Principal and Teacher Perceptions of the Effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program

Carolyn Spears Daugherty
Approval of Dissertation Form

The Dissertation Committee for Lincoln Memorial University certify that this is the approved version of the following dissertation:

PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE OLWEUS BULLYING PREVENTION PROGRAM

Committee:

________________________________
Committee Chairperson, Date

________________________________
Content Member, Date

________________________________
Methodologist, Date

________________________________
Director, Date

________________________________
Dean’s Name/Date

________________________________
Vice President Academic Affairs, Date
Lincoln Memorial University
Carter and Moyers School of Education
Executive Leadership Department

Dissertation Committee
Dr. Frances Swantic, Chair
Dr. Gary Peevely
Dr. Gregory Duthey

PRINCIPAL AND TEACHER PERCEPTIONS OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE OLWEUS BULLYING PREVENTION PROGRAM

By
Carolyn Spears Daugherty

A dissertation presented to the graduate school of Lincoln Memorial University in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Education

April 2011
Dedication

This dissertation is dedicated to my soul mate, husband, and best friend Jason Daugherty. This paper would not have been possible without his faith in me, his patience, his love, and support. Jason gave up vacations, time with friends, and time with family so I could work for two years on this project. He is the strongest, most selfless person I know.

This dissertation is also dedicated to my parents, Preston and Cindy Spears. They provided a true foundation of love and support to guide me. They made me believe that I could do anything in this world. I am beyond blessed to have them as my parents.
Acknowledgments

Several people contributed to the success of this study. Dr. Frances Swantic inspired the idea for this research. As my chair, she listened, guided, supported, and critiqued when necessary. Her knowledge of the process and her caring spirit made this process a positive one. Dr. Gary Peevely, my methodologist, introduced me to a whole new world in academia. He rightly suggested I sit “under the tree” to think about all I needed to absorb during this program to be successful. His support is appreciated beyond words. Committee member Dr. Gregory Duthey assisted with content and formatting guidance. Dr. Cynthia Norris, director of the program, is the epitome of grace and leadership; her example inspired the entire cohort to strive for excellence. Robin Moody was an exceptional guide to support and keep me on the right path.
Abstract

The purpose of this study was to explore the effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP) and to provide an annotated bibliography of professional literature related to bullying for professional educators. The OBPP used a whole school approach and taught common vocabulary to define the word bullying. Bullying rose to front-page news in recent years and the events led to injuries, death, and even suicide. Long-term effects were severe and included self-esteem issues. The OBPP was one of the better-known programs; however, there were contradictory reports on its effectiveness. This mixed methods study gauged teacher and principal perceptions of the effectiveness of the OBPP. Principals and teachers were surveyed and follow-up interviews were conducted with the principals to better explain the survey results. This study affirmed that the OBPP was effective as measured by these teachers and principals. Based on this sample, results indicated that the OBPP was an effective tool to reduce bullying in the elementary school populations involved in this study. A recommendation stemming from the completion of this study was that the manner in which data on bullying is collected be streamlined. Further research may delve into the possibilities of consistent data collection nationwide to properly assess the bullying phenomena and navigate appropriate programs as solutions.
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Chapter 1: Introduction to the Problem

In November of 1998 a thirteen-year-old boy was punched when exiting his school bus in a north Georgia County. The young boy suffered fatal brain stem trauma. The neighbor youth who inflicted this violence had a history of reproachable behaviors. For months, the victim had been teased, harassed, and had things thrown at him by the fifteen year old neighbor (Bixler, 1998). In 1994, at a Cherokee County, Georgia, high school a boy shot himself in his classroom, allegedly from the torment he had suffered at the hands of bullies (Shear & Salmon, 1999). In April 2009, another Georgia eleven-year-old boy committed suicide; his parents insisted this was a result of being bullied at school (Walker, 2009). “In the late 1990’s a series of school shootings shook the foundation of American public education and forced a re-evaluation of the nature and scope of school-based prevention” (Jenson & Dieterich, 2007, p. 1). Reports concluded that bullying led to fatal consequences for students in Georgia (Bixler, 1998; Walker, 2009).

