-test/post-test change on six measures:

a) Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Screener Short Form (Kamphaus et al., 2002),
b) The BASC-TRS-C or BASC-TRE-A Aggression Scale (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992).
c) Student Survey - a student self-report measure of bullying, victimization, and fighting experiences in school (Bosworth & Espleage, 1999).
d) Teacher Frequency - a rating of the frequency of classroom bullying incidents.
e) Teacher Information, Skills, and Knowledge - Elementary (TISK-E) - a teacher report of knowledge and skills related to the intervention and preventing of bullying and victimization (Horne et al., 2003).
f) Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) - a teacher report of self-efficacy in working with bullies and victims (Horne et al., 1998).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

The following research questions and corresponding hypotheses were examined in this study.

Research Question One: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' behavior profiles?

Null Hypothesis 1a. There is no statistically significant difference in individual student's overall composite score as measured by the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Screener Short Form from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 1b. There is no statistically significant difference in the overall composite score of students in each classroom as measured by the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Screener Short Form from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 1c. There is no statistically significant difference in individual student's aggression scale scores as measured by the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Aggression Scale from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 1d. There is no statistically significant difference in the aggression scale scores of students in each classroom as measured by the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Aggression Scale from pre- to post-intervention

Research Question Two: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of bullying?

Null Hypothesis 2a. There is no statistically significant difference in self-report scores of bullying of students in each classroom as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 2b. There is no statistically significant difference in individual student's self-report scores of bullying in each classroom as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

Research Question Three: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of victimization?

Null Hypothesis 3a. There is no statistically significant difference in overall self-report scores of victimization of students in each classroom as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 3b. There is no statistically significant difference in individual student's self-report scores of victimization as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

Research Question Four: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of victimization?

Null Hypothesis 4a. There is no statistically significant difference in overall self-report scores of fighting of students in each classroom as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 4b. There is no statistically significant difference in individual student's self-report scores of fighting as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

Research Question Five: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers affect the frequency of teacher reported classroom incidents of bullying?

Null Hypothesis 5a. There is no statistically significant difference in the frequency of classroom incidents of bullying as measured by teachers' frequency ratings from pre- to post-intervention.

Research Question Six: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers affect teachers' knowledge and use of bully intervention skills?

Null Hypothesis 6a. There is no statistically significant difference in teachers' knowledge and use of bully intervention skills as measured by the Teacher Information, Skills, and Knowledge - Elementary (TISK-E) from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 6b. There is no statistically significant difference in teachers' knowledge and use of bully intervention skills per modules as measured by the Teacher Information, Skills, and Knowledge - Elementary (TISK-E) from pre- to post- intervention.

Research Question Seven: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers affect teachers' self-efficacy in working with and their attributions regarding bullies and victims?

Null Hypothesis 7a. There is no statistically significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy in working with bullies as measured by the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 7b. There is no statistically significant difference in teachers' attributions regarding the expected progress a "bully" would make during the school year as measured by the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 7c. There is no statistically significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy in working with victims as measured by the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) from pre- to post-intervention.

Null Hypothesis 7d. There is no statistically significant difference in teachers' attributions regarding the expected progress a "victim" would make during the school year as measured by the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) from pre- to post-intervention.

Limitations of the Study

The limitations of this research study are as follows:

1. This was a brief intervention spanning the remaining two months of the school year. As a result modules were implemented over a brief period of time, limiting the number of activities and modules the teachers were able to successfully implement. Only a few of the teachers reported implementing all of the eight modules in their classroom due to time constraints.
2. Only selected schools were selected for participation in this project. The teachers at these two schools were involved in additional research projects involving the participation of the researchers. Thus, there already existed a level of familiarity between the teachers and the researchers as well as familiarity with several of the measures administered to the teachers and students.
3. The project was only available to teachers in grades third, fourth, fifth for participation and thus was not a true school-wide intervention program.
4. Support staff and other school personnel did not participate in the teacher training, so the overarching goals of the program were limited to the students' classrooms.
5. All teachers and interested in participating were permitted to do so, therefore the project lacked a control group.

CHAPTER 4

Results and Discussion

This study was designed to examine the effectiveness of an elementary school bully intervention and prevention program, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne et al., 2003). In order to determine the effectiveness of the teacher-led psychoeducational Bully Busters program, pre-test and post-test comparisons were calculated for both the teachers and the students.

This chapter provides the results of the statistical analyses of the data collected to investigate the effect of the program on both the teachers and the students. Seventeen null hypotheses were created from the seven research questions. The significance level needed for rejecting the null hypotheses was set at a 95% confidence level, $p < \text{or} = .05$. The findings of each of the 17 null hypotheses as well as a discussion of the results are reported below.

Findings

Prior to the analysis of each measure, subjects were removed due to missing values. For the purpose of the analyses no distinction was made between schools.

Null Hypothesis 1a.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in individual student's overall composite score as measured by the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Screener Short Form from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 1a, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 3. As

reported in Table 3, there were no statistically significant differences in the overall pre-intervention verses post-intervention scores, with means of 25.689 and 25.695, respectively (p=.99). Thus, null hypothesis 1a is not rejected.

Null Hypothesis 1b.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in the overall composite score of students in each classroom as measured by the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Screener Short Form from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 1b, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the means, standard deviations, and significance levels by teacher, are shown in Table 4. As reported in Table 4, there were no statistically significant differences in the pre-intervention verses post-intervention scores for 12 of the 15 participating classrooms. Of the 220 students in the sample, 70 students had a pre-intervention score of 33 or above indicating that they could be considered at-risk for behavior problems that would interfere with learning and 66 had a post-intervention score of 33 or higher.

However, for Teacher 1 and Teacher 2, mean scores were statistically significant, showing a decrease from pre-intervention to post-intervention with a mean decrease of 3.69 points (p=.05) and 7.58 (p=.034), respectively. For Teacher 12, there was a statistically significant increase of 2.54 points (p=.040).

Null Hypothesis 1c.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in individual student's overall aggression scale scores as measured by the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Aggression Scale from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 1c, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the means, standard deviations, and significance levels by teacher, are shown in Table 5. As reported in Table 5, there was a statistically significant increase in the pre-intervention verses post-intervention scores of 1.19 (p=.001). Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected.

Null Hypothesis 1d.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in the aggression scale scores of students in each classroom as measured by the Behavior Assessment System for Children-Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) Aggression Scale from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 1d, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the means, standard deviations, and significance levels by teacher, are shown in Table 6. As reported in Table 6, there were no statistically significant differences in the pre-intervention verses post-intervention scores for 13 of the 15 participating classrooms.

However, for Teacher 6 and Teacher 8, mean scores was a statistically significantly increase from pre-intervention to post-intervention with a mean increase of 4.47 (p=.0007) and 3.42 (p=.0135), respectively.

Null Hypothesis 2a.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in the overall self-report scores of bullying of students in each classroom as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 2a, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 7. As reported in Table 7, there was a borderline statistically significant difference in the pre-

Table 3

Overall Mean, Standard Deviation, and Significance Level for the BASC-TRS-C Screener Short Form

	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
Overall Scores	25.69	15.72	25.7	16.7	.9905

*p<.05

Table 4

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels By Teacher for the BASC-TRS-C Screener Short Form

Teacher	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
1	14.56	13.28	10.88	11.59	.0507*
2	27.42	17.61	19.83	24.18	.0339
3	**	**	**	**	**
4	**	**	**	**	**
5	27.44	13.34	28.0	12.36	.7384
6	36.63	10.72	37.95	12.49	.2983
7	22.13	16.62	22.88	13.82	.6878
8	37.95	12.48	39.53	8.66	.3278
9	26.1	11.16	27.6	11.08	.4842
10	14.86	12.65	16.29	13.35	.4139
11	25.13	18.87	24.88	18.34	.7554
12	28.0	13.13	30.55	12.95	.0404*
13	27.0	20.63	27.6	26.4	.8691
14	15.67	7.53	17.17	8.7	.3991
15	14.78	12.23	15.89	14.31	.4863

*p< or = .05
**missing information

Table 5

Overall Mean, Standard Deviation, and Significance Level for the BASC-TRS-C Aggression Scale

	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
Overall Scores	7.16	8.0	8.36	8.88	.0011*

*p<.05

Table 6

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels By Teacher for the BASC-TRS-C Aggression Scale

Teacher	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
1	3.31	5.25	3.88	6.57	.6708
2	3.54	4.52	6.77	9.79	.1295
3	**	**	**	**	**
4	**	**	**	**	**
5	5.44	6.25	5.56	5.29	.8817
6	15.67	6.93	20.14	8.97	.0007*
7	9.6	9.58	8.4	7.68	.2789
8	10.71	6.79	14.14	3.65	.0135*
9	4.5	6.2	5.4	6.06	.5837
10	2.73	7.03	3.53	8.53	.2003
11	9.81	8.61	8.69	8.52	.1776
12	3.36	2.96	4.18	2.64	.0683
13	8.29	13.52	7.43	11.57	.6070
14	3.0	6.66	1.43	2.94	.3186
15	4.11	5.42	4.56	6.0	.5251

*p< or = .05
**missing information

intervention (M=13.0) verses post-intervention (M=12.42) student self-reports of engaging in bullying activities with a .57 mean decrease (p=.059). Thus, null hypothesis 2a was rejected.