Coloroso (2008) defined bullying is an imbalance of power where one person intends to harm another person physically or emotionally; she identified types of bullying to include name-calling, exclusion, physical violence, threats, property damage, telling lies, racial comments, sexual comments, and cyber-bullying. This behavior can take place in multiple settings within a school building. The Hazelden Foundation (2011) discovered that students faced this difficult situation in classrooms, lunchrooms, playgrounds, and hallways. Also, because most bullying behaviors were established to be verbally damaging and not physically abusive, some bullying behavior was difficult to prove (Sullivan, Cleary, & Sullivan, 2004). Children had difficulty telling adults when there were no physical marks on the child to show as evidence.
Bardick and Bernes (2008) suggested that violent behaviors perpetrated bullying and harassment. Olweus (1993) forecasted that bullies, as well as their victims, would be at risk for life-long mental and physical damage. Singer and Flannery (2000) surmised that harassment and threats were a cause for concern because these actions led to aggressive behavior. From life examples, it could be ascertained that school bullying, if not addressed, would be catastrophic.

Dan Olweus, a psychology researcher at the University of Bergen in Norway, created an anti-bullying program to address bullying in schools (Jenson & Dieterich, 2007). His research spanned nearly 40 years of investigative work with bullying behaviors of school children (Hazelden Foundation, 2011). Sheras (2002) called Olweus one of the “preeminent researchers in the field” (p.7). Olweus’ work from 1991 through 1999 involved thousands of children and realized a reduction in self-reported bullying and victimization upon implementation of the Olweus Program (Olweus, Limber, & Mihalic, 2002).

The National Institute of Child Health and Human Development (2001) funded a survey to assess bullying rates in the United States. The results of this survey showed that more than 16% of children were bullied in school. Mueller and Parisi (2002) concurred, stating that nearly 160,000 children in the United States were fearful of attending school each day for reasons such as being teased or bullied. Children should feel safe in their school environments. Other worries distract from learning.

Background of the Study

In 1943, Abraham Maslow proposed what is now known as Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs. The visual representation to explain the psychological theory was in the form of a pyramid (see Figure 1). The very bottom of the pyramid represented the most basic of
physiological needs, such as breathing, food, water, sleep, homeostasis, and excretion. The next most basic need was safety, and the remaining three were love and belonging, esteem, and self-actualization (Maslow, 1943).

Safety is a basic need for children. In a federal hearing entitled Strengthening School Safety Through Prevention of Bullying (2009), Chairwoman McCarthy stated, “Students cannot learn and teachers cannot teach in environments that aren’t safe, or if they are frightening. Schools should be sanctuaries…not places where children have to worry about physical or emotional violence” (p. 2). Edmondson and Hoover (2008) reported that in a rural Illinois county, only 50% of students felt safe at school. Within the county 70% of fifth grade students reported being bullied, while another 70% reported bullying others; the two groups were not mutually exclusive. Of the 452 students surveyed, almost half reported
being teased about their looks, over half were excluded, and half confirmed they were punched or kicked. Unfortunately, half had not observed an adult intervene in the bullying situation (Edmondson & Hoover, 2008). At times, these behaviors were seen as kids just being kids.

Edmondson and Hoover’s (2008) conclusions provided information to prompt action. They assessed the data, needs were analyzed, and the mid-western county health department offered a program to alleviate occurrences. Many strategies were implemented including building consistency throughout the school using recommendations based on Olweus’s work. The health department implemented this strategy with an overall wellness approach (Edmondson & Hoover, 2008). Specific strategies included forming a task force and spreading the word that bullying is unacceptable; implementing a school conference day or anti-bullying day; creating class rules against bullying; holding class meetings to practice problem solving; speaking to parents, victims, and bullies; and teaching social skills.

Edmondson and Hoover found the program increased the number of reported infractions, the staff had a higher sensitivity to the bullying issue, there was an increase in “reaching out” behavior, and “feelings of safety were increased” (p. 5).

In many cases parents, teachers, and counselors were oblivious to the extent of bullying. Sullivan et al. (2004) determined that students may not report incidents because it was likely that adults would not or could not change the bullying behavior. They found that locations such as the cafeteria, playground, and bus were difficult to supervise, but if all staff were trained to identify and put a stop to the behavior, the overall school climate could improve. Whole school approaches were most popular in current research trends (Sullivan et al., 2004).
A whole school approach focused on the entire school population as well as the surrounding population (Sullivan et al., 2004). A whole school approach brought in teachers, principals, and even community members to participate in the whole school program for bully prevention (Sullivan et al., 2004). Unlike simply addressing students individually, or addressing a classroom of students solely, the whole school approach was more encompassing and supported involvement from all stakeholders.