Null Hypothesis 2b.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in individual student's self-report scores of bullying as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 2b, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the means, standard deviations, and significance levels by teacher, are shown in Table 8. As reported in Table 8, only Teacher 1 showed a statistically significant decrease in student's self-reports of engaging in bullying activities of 2.7 (p=.007) with a pre-intervention mean of 16.3 and a post-intervention mean of 13.8.

Null Hypothesis 3a.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in overall self-report scores of victimization of students in each classroom as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 3a, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 7. As reported in Table 7, there was no statistically significant difference in students' self-reports of victimization with an overall pre-intervention score of 9.6 and a post-intervention score of 9.18 (p=.114). Thus, null hypothesis 3a was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis 3b.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in individual student's self-report scores of victimization as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 3b, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the means, standard deviations, and significance levels by teacher, are shown in Table 9. As reported in Table 9, only 2 of the 15 teachers showed borderline statistically significant differences in the pre-intervention verses post-intervention student self-reports of victimization. Teacher 14 had a pre-intervention mean of 14.57 and a post-intervention mean of 11.71, a 2.86 point decrease (p=.0523). Teacher 15 had a pre-intervention mean of 12.25 and a post-intervention mean of 10.5, a 1.75 point decrease (p=.0524).

Null Hypothesis 4a.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in overall self-report scores of fighting of students in each classroom as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 4a, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 7. As reported in Table 7, there was no statistically significant difference in students' self-reports of fighting with an overall pre-intervention score of 8.7 and a post-intervention score of 9.37 (p=.2141). Thus, null hypothesis 4a was not rejected.

Table 7

Overall Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels for the Three Dimensions of the Student Survey

	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
Bullying	13.0	5.25	12.42	4.75	.0595*
Victimization	9.61	4.67	9.18	4.59	.1140
Fighting	6.7	4.14	8.37	5.0	.2141

*p< or =.05

Table 8

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels By Teacher for the Bully Dimension of the Student Survey

Teacher	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
1	16.3	5.0	13.8	4.67	.0077*
2	17.0	8.3	14.58	8.04	.1608
3	11.85	3.72	10.46	1.94	.1738
4	10.8	4.09	10.6	1.14	.9001
5	11.42	2.47	13.25	4.54	.1066
6	13.11	3.76	11.11	2.71	.0701
7	12.6	5.73	14.8	7.05	.0858
8	13.15	4.58	12.77	3.83	.7134
9	11.4	4.3	13.2	4.42	.980
10	11.83	3.88	11.17	2.48	.3752
11	13.08	8.39	13.31	7.93	.8269
12	12.88	5.28	13.25	5.06	.7318
13	10.86	2.12	10.14	1.77	.5637
14	12.5	5.09	9.67	1.63	.2005
15	10.25	3.01	11.0	2.07	.32

*p< or = .05

Table 9

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels By Teacher for the Victimization Dimension of the Student Survey

Teacher	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
1	8.55	3.53	8.2	3.64	.6135
2	6.21	3.42	5.79	4.21	.2896
3	11.21	4.58	11.29	5.3	.9183
4	10.17	5.08	10.83	3.37	.7265
5	8.38	4.11	7.46	2.96	.2295
6	10.73	4.34	9.55	4.66	.4141
7	12.4	4.51	13.0	2.45	.7215
8	11.0	5.32	11.77	4.87	.5470
9	5.9	2.96	6.4	2.88	.4525
10	8.25	4.03	6.92	4.32	.1241
11	10.21	5.22	10.36	5.2	.8903
12	9.13	4.32	10.0	4.96	.7066
13	10.83	5.34	8.67	5.72	.2176
14	14.57	5.68	11.71	5.91	.0523*
15	12.25	3.5	10.5	3.12	.0524*

*p< or = .05

Table 10

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels By Teacher for the Fighting Dimension of the Student Survey

Teacher	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
1	9.52	4.2	8.14	2.87	.1162
2	11.09	4.23	8.55	4.52	.0043*
3	8.93	4.17	8.53	3.38	.6313
4	6.67	2.66	6.67	1.51	1.000
5	7.75	3.39	9.17	3.69	.1604
6	9.17	3.13	7.67	1.87	.0069*
7	10.86	5.27	11.57	7.14	.7415
8	12.42	5.85	13.0	4.53	.7280
9	7.4	3.75	7.9	3.87	.4127
10	6.17	1.95	5.67	0.98	.3243
11	7.62	4.25	8.85	6.34	.2249
12	9.29	3.35	10.29	3.04	.1975
13	6.57	3.36	6.43	1.4	.8731
14	8.67	3.20	6.0	1.26	.0872
15	8.86	1.46	5.14	.38	.1403

*p< or = .05

Null Hypothesis 4b.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in individual student's self-report scores of fighting as measured by the student survey from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 4b, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the means, standard deviations, and significance levels by teacher, are shown in Table 10. As reported in Table 10, only 2 of the 15 teachers showed statistically significant differences in the pre-intervention verses post-intervention student self-reports of fighting. Teacher 2 showed a statistically significant decrease with a pre-intervention mean of 11.09 and a post-intervention mean of 8.54, a 2.54 point decrease (p=.004). Teacher 6 had a pre-intervention mean of 9.17 and a post-intervention mean of 7.66, a 1.5 point decrease (p=.007).

Null Hypothesis 5a.

It was hypothesized that there would be no statistically significant difference in the frequency of classroom incidents of bullying as measured by teachers' frequency ratings from pre- to post-intervention.

To test null hypothesis 5a, the frequency and percent of pre-intervention and post-intervention bullying incidents were identified and a Bowkers test of symmetry was utilized to test for differences in the distributions of reported incidents of bullying pre and post intervention. Table 11 presents reports the frequency ratings, percentiles, and the results of the Bowkers test of symmetry.

As presented in Table 11, these was no statistical significance in the overall number of classroom incidents of bullying before and after the intervention (p=.89). Thus, the null

Table 11

Frequencies, Percentiles, and Bowkers Test of Symmetry for Teacher Reported Incidents of Bullying

Number of Bullying Incidents	Pre-Intervention Frequency	Pre-Intervention Percent	Post-Intervention Frequency	Post-Intervention Percent
0-3	4	33.33	2	16.67
3-6	4	33.33	4	33.33
7-10	3	25.0	4	33.33
10 or more	1	8.33	2	16.67

Bowkers Test of Symmetry p=.89

hypothesis was not rejected. In fact, the data suggests a tendency towards an increase in the number of incidents with 66.6% of teachers reporting 6 or fewer incidents pre-intervention verses 50% reporting 6 or fewer incidents post-intervention. Due to missing information, there were too few reporting teachers for this to approach statistical significance.

Null Hypothesis 6a.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in teachers' knowledge and use of bully intervention skills as measured by the Teacher Information, Skills, and Knowledge - Elementary (TISK-E) from pre- to post-intervention.

To test the null hypothesis 6a, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 12. As reported in Table 12, there was an overall increase of 33.3 in teacher knowledge and skill use regarding bullying inventions skills with a pre-intervention score of 105.6 and a post-intervention score of 139.0 ($p=.04$). Thus, null hypothesis 6a is rejected.

Null Hypothesis 6b.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in teachers' knowledge and use of bully intervention skills per modules as measured by the Teacher Information, Skills, and Knowledge - Elementary (TISK-E) from pre- to post- intervention.

To test null hypothesis 6b, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis for each module, including the means, standard deviations and significance levels, are presented in Table 13. Although as shown in Table 13, each module showed an overall increase, only certain modules (Modules 1, 4, 5, and 7) yield statistically significant results. Mean scores for Module 1 increased from a pre-interventions mean score of 11.17 to a post-intervention score of 13.17 ($p=.0117$) with total possible score of 18. Module 4 mean scores increased from a pre-

Table 12

Overall Mean, Standard Deviation, and Significance Level for the TISK-E

	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
Overall Scores	105.67	25.48	139.0	21.15	.0406*

*p<.05

Table 13

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels for the Eight Modules of the TISK-E

Module	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
Module 1	11.17	1.17	13.17	1.83	.0117*
Module 2	22.67	3.92	25.83	5.34	.0803
Module 3	14.83	3.31	17.67	4.46	.1369
Module 4	4.0	3.85	9.83	4.17	.0171*
Module 5	8.33	5.16	14.0	2.76	.0136*
Module 6	45.0	13.8	52.33	7.17	.2285
Module 7	15.5	8.04	25.0	5.97	.0417*
Module 8	3.33	3.98	6.33	1.86	.1402

*p<.05

intervention score of 4.0 verses a post-intervention score of 9.83 (p=.0171) with a total possible score of 12. Mean scores for Module 5 increased from a pre-intervention score of 8.33 to a post-intervention score of 14.0 (p=.0136), with a total possible score of 18. Module 7 mean scores increased from a pre-intervention score of 15.5 verses a post-intervention score of 25.0 (p=.0417), with a total possible score of 36. The other modules (Modules 2, 3, 6, and 8) would undoubtedly have resulted in similarly significant results had more teachers answered every question on the instrument. Approximately half of the teachers failed to answer every question, making it impossible to calculate scores which would be comparable to scores from teachers who completed every item.

Null Hypothesis 7a.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy in working with bullies as measured by the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) from pre- to post-intervention.

To test null hypothesis 7a, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 14. As shown in Table 14, there were statistically significant differences in pre- verses post-intervention mean scores measuring teachers' self-efficacy in working with bullies. The pre-intervention mean score was 22.69 verses a post-intervention mean score of 26.07 (p=.039). Thus, null hypothesis 7a was rejected.

Null Hypothesis 7b.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in teachers' attributions regarding the expected progress a "bully" would make during the school year as

measured by the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) from pre- to post-intervention.

To test null hypothesis 7b, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 14. As shown in Table 14, there were no statistically significant differences in pre- verses post-intervention mean scores measuring teachers' attribution regarding bullies. The pre-intervention mean score was 2.58 verses a post-intervention mean score of 13.5 (p=.46). Thus, null hypothesis 7b was not rejected.

Null Hypothesis 7c.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in teachers' self-efficacy in working with victims as measured by the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) from pre- to post-intervention.

To test null hypothesis 7c, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 14. As shown in Table 14, there were statistically significant differences in pre- verses post-intervention mean scores measuring teachers' self-efficacy in working with victims. The pre-intervention mean score was 24.42 verses a post-intervention mean score of 28.5 (p=.032). Thus, null hypothesis 7c was rejected.

Null Hypothesis 7d.

It was hypothesized that there is no statistically significant difference in teachers' attributions regarding the expected progress a "victim" would make during the school year as measured by the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) from pre- to post-intervention.

Table 14

Means, Standard Deviations, and Significance Levels for the Efficacy and Attribution Dimensions of the TEAM

Dimension	Pre-Intervention		Post-Intervention		
	M	SD	M	SD	p
Teacher Attributions					
Bully	12.58	4.06	13.5	2.65	.46
Victim	14.08	3.15	15.17	2.44	.36
Teacher Self-Efficacy					
Bully	22.69	7.8	26.07	4.86	.039*
Victim	24.42	6.29	28.5	4.6	.032*

*p<.05

To test null hypothesis 7d, a Paired t-Test was conducted. The results of the analysis, including the mean, standard deviation, and significance level, are shown in Table 14. As shown in Table 14, there were no statistically significant differences in pre- verses post-intervention mean scores measuring teachers' attributions regarding victims. The pre-intervention mean score was 14.08 verses a post-intervention mean score of 15.17 (p=.36). Thus, null hypothesis 7d was not rejected.

Discussion

The bully prevention and intervention program, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5), was implemented and examined for effectiveness along several dimensions, including teacher knowledge and use of bullying prevention and interventions skills, teacher efficacy and attributions regarding their work with bullies and victims, frequency of teacher reported bullying incidents, and changes in student behavior. This manual was developed following the development and examined effectiveness of the middle school version, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Newman et al., 2000) and has been developed to incorporate current practices of aggression reduction in schools and extends the research to an elementary population. This program included intervention components for both teachers and students and put forth efforts to evaluate the impact of the program on the teachers and their students.

The overall results of the intervention for teachers produced positive results on the teachers' general development and use of bullying intervention and prevention skills (null hypothesis 6a) and on their self-efficacy in working with bullies and victims (null hypotheses 7a and 7c). While null hypothesis 6b produced positive effects for 4 of the 8 modules, thus indicating that teachers increased their knowledge and use of skills regarding an awareness of

bullying, the recognition of bullying and victimization, and in their awareness of ways to effectively work with victims. However, teachers did not indicate a statistically significant decrease in the frequency of bullying incidents in their classrooms, in fact there was a trend towards an increase in observed bullying incidents (null hypothesis 5a).

The general results of the intervention for students did not yield positive results across the overall student sample. Given the results of the statistical analyses on teachers' perspectives of student behavior, it appears as though teachers' perceived an increase in aggressive behaviors (null hypotheses 1c and 1d) and that student behaviors remained consistent (null hypothesis 1a). Across the student sample, students also perceived their own behaviors and perspectives as relatively constant in terms of their self-reports of victimization and their engagement in fighting behaviors (null hypotheses 3a and 4a). The exception exists for a few classrooms where students did report a borderline statistically significant decrease in self-reported victimization and fighting (hypotheses 3b and 4b). In addition, a few teachers did perceive a statistically significant decrease in at-risk behaviors (null hypothesis 1b) and students showed an overall decrease in their own self-reports of engagement in bullying related behaviors (null hypotheses 2a and 2b).

CHAPTER 5

Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations for Future Research

The bully prevention and intervention program, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5), was implemented for the purposes of this study in an effort to examine the overall effectiveness of this teacher-led psychoeducational program. This chapter summarizes the study, speaks to the conclusions that can be made based on the data results, identified implications for further use, and formulates recommendations for future research.

Summary

Statement of the Problem

Although schools are intended to be safe, nurturing havens that facilitate student learning and development, students and teachers may encounter barriers that impede student learning and jeopardize the positive school climate that school personnel are working to create. One such barrier is school violence, such as bullying. Bullying behaviors and, thus, the resulting victimization are of primary concern when schools consider the safety and climate of their school environment. As a result of the impact of bullying and victimization, teachers, administrators, parents, and students are confronted with what to do to effectively intervene in bullying incidents and prevent future ones.

In thinking about how schools can best address issues related to bullying and the resulting victimization, it is important to recognize that not only are teachers faced with the challenge of how to handle the phenomenon of bullying but students are as well. Teachers are often impaired

in their ability to effectively handle bullying in their classroom for a variety of reasons (Boutlon, 1997; Craig et al., 2000a; Garrett, 2003; Hazler, 1996; O'Moore, 1997; Shellard, 2002; Stephenson & Smith, 1989; Horne & Socherman, 1996). In addition, students, too, are often unaware and unequipped as how to effectively manage and prevent bullying incidents (Craig et al., 2000b; Henderson & Hymel, 2002; O'Connell et al., 1999). Thus, the question becomes will increasing teachers' and students' awareness and skills surrounding the phenomenon of bullying effectively reduce bullying incidents.

Purpose of the Study

This study was an extension of previous studies that examined the effectiveness of the middle school version of a bully intervention program, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Newman, Horne, & Bartolomucci, 2000). The present study examined an elementary version of the treatment program, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne et al., 2003), a program intended to provide teachers with the knowledge and skills to work with their students to prevent and intervene in bullying related incidents.

This study was aimed at examining the effectiveness of the Bully Busters program, which was specifically developed to reduce and prevent bullying and victimization in the classroom setting through the implementation of a teacher-led psychoeducational program. For the purposes of data collection both the consenting teachers and their students were asked to complete instruments. Effectiveness was examined by comparing pre-intervention and post-intervention means across several measures, one for students, a student self-report of bullying, victimization, and fighting (Bosworth & Espleage, 1999); and five for teachers, the Behavior Assessment System for Children - Teacher Rating Scale – Child Version (BASC-TRS-C) –

Screener Short-Form (Kamphaus et al., 2002), the BASC-TRS Aggression Scale (Reynolds & Kamphaus, 1992), Teacher Information, Skills and Knowledge – Elementary (TISK-E) (Horne et al., 2003), a report of frequency of bullying incidents, and the Teacher Efficacy and Attribution Measure (TEAM) (Horne, Socherman, & Dagley, 1998).

Sample

The sample for this study was comprised of 15 third through fifth grade teachers and 220 of their students at two elementary schools in an urban town in the southeastern region of the United States with a diverse population. Teachers were informed of the study by the researchers at a staff meeting with the assistance of the school's administrative team. Fifteen of the 21 teachers invited to take part in this study consented to participate. Students in grades three through five were also invited to participate in this study and were informed about the program by their teacher during class time prior to the consent forms going home. Two-hundred and twenty students returned their consent forms indicating that they would participate in the study.

Description of the Intervention Program

The foundation of this study was the teacher-led psychoeducational bully intervention and prevention manual, Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5). As part of the teachers' participation in this study, they attended a 4-hour Bully Busting staff development training based on the manual, attended three follow-up teacher support groups, and implemented the eight Bully Busting modules in their classrooms. Interventions with the teachers, staff development and support groups, were aimed at increasing teachers' knowledge and use of bullying intervention and prevention skills, increasing their level of self-efficacy in working with bullies and victims, and supporting teachers' in their implementation of the intervention manual within their classrooms.