The Donegal Anti-Bullying Project was the result of a 1993-94 nationwide study on bully behavior conducted in Ireland. The study concluded that bullying was a widespread issue affecting primary and post-primary schools (O’Moore & Minton, 2004). The Donegal Project encompassed four components: a training component to educate teachers and students, a resource kit to assist teachers with implementation, a resource kit for the parents including an informational pamphlet, and an agreement that all stakeholders would work together to ensure a zero tolerance ideal for bullying behaviors (O’Moore & Minton, 2004).

The more people who become sensitive to the bullying issue, the more likely it is to be extinguished. The Nonviolent Campaign emphasized collaboration with parents paired with strict anti-bullying beliefs (Koivisto, 2004). Again, this campaign stressed zero tolerance. The students created class rules together, and the school staff intervened immediately in any bullying action (Koivisto, 2004).

Another effective program was the Professional Development Program. This program’s focus was based upon quality and learning in an elementary school with adult intervention as a key component of the program (Roland & Galloway, 2004). The Professional Development Program was based on four issues: ensuring individual quality
care, creating routines, monitoring progress and social skills, and intervening when problematic situations arise (Roland & Galloway, 2004).

The Steps to Respect program was a multi-faceted program involving a change in the school environment (Committee for Children, 2009). It encompassed a set curriculum and training among staff, classrooms, and parent outreach. The Steps to Respect program also addressed the bystander issue (Committee for Children, 2009). Lodge and Frydenberg (2006) looked at the role peers play as bystanders of bullying. Several factors played into the participation of bystanders who watch, join in, support the bully, or support the victim. The factors included whether the person was a friend of the bully or a friend of the victim, whether the person had low or high self-esteem, and his or her levels of self-restraint. Bystanders may not become involved for fear of being the next victim, lack of self-esteem, or lack of acceptable strategies (Lodge & Frydenberg, 2006).

The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP) provided a program implementation for the entire school. It emphasized bringing awareness to students, teachers, and parents (Hazelden Foundation, 2011). According to Jenson and Dieterich (2007), “With the exception of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program, there is a lack of efficacious anti-bullying programs in the United States” (p. 294). The program utilized class rules, class meetings, and meeting with individuals (Hazelden Foundation, 2011). Olweus stressed the differentiation between teasing and bullying (Limber, 2006). Limber suggested that bullying is repeated, intentional, and power-based.

Statement of the Problem

It was troublesome that in the public school system many children felt unsafe at school. In Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, safety was a key component to wellness and
learning (Maslow, 1943). Georgia Bullying Law (2010) required school districts to implement an anti-bullying program in grades six through 12, or state funding could be withheld. The OBPP had been implemented in fifteen out of twenty-three elementary schools in a large school district in north Georgia. It was implemented during a zone initiative during the 2006-2007 school year. The OBPP was implemented a few schools at a time, but with fidelity and accordance to the Olweus protocols. Dr. Mike Carpenter (2004), a National Olweus trainer, provided professional development for the program’s implementation. This district acknowledged that bullying behaviors were unacceptable. To date, however, the effectiveness of the OBPP within this county had not been examined, and no data had been collected to examine the perspectives of the principals and teachers.

Principals and teachers work with students and bullying issues daily. They are responsible for how each situation is handled. They witness first-hand any problems in their schools. Knowing that many school districts have adopted the OBPP as the solution to the bullying problem, more information was needed on how effective this program was according to those people who were accountable. Perceptions of the OBPP’s effectiveness were examined in three elementary schools in a north Georgia school district using principal and teacher surveys and principal interviews.

**Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this study was to examine whether teachers and principals within the elementary schools that implemented this bullying prevention program in this specific Georgia school system perceived the OBPP as being effective. Information provided by principals and teachers revealed the perceived effectiveness of the program. Study results provided information to ascertain if the time, money, and effort expended on the OBPP has
made a difference in the bullying issue in general. A secondary purpose to this research was to create an annotated bibliography of professional literature related to bullying for school district personnel.

**Research Questions**

Research questions addressed were:

R1 What were principals’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program?

R2 What were teachers’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program?

R3 What were some unintended consequences of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program?

**Definition of Terms**

The following terms were operational during this study.

*Bully.* A person who purposefully tried to harm another individual was a bully (Olweus, 2003). A bully tried to hurt others and took joy in that harm (Coloroso, 2008).