Research Design

The research design for this study was an exploratory pre-test/post-test, non-randomized evaluation of the effectiveness of Bully Busters program (Table 2). The treatment group consisted of teachers in third through fifth grade that consented to participate in the Bully Busters program as well as students in participating classrooms who consented to participate.

Null Hypotheses and Statistical Analysis of Results

A total of 17 null hypotheses were derived from the seven research questions developed to evaluate the overall effectiveness of the Bully Busters invention and prevention program in positively impacting bullying. Below is a summary and discussion of the seven research questions and the results of the statistical analyses.

Research Question One: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' behavior profiles?

For research question one, the Paired t-test results yielded no statistically significant results for null hypothesis 1a. Pre-intervention and post intervention scores on the BASC-TRS-C Screener Short Form were 25.69 and 25.7, respectively, indicating that the overall mean of students' behavior profile scores were not significantly impacted (p=.99). Thus, null hypothesis 1a was not rejected.

Null hypothesis 1b was not rejected for 12 of the 15 teachers. For 3 of the teachers, null hypothesis 1b was rejected. The Paired t-Tests of Teacher 1 and Teacher 2 showed a statistically significant decrease in mean scores (p=.05 and p= .034, respectively), indicating that their students showed an overall improvement in their behavior. However, Teacher 12 showed a statistically significant increase in their students' overall mean scores (p=.04), indicating that his/her students' behavior showed an overall decline.

Although null hypothesis 1c was rejected (p=.0011), the Paired t-Test results indicate that aggression scores on the BASC-TRS-C Aggression Scale increased significantly across the 15 teachers. Thus, the null hypothesis was rejected in a negative manner. Null hypothesis 1d, showed similar results for Teachers 6 and 8, who also had statistically significant increases in their students' mean aggression scores. For the remainder of the 15 teachers the null hypothesis was not rejected.

Research Question Two: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of bullying?

For research question two, null hypothesis 2a was rejected. The Paired t-test yielded borderline statistically significant results (p=.059), indicating that students' self-reported an overall decline in bullying behaviors.

The Paired t-Test generated statistically significant results for null hypothesis 2b for Teacher 1, whose students' self-reported a decrease in bullying behaviors (p=.007). Thus, null hypothesis 2b is rejected for 1 of the 15 teachers, for the remaining 14 teachers, null hypothesis 2b was not rejected.

Research Question Three: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of victimization?

For research question three, null hypothesis 3a was not rejected. The Paired t-test did not yielded statistically significant results (p=.114), indicating that students' self-reports of victimization did not change significantly.

The Paired t-Test generated borderline statistically significant results for null hypothesis 3b for Teacher 14 (p=.0523) and Teacher 15 (p=.0524), whose students' self-reported a decrease

in victimization. Thus, null hypothesis 3b is rejected for 2 of the 15 teachers, for the remaining 13 teachers, null hypothesis 3b was not rejected.

Research Question Four: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school students affect students' self-report scores of victimization?

For research question four, null hypothesis 4a was not rejected. The Paired t-test did not yielded statistically significant results (p=.2141), indicating that students' self-reports of fighting behaviors did not produce a notable change.

The Paired t-Test produced statistically significant results for null hypothesis 4b for Teacher 2 (p=.004) and Teacher 6 (p=.007), whose students' self-reported a decrease in fighting behaviors. Thus, null hypothesis 4b is rejected for 2 of the 15 teachers, for the remaining 13 teachers, null hypothesis 4b was not rejected.

Research Question Five: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers affect the frequency of teacher reported classroom incidents of bullying?

For research question five, a Paired t-Test was conducted and did not yield statistically significant results (p=.89). In fact the data suggests a tendency towards an increase in the number of teacher reported bullying incidents. Thus, null hypothesis 5a was not rejected.

Research Question Six: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers affect teachers' knowledge and use of bully intervention skills?

For research question six, the Paired t-Test generated statistically significant results (p=.0406). Teachers showed an overall increase in knowledge and skill use of bullying prevention and intervention skills on the TISK-E. Thus, hypothesis 6a was rejected.

In examining each of the 8 modules, statistically significant results, using a Paired t-Test, were found for Modules 1, 4, 5, and 7 (p=.0117, p=.0171, p=.0136, and p=.0417, respectively).

Analyses of Modules 2, 3, 6, and 8 did not yield statistically significant results (p=.0803, p=.1369, p=.2285, and p=.1402, respectively). Thus, null hypothesis 6b is rejected for 4 or the 8 modules and not rejected for 4 of the 8 modules.

Research Question Seven: Does a psychoeducational intervention for elementary school teachers affect teachers' self-efficacy in working with and their attributions regarding bullies and victims?

For question seven, the Paired t-Test results yielded statistically significant results for hypotheses 7a and 7c, which examined the self-efficacy dimensions of the TEAM. Teacher's self-efficacy in working effectively with bullies and victims improved significantly (p=.039 for bullies and p=.032 for victims). Thus, hypotheses 7a and 7c are rejected.

However, the Paired t-Test results of the attribution dimensions of the TEAM indicate that teachers' beliefs about the behavior of bullies and victims within their classrooms' did not improve significantly (p=.46 for bullies and p=.36 for victims). Thus, hypotheses 7b and 7d are not rejected.

Conclusions

The overall findings of the intervention for teachers produced positive results on the teachers' general development and use of bullying intervention and prevention skills and on their self-efficacy in working with bullies and victims. However, teachers indicated a trend towards an increase in observed bullying incidents. In addition, the general results of the intervention for students did not yield positive results across the overall student sample. Teachers' perceived an increase in aggressive behaviors and students perceived their own behaviors and perspectives as relatively constant in terms of their self-reports of victimization and their engagement in fighting

behaviors, with the exception of an overall decrease in their own self-reports of engagement in bullying related behaviors.

In general, the findings of the Bully Busters program indicate effectiveness in increasing teachers' knowledge and use of bullying prevention and intervention skills and their self-efficacy in working with bullies and victims; however the impact on student behavior was minimal. In reflecting on the conclusions discussed below, the researchers believe that it is important to consider several of the limitations of the study due to the potential effects of such constraints, including the limited implementation time of the teacher-led psychoeducational intervention and the fact that many of the teachers did not implement all of the modules as requested.

1. Based on the instruments used in this study, it can be concluded that the staff development and support groups developed out of the Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne et al, 2003) manual were effective in increasing teachers' overall knowledge and use of bullying prevention and intervention skills. However, it is important to note that the findings suggest that teachers were more successful in gaining knowledge and skills in certain areas or modules of the manual, including awareness of bullying, the recognition of bullying and victimization, and awareness of strategies for effectively working with victims. These positive findings are supportive of previous assertions regarding the importance of providing teachers with the skills and tools to actively discourage bullying, educate their students, and provide support and advice to victims (Boutlon, 1997; Hazler, 1996; Rigby, 2001). It also supports viewpoints that training should be accompanied by feedback and support for implementation (Bernard & Goodyear, 1998; Thies-Sprinthall & Sprinthall, 1987).

2. Based on the instruments used in this study, it can be concluded that the staff development and support groups developed out of the Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne et al, 2003) manual were effective in increasing teachers' self-efficacy in working with bullies and victims. Even though, teachers reported an increase in their own feelings of capability in working with students who bully or are victimized, their beliefs about or attributions regarding bullies and victims were not significantly affected. Perhaps it is because teachers felt more capable due to their increase in knowledge and skills, but having had limited time to test out their improved feelings of effectiveness did not have experiences that led to changes in their beliefs. At this time, it is unknown as to why their attributions did not change for the positive along with their feelings of self-efficacy.

3. Based on the instruments used in this study, it can be concluded that the staff development and support groups developed out of the Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne et al, 2003) manual as well as the teacher-led psychoeducational intervention were not successful in decreasing teachers' perceived frequency of bullying. This conclusion could speak positively or negatively to the effectiveness of the intervention made with the teachers. One explanation could be that due to an increased awareness and/or their attention to bullying related issues as a result of their participation in the study, teachers were more attuned to bullying, thus noticing more of the bullying incidents occurring or having less of a tolerance for such behaviors. Or perhaps students, as a result of learning about bullying and victimization, made more frequent reports of such incidents due to an increased awareness. On the other hand, it could be explained that there was a genuine rise in bullying incident.

4. Based on the instruments used in this study, it can be concluded that the teacher-led psychoeducational Bully Buster program did not have a significantly positive impact on students' aggressive behavior or general at-risk behaviors. Again, one explanation could be that changing behavior is a process that takes time and that due to the time limitations of the implementation of this program there was not sufficient time to show positive effects. It is also important to note that only one of the items from the BASC-TRS-C and BASC-TRS-A Aggression Scales is on the BASC-TRS-C Screener, thus the scales are measuring different behaviors. However, a few teachers did perceive a statistically significant decrease in at-risk behaviors, perhaps speaking to differences in teachers' implementation of the program.