*Bullying.* Bullying was repeated unwanted behaviors over time, where one exerted strength over another (Hazelden, 2011). Bullying was physical, emotional, and verbal and was exerted by a person with more power against a less powerful person (Baldry & Farrington, 2007).

*Bully-Victims.* They provoked the bully and may cause much of the bullying to occur. Pellegrini (1998) called them hot-tempered.

*Bystander.* A bystander was a person who stands by and does nothing (Coloroso, 2008).
Cyberbullying. A method of bullying, which used technology such as, texting, emails, web blogs, and social networking sites (Olweus et al., 2007).

Flooding. Blocking others from communicating by pressing the submit button on a computer and holding it down (Maher, 2008).

Provocative Victim. A provocative victim was a student whose behavior could provoke negative actions from others (Olweus, 1993).

Victim. A person was a victim when he or she was the object of repeated physical, emotional, or verbal harm on the part of the same child or children (Olweus, 1993). A victim was harassed because he was considered different or vulnerable (Coloroso, 2008).

Assumptions

The researcher approached the study with the ontological assumption that there were multiple realities within the effectiveness of the OBPP and realized that different demographic samples could have yielded varying results; therefore, demographically, this sample was limited. The study utilized a convenience sampling, and each school surveyed had similar demographics. It was assumed that conducting this same study within a different population could demonstrate a different perspective from teachers and principals.

Epistemologically, the researcher was part of the study during the interview phase. The researcher was neither trained in the OBPP, nor worked in a school where it was implemented, and therefore brought little bias to the study. The researcher had no vested interest in the OBPP’s triumphs or failures. The researcher’s axiological assumption was that her values and beliefs had no effect on the survey or the interview questions. The survey was piloted for validity and reliability using quantitative and qualitative measures. The final survey’s data was collected quantitatively. The interview questions were created based on
the analysis of the survey results. Through the process, the researcher did believe in a safe learning environment for all children, and that bullying would be a disruption to that goal.

**Organization of the Remainder of the Study**

Chapter 1 presents an overview of the study, including some literature to support the background, purpose and methodology of this research, as well as operational definitions of terms. Chapter 2 provides a thorough review of the literature related to types of bullies, roles in bullying, perceptions, strategies and programs to alleviate bullying, and laws against bullying. Chapter 3 examines the research questions, instrumentation, the population sampling, limitations, and delimitations. Chapter 4 explores the data from the surveys as well as the interviews. Chapter 5 is dedicated to recommendations for practice and future research, as well as implications derived from this study.

**Summary**

Bullying undermined the ability of a school to facilitate learning in a worry-free environment and introduced physical harm and emotional instability; bullying left a child feeling friendless. Safety was a key component to a child’s wellness and learning, as well as a desire to feel needed (Maslow, 1943). Bixler (1998) and Walker (2009) suggested that bullying in Georgia was responsible for fatal consequences. The Hazelden Foundation (2011) recommended the OBPP as a whole school approach to extinguish bullying in schools. This research study analyzed perceptions of principals and teachers through survey and follow up principal interviews; it concluded that the OBPP was perceived as an effective program within a sample of elementary schools in north Georgia.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

Background on Bullying

Koo (2007) attempted to retrace the history of bullying by evaluating the eighteenth century. Based on Victorian Era news clippings and historical documents, bullying was harassment in the physical form and was correlated with isolation of children (Koo, 2007). Koo identified hazing in the military and the discipline of children from different cultures as the first recorded acts of bullying. From 1603 to 1866, the Japanese ignored children as a form of punishment; this practice was referred to as Ijime. Koreans used a similar form of psychological isolation, called Myunsinrae, from 1392 until 1910, for new cadets in the military (Koo, 2007). These examples pinpointed parts of bullying definitions, but were much too general to fit with the contemporary definition used in most schools today, which covered direct and indirect bullying.

Green (2007) reviewed Dan Olweus' definition of bullying, which states, "a student is being bullied when he or she is exposed repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more students" (p. 1). Green also differentiated between direct bullying, such as kicking, shoving, and hitting, and indirect bullying, such as rejection, name-calling, gossip, or threats. A person’s intention must have been to harm another person, and bullying involved repetition of the act (Koo, 2007). Intention and repetition were vital components to determine if the act is indeed bullying (Koo, 2007).