5. Based on the instruments used in this study, it can be concluded that the staff teacher-led psychoeducational Bully Buster program did have a significant impact on students' self-reports of engagement in bullying related behaviors. It appears that students' observed a decrease in their own engagement in bully-type behaviors. Thus, it can be concluded that a teacher-led psychoeducational, such as Bully Busters, can positively affect students' engagement in bullying behaviors.

6. Based on the instruments used in this study, it can be concluded that although the staff teacher-led psychoeducational Bully Buster program positively impacted student engagement in bullying, it did not have a significant impact on students' self-reports of victimization and their engagement in fighting behaviors. However, it is important to note that, there were a few exceptions to this finding. The exception did exist for a few classrooms where students did report a borderline statistically significant decrease in self-reported victimization and fighting. Again, one explanation could be that changing behavior is a process and that due to the time

limitations of the implementation of this program there was not sufficient time to show significantly positive effects.

Implications

Several implications were made by the researchers based upon the findings of this research study.

1. Staff development training and follow teacher support groups significantly impacted teachers. Teachers reported an increase in their knowledge and skill use surrounding bullying prevention and intervention as well as in their feelings of self-efficacy in working with students who bully or who are victimized. During trainings and support groups teachers voiced their frustrations, confusion, and lack of knowledge about how to successfully deal with bullying in their classroom, which was reflective of prior research on teachers perspectives on bullying (Boutlon, 1997; Craig et al., 2000a; Garrett, 2003; Hazler, 1996; O'Moore, 1997; Shellard, 2002; Stephenson & Smith, 1989; Horne & Socherman, 1996).

2. Upon the completion of the project, many of the teachers expressed a desire and intent to implement the program the following school year, indicating the usefulness of the Bully Busters manual. It is, thus, inferred by the researcher that this speaks to not only the teachers' awareness of the problem of bullying within their classroom and school, but to the manual itself. The manual is set-up in a manner that is teacher-friendly and provides a comprehensive program.

3. Involving teachers in a bully intervention and prevention program did not impact teachers' viewpoints or attributions regarding the progress and behaviors a bully or victims would engage in within their classroom. Even though teachers reported feeling more competent in their ability to effectively work with bullies and victims, it appears that beliefs about such students did not improve. Thus, more attention needs to be paid to working to change teachers'

attributions as their own beliefs about bullying will effect how and if they will respond (Craig et al., 2000a). It is also important to note that due to the brief intervention with teachers there was not sufficient time to change teachers' thinking. In a study by Peace & Sprinthall (1998) on training teachers, they found that teachers' conceptual level and reasoning "are highly stable over a 1-year period and cannot be expected to change from any of the normal effects of maturation, regular course work, or history" (p 7).

4. Exposing students to a teacher-led psychoeducational bully intervention and prevention program positively impacted students engagement in bullying behaviors. It is inferred by the researchers that this positive impact may be due to students' increased awareness of their own behavior and to a more comprehensive and accurate understanding of what constitutes bullying.

5. Exposing students to a teacher-led psychoeducational bully intervention and prevention program was not sufficient enough to impact student behavior from the perspective of the teachers nor from the students' own self-reports of victimization and fighting. However, it is the perspective of the researchers' that the limitations of the study more than likely negatively impacted the results (i.e., limited implementation time, inconsistent and incomplete implementation all of the modules); therefore, if the project had been implemented for a longer period of time, there would have been statistically significant findings. Such findings would be supportive of previous research that have shown significant reductions in disciplinary referrals (Twemlow et al., 2001) and a decrease in students' report of bullying and victimization, a reduction in general antisocial behavior improvements in school climate; and a reduction in victimization (Olweus et al., 1999).

Recommendations for Future Research

In general , it is recommended that future research focus on a whole school approach over a more extensive period of time to better assess the effectiveness of the teacher led-psychoeducational program based on the Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5) (Horne et al, 2003) manual. In implementing the manual, it is also recommended that:

1. The program is implemented across multiple schools and examined using a control and a treatment group. Such a study would allow for comparative conclusions about the differences in school receiving the intervention verses schools without the intervention. Thus degree effectiveness in impacting bullying and victimization could then be further evaluated.
2. That further research efforts look more closely at the impact of the staff development training and support group components in order to tease out the effects of each on the overall effectiveness of implementation.
3. The program is implemented throughout an entire school year. Such a study would allow for a more in-depth, accurate, and conclusive evaluation of the impact of the Bully Busters program.
4. The program is evaluated for effectiveness over time. Looking at the effectiveness over time would help to identify and determine the longevity of the program. For example, would trends in students' self-reports indicating decreased engagement in bullying activities continue to improve or would teacher's continue to utilize their bully prevention and intervention skills after the project concluded?

5. That future research efforts examine the effects of the program on the social context of bullying. Thus, looking separately at how the program affects bullies, victims, and bystanders.
6. In implementing such a study, attaining the support of the school's administrative team, professional school counselor, and other school personnel in addition to the willingness of the teachers to participate are critical to effective implementation. As observed during this study, the more excited the school community was in engaging in this project the more the teachers showed enthusiasm and investment in the implementation of this Bully Busters program.

REFERENCES

Anti-Bullying Network (n.d.). Information on Reacting to Bullying [On-line]. Available: http://antibullying.net/reacting2.htm.

Association for Specialists in Group Work (2000). Professional standards for the training of group workers [On-line]. Available: www.asgw.org/training_standards.htm.

Atlas, R. S. & Pepler, D. J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom. Journal of Educational Research, 92(2), 86-100.

Bear, G. G. (1998). School discipline in the United States: Prevention, corrections, and long-term social development. School Psychology Review 27(1), 14-32.

Berger, K. S. (1991). The Developing Person Through Childhood and Adolescence. New York, NY: Worth Publishers.

Bernard J. M. & Goodyear, R. K. (1998). Fundamentals of Clinical Supervision (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Boutlon, M. J. (1997). Teachers' views on bullying: Definitions, attitudes and ability to cope. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 67, 223-233.

Boutlon, M. J., & Underwood, K. (1992). Bully/victim problems among middle school children. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 62, 73-87.

Bosworth, K., & Espelage, D. L. (1999). Factors associated with bullying behavior in middle school students. Journal of Early Adolescence, 19(3), 341-362.

Botsche, G & Moore, B (2000). Bullying fact sheet. Behavioral Interventions: Creating A Safe Environment In Our Schools, 10-12.

Cochran-Smith, M. (2004). Walking the Road" Race, Diversity, and Social Justice in Teacher Education. New York: Teachers College Press.

Conyne, R. K., Wilson, F. R., & Ward, D. E. (1997). Comprehensive Group Work: What it Means & How to Teach it. Alexandria, VA: American Counseling Association.

Craig, W. M. (1998). The relationship among bullying, victimization, depression, anxiety, and aggression in elementary school children. Personality and Individual Differences, 24(1), 123-130.

Craig, W. M., Henderson, K., & Murphy, J. G. (2000a). Prospective teachers' attitudes toward bullying and victimization. School Psychology International, 21(1), 5-21.

Craig, W. M., Pepler, D., & Atlas, R. (2000b). Observations of bullying on the playground and in the classroom. School Psychology International, 21(1), 22-36.

Crick, N. R. & Dodge, K. A. (1997). A review and reformulation of social information-processing mechanisms in children's social adjustment. Psychological Bulletin, 115(1), 74-101.

Dwyer, K. & Osher, D. (2000). Safeguarding Our Children: An Action Guide. Washington, DC: U.S. Departments of Education and Justice, American Institutes for Research.

Elliott, M. (1997). Bullies and victims. In M. Elliott (Ed.). Bullying: a Practical Guide to Coping for Schools. London: Pearson Education.

Espelage, D. L., Bosworth, K, & Simon, T. R. (2000). Examining the social context of bullying behaviors in early adolescence. Journal of Counseling and Development, 78(3), 326-233.

Espelage, D. L. & Swearer, S. M. (2003). Research on school bullying and victimization: What have we learned and where do we go from here? School Psychology Review, 23(3), 365-383.

Fried, S. & Fried, P. (1996). Bullies & Victims: Helping Your Child Survive the Schoolyard Battlefield. New York: M. Evans and Company, Inc.

Froschl, M., & Gropper, N. (1999). Fostering friendships, curbing bullying. Educational Leadership, 56(8), 72-75.

Garrett, A. G. (2003). Bullying in American Schools: Causes, Preventions, Interventions. Jefferson, NC: McFarland.

Glover, D., Gough, G., Johnson, M., & Cartwright, N. (2000). Bullying in 25 secondary schools: Incidence, impact, and intervention. Educational Research, 42, 141-156.

Hawkins, D. L., Pepler, D. J., & Craig, W. M. (2001). Naturalistic observations of peer interventions in bullying. Social Development, 10(4), 512-527.

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

Hazler, R. J. (1996). Breaking the Cycle of Violence: Interventions for Bullying and Victimization. Washington, DC: Taylor & Francis.

Hazler, R. J. (1998). Promoting personal investment in systemic approaches to school violence. Education, 119(2), 222-231.

Henderson, N. R. & Hymel, A. (2002). Peer Contributions to Bullying in Schools: Examining Student Response Strategies. A poster presented at the 2002 National Association of School Psychologists Annual Convention, Chicago, IL.

Horne, A. M., Bartolomucci, C. L., & Newman-Carlson, D. (2003). Bully Busters: A Teacher' Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders (Grades K-5). Champaign, IL: Research Press.

Horne, A. M., Glaser, B., & Sayger, T. V. (1994). Bullies. Counseling and Human Development, 27(3), 1-12.

Horne, A. M., & Orpinas, P. (2003). Bullying, childhood. In M. Bloom & T. Gullotta (Eds.), Encyclopedia of Prevention and Health Promotion, 233-240.

Horne, A. M., & Socherman, R. (1996). Profile of a bully: Who would do such a thing? Educational Horizons, 77-83.

Horne, A. M., Socherman, R. E., & Dagley, J. (1998). Teacher efficacy and attribution: A construct validation. **(?)**

Hoover, J., & Hazler, R. J. (1991). Bullies and victims. Elementary School Guidance and Counseling, 25(3), 212-220.

Howard, N. M., Horne, A. M., & Jolliff, D. (2001). Self-efficacy in a new training model for the prevention of bullying in schools. Journal of Emotional Abuse, 2(2/3), 181-191.

Jackson, E. (2002). Mental health in schools: What about the staff? Journal of Child Psychotherapy, 28(2), 129-146.

Kamphaus, R. W., Huberty, C. J., DiStefanno, C., & Petoskey, M. D. (1997). A typology of teacher-rated child behavior for a national U.S. sample. Journal of Abnormal Child Psychology, 25(6), 453-463.

Kamphaus, R. W., Thorpe, J. S., Winsor. A. P., Kroncke, A. P., & Dowdy, E. (2002). Validation of a Brief Teacher-Rating Scale of Child Behavior Problems in School. Poster presentation at the Annual Meeting of the American Psychological Association. Chicago, IL.

Kelder, S., Orpinas, P., McAlister, A., Frankowski, R., Parcel, G. S., & Friday, J. (1996). The students for peace project: A comprehensive violence-prevention program for middle school students. American Journal of Preventive Medicine, 12(Suppl. 5), 22-30.

Kilpatrick, J. (1997). Bullying pays! A survey of young offenders. In M. Elliott (Ed.). Bullying: a Practical Guide to Coping for Schools. London: Pearson Education.

Kirk, W. & Walter, G. (2001). Teacher support groups serve to minimize teacher burnout: Principles for organizing. Education, 102(2), 147-150.

Koplan, J. P., Autry III, J. H., & Hyman, S. E. (2001). Youth Violence: A Report of the Surgeon General. Washington, DC: Department of Health and Human Services.

Kumpulainen, K., Rasanen, E. Henttonen, I., Almqvist, F., Kresanov, K., Linna, S. L., Moilanen, I., Piha, J., Tamminen, T., & Puura, K. (1998). Bullying and psychiatric symptoms among elementary school-age children. Child Abuse and Neglect, 22(7), 705-717.

Maine Project Against Bullying. (2000). A Survey of Bullying Behavior Among Maine Third Graders [On-line]. Available: http://lincoln.midcoast.com/~wps/against/bullying.html.

Mosher, R. L. & Sprinthall, N. A. (1971). Psychological education: A means to promote personal development during adolescents. The Counseling Psychologist, 2(4), 3-82.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth. Journal of the American Medical Association, 285(16), 2094-2100.

National Center for Education Statistics (2003). Indicators of School Crime and Safety 2003. Washington, D.C.: Institute of Education Sciences, U.S. Department of Education.

Newman, D. A. (1999). The effectiveness of a psychoeducational intervention for classroom teachers aimed at reducing bullying behavior in middle schools students. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Georgia, Athens.

Newman, D. A., Horne, A. M., & Bartolomucci, C. L. (2000). Bully Busters: A Teacher's Manual for Helping Bullies, Victims, and Bystanders. Champaign, IL: Research Press.

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

Olweus, D. (1994). Annotation: Bullying at school: Basic facts and effects of a school based intervention program. Journal of Child Psychology and Psychiatry, 35(7), 1171-1190.

Olweus, D., Limber, S., & Mihalic, S. (1999). Bully prevention program. In D. S. Elliott (Series Ed.), Blueprints for Violence Prevention. Golden, CO: Venture Publishing.

O'Moore, A. M. (1997). What do teachers need to know? In M. Elliott (Ed.). Bullying: a Practical Guide to Coping for Schools. London: Pearson Education

Orpinas, P., & Horne, A. M. (in press). Bullies and victims: A challenge for schools. In J. Lutzker (Ed.), Violence Prevention. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Peace, S. D. & Sprinthall, N. A. (1998). Training school counselors to supervise beginning counselors: Theory, research and practice. Professional School Counseling, 1(5), 2-8.

Pellegrini, A. D., Bartini, M., & Brooks, F. (1999). School bullies, victims, and aggressive victims: Factors relating to groups affiliation, and victimization in early adolescence. Journal of Educational Psychology 91(2), 216-224.

Pellegrini, A. D. & Long, J. D. (2002). A longitudinal study of bullying, dominance, and victimization during the transition form primary school through secondary school. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 20, 259-280.

Peterson, R. L., & Skiba, R. (2001). Creating school climates that prevent school violence. The Social Studies, 92(4), 167-175.

Portman, T. A. A., & Portman, G. L. (2002). Empowering students for social justice (ES^2J): A structured group approach. Journal for Specialists in Group Work, 27(1),, 16-31.

Rigby, K. (2002). New Perspectives on Bullying. Philadelphia: Jessica Kinsley.

Rigby K. (2001). Stop the Bullying: A Handbook for Teachers. Markham, Ontario: Pembroke Publishers.

Reynolds, C. R., & Kamphaus, R. W. (1992). Behavior Assessment System for Children (BASC). Circle Pines, MN: AGS.

Roberts, Jr., W. B. (2000). The bully as victim: Understanding bully behaviors to increase the effectiveness of … Professional School Counseling, 4(2), 148-155.

Sallis, J. F. and Owen, N. (2002). Ecological models of health behaviors. In K. Glandz, F. M. Lewis, & B. K. Rimer (Eds.), Health Behavior and Health Education: Theory, Research, and Practice (3rd ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Salmivalli, C. (1999). Participant role approach to school bullying: Implications for interventions. Journal of Adolescence, 22, 453-459.

Salmivalli, C., Karhuren, J., & Lagerspetz, M. J. (1996). How do victims respond to bullying? Aggressive Behavior, 22, 99-109.

Shapiro, E. S., DuPaul, G. J., Bradley, K. L. & Bailey, L. T. (1996). A school-based consultation model for service delivery to middle school students with attention deficit/hyperactivity disorder. Journal of Emotional And Behavioral Disorders, 4, 73-81.

Shellard, E. (2002). Recognizing and Preventing Bullying. Arlington, VA: Educational Research Service.

Sutton, J., Smith, P. K., & Swettenham, J. (1999). Social cognition and bullying: Social inadequacy or skilled manipulation. British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 17, 435-450.

Teasely, M., & Rice, J. (1996). What is social justice? Perspectives on Multiculturalism and Cultural Diversity, 6(2). Available: http://www.vcu.edu/safweb/counsel/MC/justice.html.

Thies-Sprinthall, L. & Sprinthall, N. A. (1987). "Experienced teachers" Agents for revitalization and renewal as mentors and teacher educators. Journal of Education, 169(1), 65-79.

Thompson, D. A., Arora, T., & Sharp, S. (2002). Bullying: Effective Strategies for Long-Term Improvement. London: Routledge Falmer.

Tremlow, S. W., Fonagy, P., Sacco, F. C., Gies, M. L., Evans, R., & Ewbank, R. (2001). Creating a peaceful school learning environment: A controlled study of an elementary school intervention to reduce violence. American Journal of Psychiatry, 158(5), 808-810.

U.S. Department of Education, National Center for Education Statistics (2004). Crime and Safety in America's Public Schools: Selected Findings from the School Survey on Crime and Safety. NCES 2004-370. Project Officer: Kathryn Chandler. Washington, DC.

U.S. Department of Justice, Bureau of Justice Statistics (2001). School Crime Supplement to the National Crime Victimization Survey. Washington, DC.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Teacher Inventory of Skills and Knowledge – Elementary Version
(TISK- E)

Teacher: _____ Grade: _____ Date: _____

How many times have you completed the TISK-E? 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

These questions are intended to indicate how often you use certain techniques and resources when dealing with bully and victim interactions in your classroom. Please complete every item by marking the box of the response that most closely reflects your use of the intervention. Please use the blank spaces provided at the end of the questionnaire to list additional strategies and resources you have used.