As the literature indicated, bullying was not a new behavior, but has been in existence for decades (Green, 2007). Over the past decade, incidents of school violence have been linked to a history of bullying victimization upon the perpetrators (Olweus, 1993; Smith, Pepler, & Rigby, 2004; Vossekui, Fein, Reddy, Borun, & Modzeleski, 2002). School
shootings rocked the United States and gave way to a focus on bullying prevention programs (Olweus, 1993; Smith et al., 2004; Voskuil et al., 2002). Nansel et al. (2001) reported findings that nearly 30 percent of students admitted to being part of the bully or victim dynamic. Olweus (2003) found that bullying and victimization began as young as eight years old and continued on to age sixteen. A study by Brown, Birch, and Kancherla (2005) surveyed opinions of 1,229 students in the age bracket of nine to 13. This research revealed what other research also showed; one third of students reported being bullied at some time. The Brown et al. study showed that a majority of the bullying was happening in middle school. Some believe this was simply a natural part of growing up and could not be avoided; however, lasting academic, physical, and psychological consequences exist (Feldman, 2004).

Sheras (2002) identified myths associated with the bullying phenomenon. He referenced myths on how bullying works, those involved, and responses to bullying. It was not true that only boys are bullies. Likewise, it was not always the case that bullies were the social outcasts, and the bullied were not always the nerds in class (Sheras, 2002). Children had at their disposal a multitude of responses to bullying; however, these responses were not guaranteed to be effective. Common misconceptions included the belief that ignoring the bully or situation would make the behavior stop; standing up to the bully would cause him or her to go away; and assuming that bullies would not change their behavior, but it was the victim who must fix the situation (Sheras, 2002).

According to Olweus (2003), several myths existed with respect to reasons for bullying. Adequate data did not exist to support these as actual reasons for bullying (Olweus, 2003). Myths could have misappropriated attention to the wrong focus and skewed the direction for bullying prevention programs. Some myths included large class sizes, failing in
school, being overweight, wearing glasses, having a varied origin of ethnicity, or speaking a different language (Olweus, 2003). These were often thought to be the instigating criteria for becoming a victim; however, Olweus stated that individual personalities and general environment were the areas to look in to find the creation of the bullying dynamic. Sheras (2002) agreed that it was more plausible that low self-esteem and poor social connections were to blame for the bullying phenomenon, although those physical characteristics could have increased the possibility of becoming a victim. If myths are accepted as factual information, those responsible for choosing prevention programs could have been misled.

Catastrophic events led to emergent changes, but memories faded along with initiatives. Reaction to catastrophic violence has been addressed through the 1986 Drug-Free Schools Act and the 1990 Gun-Free School Zones Act (Mayer & Cornell, 2010). That gun law from 1990 was modified in the state of Georgia in April of 2010 under State Bill 308, which allowed licensed guns on school grounds. The gun must be kept in a vehicle (Firearm Carrying and Possession, 2010). Could a future disastrous event trigger doubt and overturn this law?

The American Psychological Association’s Zero Tolerance Task Force concluded that America’s oversimplified solutions for school violence, such as the Zero Tolerance Policy, have not only not worked, but have caused more problems, such as an increase in negative student behaviors and increased dropout rates (Mayer & Cornell, 2010). Mayer and Cornell also addressed the fact that bullying has been ignored as a serious problem; it is omnipresent. If bullying is perceived as kids being kids, or budgetary funding is lacking to implement some sort of program or anti-bullying initiative, the violence will continue or even worsen.
Definition of Bullying

A lack of consistency regarding an appropriate definition for bullying persists. Researchers have also struggled with a universal measure to assess degrees of bullying (Swearer, Espeledge, Vaillancourt, & Hymel, 2010). According to Baldry and Farrington (2007) “bullying is physical, psychological, or verbal actions perpetrated by a more powerful person or group of persons against a weaker person with the intention of causing harm” (p. 183). Types of bullying included name-calling, exclusion, physical violence, threats, damaging one’s property, telling lies about someone, racial comments, sexual comments, and cyber-bullying. The Hazelden Foundation (2011) found that bullying could be initiated anywhere; students could have faced this difficult situation in various locations within a school campus. It was crucial that children understood the phenomena and participated in measures to alleviate it. At some point in their lives almost all students will be the bully, the bullied, or the bystander (Feldman, 2004). It would be unusual for a student to not experience one or more of these roles.

Within the proactive, reactive, physical, and verbal types of the act of bullying there were some distinct characteristics of a bully. There were confident bullies who owned especially powerful personalities, no empathy, and huge egos (Coloroso, 2008). Social bullies excluded, rejected, and were usually popular. A fully armored bully was cool, yet vicious; he seemed to lack true feelings. The hyperactive bully lacked social skills and did not perform well in school. The bullied bully reacted to his own bullying by bullying others. Coloroso also distinguished between a cluster of bullies as a group who fell to the mob mentality to the gang of bullies who joined together to dominate and held power over others.
Types of bullies. Five types of bullies were identified: proactive, reactive, physical, verbal, and cyber.

Proactive bully. The proactive bully was most often seen at the elementary level and was the most serious type of bully (McAdams & Schmidt, 2007). This was the premeditated methodical aggression without reason. In a survey of administrators between 1982 and 2000, the rate of this type of aggression had increased from one in five instances to one in three (McAdams & Schmidt, 2007). The proactive aggressor manipulated the situation to wreak the most havoc. The proactive aggressor’s behavior would persist unchanged until he or she found empathy for the victims. McAdams and Schmidt found that intervention would be necessary to amend the actions of those children (McAdams & Schmidt, 2007).

Reactive bully. The most difficult to discover was the reactive bully. This child antagonized others until the point of retaliation, and then the reactive bully reacted and defended him or herself (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). This type of bully was occasionally referred to as the provocative victim (Olweus, 2003). Reactive aggression tended to be purposeful and premeditated (McAdams & Schmidt, 2007). The reactive aggressor was described as the hot-blooded, instant aggressor. He or she exhibited intense active aggression due to a threat. These students were determined to be unpredictable and were said to have a short fuse. They demonstrated immediate remorse. Reactive bullies had an automatic defense that kicked into action, and when the threat had passed, so had the aggression (McAdams & Schmidt, 2007).

Physical bully. The physical bully left physical evidence such as bruises, scratches, or damaged property, and physical bullying accounted for one third of reported issues (Coloroso, 2008). Physical bullying included hitting, kicking, biting, and choking (Coloroso,
Physical evidence represented concrete proof that victimization had occurred. Proof of victimization typically led to greater immediate consequences for the bully. It was also easier to justify separating the bully from the victim.

**Verbal bully.** The verbal bully, also called a relational bully, was most often female; this behavior manifested itself through exclusion and rejection (Coloroso, 2008). Goldstein, Young, and Byrd (2008) stressed that loneliness, anxiety, and peer difficulties were related to relational aggression. Research showed that physical and verbal harm affected the development and academic success of students; however, other forms of aggression, such as rejection and exclusion, were just as damaging (Goldstein et al., 2008).

**Cyber-bully.** A cyber-bully used technology to torment his or her victim. Cyber-bullying was not usually extreme, but was reported in the press quite often (Maher, 2008). In his qualitative ethnographic case study, Maher investigated cyber-bullying by following fifth and sixth grade students for a year. Students were given class projects that involved using the Internet. The different tools for the project included a class website, a chat room format, guest book, and an email service. The students’ grades would not be affected if they did not access these things from home, though they were given that option. Maher chronicled events weekly and found bullying to be an issue, but not the serious issue that the media spins it to be. The differences with boys and girls and cyber-bullying were obvious. Boys bullied more online than girls. Boys used more serious language and tone. Girls tended to use masquerade; they would pose as someone else to hurt feelings. Flooding was used by the boys and involved blocking others from communicating by pressing the submit button and holding it down. Because schools had boundaries as to what could be enforced in and out of
school, considerable cooperation between schools and parents would be required to manage cyber-bullying (Maher, 2008).

**Bullying roles.** The bully, the victim, the bully/victim, and the bystander were the roles of any given bullying situation (Cowie, 1998; Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). Unfortunately, at some point during their schooling, most children have participated in some aspect of the bullying phenomenon.

**Bullies.** A bully suffered from low self-esteem, aggression, hostility, and demonstrated poorer psychosocial functioning than their peers (Smokowski & Kopasz., 2005; Veenstra et al., 2005). Schafer, Korn, Brodbeck, Wolke, and Schulz (2005) referred to the bully’s role as a “search for dominance” (p. 325). Many times bullies were considered the popular kids (Pellegrini, 1998), and one study alluded that bullies often make friends very easily (Nansel et al., 2001). Bullies themselves could be at risk for physical harm as well and suffer from guilt (McAdams & Schmidt, 2007). Approximately 10% to 20% of children fell into the bully category (Swearer et al., 2010).