	Intervention	**Never**	**Sometimes**	**Often**	**Almost Always**
1.	Establish a zero tolerance policy – "No bullying."				
2.	Create an atmosphere of kindness and respect in my classroom.				
3.	Create an open door policy.				
4.	Attend to the social and academic development of my students.				
5.	Teach the basic social skills needed to handle and prevent bullying interactions.				
6.	Establish and implement classroom rules and a code of conduct.				
7.	Recognize that you are a role model and model decision-making, respect of others, and a positive attitude.				
8.	Create opportunities for student success.				
9.	Develop a special relationship with each child.				
10.	Nourish my students' developmental assets.				
11.	Believe that you can successfully bring about a desired outcome in your students.				
12.	Understand the role of prevention in ending bullying.				
13.	Implement classroom activities aimed at bully prevention.				
14.	Implement classroom activities to increase awareness of bullying/victimization.				
15.	Teach steps of problem solving and decision making for behavior problems.				
16.	Highlight strengths of victims and bully (help students become aware of their strengths).				
17.	Defuse bully situation in the classroom immediately and tackle the issue with the bully after class, privately.				
18.	Use consequences for undesirable acts/misbehavior				

	committed by the bully.				
19.	Use praise and attention to reinforce good behaviors and accomplishments.				
20.	Use loss of privileges for bullies.				
21.	Conduct follow-up on bullying incidents.				
22.	Verbally correct/reprimand the bully individually so as to avoid reinforcing attention-seeking behavior.				
23.	Make a disciplinary referral.				
24.	Contact parents regarding student misbehavior via phone call, letter, and conference.				
25.	Contact parents regarding positive behavior of all students.				
26.	Consult with another teacher for advice.				
27.	Refer to counselor.				
28.	Consult with school counselor, school psychologist, etc.				
29.	Use teacher/student support teams as a resource for consultation and support for bullying problems.				
30.	Reinforce behavior, not the child (e.g., "Bob, I am proud of you for _____").				
31.	Use the technique of overcorrection with bullies.				
32.	Use four R's of bully control: Recognize, Remove, Review, and Respond.				
33.	Reward for improvements (successive approximations of desired behavior).				
34.	Reinforce nonbullying behaviors (e.g., on-task behavior, assertive/nonaggressive behavior, helping behaviors, etc).				
35.	Understand the PIC criteria for bullying.				
36.	Differentiate between the different forms of bullying (aggressive, passive, relational).				
37.	Teach students to recognize and identify the different types of bullies, their characteristics and behaviors.				
38.	Understand how bullying behaviors develop.				
39.	Acknowledge the common differences between male and female bullying.				
40.	Encourage bullies to understand the victim's point of view - Help bullies to develop an empathic understanding of victims.				
41.	Teach bullies "non-aggressive" and "non-bullying" behavioral alternatives.				
42.	Teach bullies a better way of thinking – to shift from aggressive-based appraisals to assertive-based ones.				
43.	Teach bullies new skills for achieving their goals.				
44.	Teach anger management strategies to bullies.				
45.	Use an invitational approach (encourage bully and victims to share their perspectives).				
46.	Recognize the warning signs of victimization.				
47.	Understand the victim and their needs.				
48.	Understand the "Code of Silence" that prevents children from sharing bullying incidents.				
49.	Provide support for victims (i.e., create an open door				

	policy).				
50.	Recognize the different types of victims (passive, provocative, relational, and bystander).				
51.	Teach students to recognize and identify the characteristics and behaviors of different types of victims.				
52.	Teach victims social skills (e.g., self-presentation, non-victim body language, skills to deal with conflicts).				
53.	Teach victims physical and verbal assertiveness skills (e.g., assertive words, posture, eye contact, etc).				
54.	Assist victims of bullying in identifying skills and behaviors they may want to learn.				
55.	Teach confidence and self-esteem building skills to victims.				
56.	Teach coping skills to victims.				
57.	Recognize how each student can actively prevent and intervene in bullying interactions.				
58.	Teach skills for dealing with bully/victim interactions.				
59.	Use cooperative learning with bullies and victims, i.e., incorporate group projects/team approach into your curriculum.				
60.	Teach bullies and victims verbal and nonverbal communication skills (e.g., sharing opinions, communicating in situations involving conflict, listening to others, etc).				
61.	Teach collaborative conflict resolution skills to bullies and victims (i.e., teach bully and victim to become responsible for finding their own solutions through negotiation).				
62.	Maintain a Behavior log by recording bullying incidents and interventions.				
63.	Recognize the role and impact of stress.				
64.	Aware of general stress management skills.				
65.	Teach stress management skills to my students.				

(Horne, Bartolomucci, & Newman-Carlson, 2003)

Appendix B

TISK-E Questions by Module

Module 1: Increasing Awareness of Bullying	**N**	**S**	**O**	**AA**
4. Attend to the social and academic development of my students.				
7. Recognize that I am a role model and model decision making, respect for others, and a positive attitude.				
12. Understand the role of prevention in ending bullying.				
26. Consult with another teacher for advice.				
35. Understand the PIC criteria for bullying.				
62. Maintain a record of bullying incidents and interventions.				
Total				

Module 2: Preventing Bullying In Your Classroom	**N**	**S**	**O**	**AA**
1. Establish a zero-tolerance policy – "No bullying."				
3. Create an open door policy.				
6. Establish and implement classroom rules and a code of conduct.				
7. Recognize that I am a role model and model decision making, respect for others, and a positive attitude.				
11. Believe that I can successfully bring about a desired outcome in my students.				
12. Understand the role of prevention in ending bullying.				
13. Implement classroom activities aimed at bully prevention.				
14. Implement classroom activities to increase awareness of bullying/victimization.				
23. Make a disciplinary referral.				
59. Use cooperative learning with bullies and victims (i.e., incorporate group projects/team approach into the curriculum.				
61. Teach collaborative conflict resolution skills to bullies and victims (i.e., teach bully and victim to become responsible for finding their own solutions through negotiation.				
Total				

Module 3: Building Personal Power	**N**	**S**	**O**	**AA**
2. Create an atmosphere of kindness and respect in my classroom.				
4. Attend to the social and academic development of my students.				
5. Teach the basic social skills needed to handle and prevent bullying interactions.				
8. Create opportunities for student success.				
9. Develop a special relationship with each child.				
44. Teach anger management strategies to bullies.				
60. Teach bullies and victims verbal and nonverbal communication skills (i.e., sharing opinions, communicating in situations involving conflict, listening to others, etc.)				
61. Teach collaborative conflict resolution skills to bullies and victims (i.e., teach bully and victim to become responsible for finding their own solutions through negotiation.				
Total				

Module 4: Recognizing the Bully				

36. Differentiate between the different forms of bullying (aggressive, passive, relational)				
37. Teach student to recognize and identify the different types of bullies, their characteristics and behaviors.				
38. Understand how bullying behaviors develop.				
39. Acknowledge the common differences between male and female bullying.				
Total				

Module 5: Recognize the Victim	**N**	**S**	**O**	**AA**
46. Recognize the warning signs of victimization.				
47. Understand the victim and their needs.				
48. Understand the "Code of Silence" that prevents children from sharing bullying incidents.				
49. Provide support for victims (i.e., create an open door policy).				
50. Recognize the different types of victims (passive, provocative, relational, and bystander).				
51. Teach students to recognized and identify the characteristics and behaviors of different types of victims.				
Total				

Module 6: Recommendations and interventions of Bullying Behaviors	**N**	**S**	**O**	**AA**
7. Recognize that I am a role model and model decision making, respect for others, and a positive attitude.				
8. Create opportunities for student success.				
9. Develop a special relationship with each child.				
15. Teach steps of problem solving and decision making for behavior problems.				
17. Defuse bully situations in the classroom immediately and tackle the issue with the bully after class, privately.				
18. Use consequences for undesirable acts/misbehavior committed by the bully.				
19. Use praise and attention to reinforce good behaviors and accomplishments.				
20. Use loss of privileges for bullies.				
22. Verbally correct/reprimand the bully individually so as to avoid reinforcing attention-seeking behavior.				
24. Contact parents regarding student misbehavior via phone call, letter, and conference.				
25. Contact parents regarding positive behavior of all students.				
27. Refer to counselor.				
28. Consult with school counselor, school psychologist, etc.				
30. Reinforce behavior, not the child (e.g., "Bob, I am proud of you for _____").				
31. Use the technique of overcorrection with bullies.				
32. Use four R's of bully control: Recognize, Remove, Review, and Respond.				
33. Reward for improvements (successive approximations of desired behaviors.				
34. Reinforce nonbullying behaviors (e.g., on-task behaviors, assertive/nonaggressive behaviors, helping behaviors, etc).				
40. Encourage bullies to understand the victim's point of view – Help bullies to develop an empathic understanding of victims.				

41. Teach bullies "non-aggressive" and "non-bullying" behavioral alternative.				
42. Teach bullies a better way of thinking – to shift from aggressive-based appraisals to assertive-based ones.				
43. Teach bullies new skills for achieving their goals.				
44. Teach anger management strategies to bullies.				
45. Use an invitational approach (encourage bully and victims to share their perspective).				
61. Teach collaborative conflict resolution skills to bullies and victims (i.e., teach bully and victim to become responsible for finding their own solutions through negotiation.				
Total				

Module 7: Recommendations and Interventions for Helping Victims	**N**	**S**	**O**	**AA**
3. Create an open door policy.				
16. Highlight strengths of victims and bullies (help student become aware of their strengths).				
21. Conduct follow-up on bullying incidents.				
29. Use teacher/student support teams as a resource for consultation and support for bullying problems.				
45. Use an invitational approach (encourage bully and victims to share their perspective).				
51. Teach students to recognized and identify the characteristics and behaviors of different types of victims.				
54. Teach victims social skills (e.g., self-presentation, non-victims body language, skills to deal with conflicts).				
53. Teach victims physical and verbal assertiveness skills (e.g., assertive words, posture, eye contact, etc).				
54. Assist victims of bullying in identifying skills and behaviors they may want to learn.				
55. Teach confidence and self-esteem building skills to victims.				
56. Teach coping skills to victims.				
57. Recognized how each student can actively prevent and intervene in bullying interactions.				
58. Teach skills for dealing with bully/victim interactions.				
Total				

Module 8: Relaxation and Coping Skills	**N**	**S**	**O**	**AA**
63. Recognize the role and impact of stress.				
64. Aware of general stress management skills.				
65. Teach stress management skills to my students.				
Total				

(Horne, Bartolomucci, & Newman-Carlson, 2003)

Appendix C

Bullying Frequency Survey

The following questions ask about the frequency of bullying.

During the last two weeks how many bullying incidents have you witnessed and/or been made aware of? Remember that bullying can be physical, social, or verbal.

a. 0 incidents
b. Less than 3 incidents
c. 3 – 6 incidents
d. 7 – 10 incidents
e. More than 10 incidents

Appendix D

Teacher Consent

Teacher _____

TEACHER CONSENT FORM

You are invited to participate in a study, "The Effectiveness Of A Teacher Led Psychoeducational Program Aimed At Reducing Bullying Behavior In Elementary Students," examining the effectiveness of a teacher led intervention program aimed at reducing bullying in elementary schools. Jenny L. Van Overbeke and Laurie Fleckenstein from the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at the University of Georgia, under the supervision of Dr. Arthur M. Horne at the University of Georgia, are conducting this research study. This is a one-year research study of the effectiveness of a teacher led Psychoeducational bullying intervention program. The purpose of the research is to discover how increased knowledge and awareness of the phenomenon of bullying affects teachers and students' abilities to prevent bullying and intervene in bullying situations.

The following point have been explained to me:

1) The reason for this research is to help evaluate the effectiveness of the Bully Busting For Elementary Schools manual. The manual is intended to increase student and teacher effectiveness in dealing with bullying and victimization.
2) If you chose to participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a pre and post-program behavior questionnaire for each child with parental permission in your class, a teacher report of knowledge and skills related to dealing with bullying, a teacher report of efficacy, and surveys measuring the training and support sessions. Together these measures will take approximately no more than ten hours per academic year. In addition, you will participate in a pre-program training at the beginning of the school year and one-hour monthly teacher support groups. Finally, children in your class, with parent permission, will be asked to complete one questionnaire at the beginning and end of the school year. This activity will take not more than one hour per year and will be administered by the researchers.
3) No discomforts or stresses are foreseen.
4) No risks are foreseen.
5) Participation in this study is voluntary. The results of your participation will be confidential, and will not be released in any individually identifiable form without your prior consent, unless otherwise required by law. No one will be able to identify your results of this study. Refusal to participate or withdrawal from participation will not in any way penalize you. You may have results of the participation, to the extent that they can be identified as yours, returned to you, removed from the research records, or destroyed at any time prior to the end of the study.
6) You will receive a stipend for participating in this research study. If you fully participate by implementing the eight modules from the manual, attending the training, and the

group sessions as well as complete the aforementioned data collection instruments, you will receive a $100.00 stipend. If you choose to participate in a control group capacity, by only completing the aforementioned data collection instruments, you will receive a $50.00 stipend.

The researcher will answer any further questions about the research, now of during the course of the project. You are encouraged to ask questions. You may talk with the researcher or the advising professor:

Jenny L. Van Overbeke; The University of Georgia, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, Athens, GA 30602. Telephone: (706) 549-0835. E-mail: jennyvano@aol.com

Laurie Fleckenstein; The University of Georgia, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, Athens, GA 30602. Telephone: (706) 549-0835. E-mail: lflecken2000@yahoo.com

Dr. Arthur M. Horne, The University of Georgia, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, Athens, GA 30602. Telephone: (706) 542-41074. E-mail: ahorne@coe.uga.edu

Signature of Researcher: _____Date_____

Signature of Researcher: _____Date_____

I understand the nature of this research and consent to participate.

Signed: _____(Participating Teacher)

Date: _____

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write:
Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D.
Human Subjects Office
University of Georgia
606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center
Athens, Georgia 30602-7411
Telephone: (706) 542-6514
E-Mail Address: IRB@uga.edu

PLEASE SIGN BOTH COPIES OF THIS FORM. KEEP ONE AND RETURN THE OTHER TO THE RESEARCHER.

Appendix E

Student/Parent Consent

Teacher _____

PARENT CONSENT FORM

Your child's school has been selected to take part in a program titled, "The Effectiveness Of A Teacher Led Psychoeducational Program Aimed At Reducing Bullying Behavior In Elementary Students." Jenny L. Van Overbeke and Laurie Fleckenstein from the Department of Counseling and Human Development Services at the University of Georgia under the supervision of Dr. Arthur M. Horne at the University of Georgia are conducting this program and study. Your child's class will participate in lessons on increasing students' ability to cooperate and work together in the classroom. As part of the program, I am conducting evaluative research to examine how well the program reduces bullying. All of the students in your child's class are invited to participate in this study. You do not have to allow your child to be in this study if you do not want to. Your child can stop taking part at any time without giving reason, and without penalty. The information related to your child can be removed from the research records or destroyed at any time at your request.

- The reason for this study is to find out if working with all students in the classroom to prevent aggressive and disruptive classroom behavior by addressing bullying behaviors is effective.
- Children who take part in the lessons may improve their communication, anger management, and problem solving skills. The researchers also hope to learn about ways to help students decrease and prevent bullying in the future.
- Your child will be asked to participate in class discussions and education about bullying and victimization. Lessons will occur throughout the school year and will last 15-45 minutes. These lessons will not interfere with other school activities and academic subjects. Students will participate in activities aimed at preventing bullying behaviors; these activities will be in the form of discussions, art activities, language arts related activities, and role-plays.
- If you allow your child to participate in the research study, your child will be asked to complete a questionnaire about his/her perceptions of bullying related behaviors in his/her classroom before and after the program. If you decide you do not want your child to participate then he/she will be allowed to stop without penalty.
- Your child's teacher will be completing a questionnaire describing your child's behavior before and after the group. Teachers will also be surveyed about their perceptions of bullying related behaviors in the classroom, and their own skills and knowledge related to handling bullying behaviors in the classroom. In addition, information will be gathered from the school database with regards to gender, age, race, and discipline referrals.
- The research is not expected to cause any harm or discomfort. Your child can quit the study at any time. Your child's grade will not be affected if he or she decides to stop taking part in the research program.

- Any information collected about your child will be held confidential unless otherwise required by law. Your child's identity will be coded and all data will be kept in a secure location. Information will be provided to your child's school summarizing the results of classroom and school-wide responses, however, individual responses will not be identifiable.
- The researcher will answer any questions about research procedures, now or during the project, and can be reached by telephone at 706-549-0835. You may also contact the professor supervising the project, Dr. Arthur M. Horne, at 542-4107.

Jenny L. Van Overbeke; The University of Georgia, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, Athens, GA 30602. Telephone: (706) 549-0835. E-mail: jennyvano@aol.com

Laurie Fleckenstein; The University of Georgia, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, Athens, GA 30602. Telephone: (706) 549-0835. E-mail: lflecken2000@yahoo.com

Dr. Arthur M. Horne, The University of Georgia, Department of Counseling and Human Development Services, Athens, GA 30602. Telephone: (706) 542-41074. E-mail: ahorne@coe.uga.edu

Signature of Researcher: _____Date_____

Signature of Researcher: _____Date_____

I understand the study procedures described above. My questions have been answered to my satisfaction, and I agree to allow my child to take part in this study. I have been given a copy of this form to keep.

Child's Name: _____

Signature of Parent or Guardian: _____

Date: _____

For questions or problems about your rights please call or write:
Chris A. Joseph, Ph.D.
Human Subjects Office
University of Georgia
606A Boyd Graduate Studies Research Center
Athens, Georgia 30602-7411
Telephone: (706) 542-6514
E-Mail Address: IRB@uga.edu

PLEASE SIGN BOTH COPIES OF THIS FORM. KEEP ONE AND RETURN THE OTHER TO YOUR CHILD'S TEACHER.