**Victims.** Victims tended to be insecure, depressed, and more quiet and cautious than their friends (Olweus, 1993). They suffered from feelings of loneliness and anxiety, dealt with academic difficulties, and, in rare cases, victims retaliated with violence or harm themselves (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). Nearly 85% of victims have been identified as being passive or submissive (Olweus, 2003). Victims tended to demonstrate lower levels of self-esteem when compared to bullies or those not involved at all in bullying (Houbre, Tarquinio, Thuillier, & Hergott, 2006). A link to post traumatic stress disorder and future substance abuse in victims has been investigated as well (Houbre et al., 2006). Victims were
ashamed, afraid of retaliation, felt helpless, and sometimes believed that it was just part of growing up (Coloroso, 2008).

**Bully-victims.** Bully-victims provoked the bully and may have caused much of the bullying to occur. Pellegrini (1998) called bully-victims hot-tempered; they overreacted to being bumped into in the hallway and retaliated quickly. Bully-victims were also periodically called provocative victims or aggressive victims, and many times they received negative reactions from the other students and even the teacher (Olweus, 2003). This negative reaction further isolated the child from positive peer and adult interactions. About half of the bullies reported being victims as well (Veenstra et al., 2005). Bully-victims tended to lack self-control and social acceptance, and suffered from depression (Veenstra et al., 2005). Houbre et al. (2006) used tools to identify self-concept, which was measured using Harter's (1982) Self-Perception Profile for Children. A bullying questionnaire, the Peer Victimization Scale, and the Bullying Behaviour Scale were used (Austin & Joseph, 1996). The first scale showed that those who both bully and also suffer as victims had the lowest opinions of themselves. Victims and then the bullies, respectively, showed the next lowest opinions of themselves (Houbre et al., 2006). Sheras (2002) explained that children who fit the bully-victim role may have suffered victimization with little or no parental support and, as a result, have become intolerably angry. Houbre et al. also concluded that children could have certain character traits such as impulsivity, arrogance, and even extroversion, which predisposed them to bullying behaviors.

**Bystanders.** Brown et al. (2005) noted that bystanders played the most important role and were a possible answer to stop bullying. Lodge and Frydenberg (2006) further explored the role peers play as bystanders of bullying. The research studied perceptions after students...
were given vignettes displaying verbal attacks on a student. Several factors played into the participation of bystanders who watch, join in, support the bully, or support the victim. The factors included whether the person was a friend of the bully or a friend of the victim, whether the person had low or high self-esteem, and his level of self-restraint. Bystanders may not have become involved for fear of being the next victim, lack of self-esteem, or lack of acceptable strategies (Lodge & Frydenberg, 2006). Bystanders affected a bullying situation positively or negatively but did not engage because they feared they would be targeted next; bullies themselves had an inflated sense of power and rationalized their behavior (Craig & Pepler, 2007). Craig and Pepler (2007) reported that in 85% of bullying situations bystanders either joined in on the bullying or provided negative attention to the problem. Sheras (2002) stressed several reasons for parents to encourage their children to avoid being a bystander. One is that it built courage. A parent would want to stress that they not endanger themselves, but that being courageous was noteworthy. A second reason was that saving another person from harm was the right thing to do. And third, avoidance increased the child’s self-esteem; other children looked to that individual as being strong. The final reason would be to avoid the heavy guilt that could weigh on a young conscience.

**Perceptions of Bullying**

It was important to understand the varying perceptions when examining the bullying issue. A student had an experience at school; maybe the teacher witnessed it, and maybe other children observed. The child went home and reported the situation to the parent. There would be at least four different vantage points to examine. The child perceived the situation with high emotions, as did the parent. The teacher and child witness had more objective
opinions of how things occurred. Even though perceptions differed, the bullying topic was serious and should be investigated each time it was reported.

In a study by Stockdale, Hangaduambo, Duys, Larson, and Sarvela (2002), surveys were given to students and teachers simultaneously. Only students whose parents agreed and gave consent were surveyed. Parent surveys were sent home for completion. Seven hundred thirty nine students in fourth through sixth grades, 367 parents, and 37 teachers were surveyed (Stockdale et al., 2002). When parents filled out the parent survey, a majority did not follow directions and indicate their own child's name; therefore, certain deductions could not be made. The results suggested that while parents and teachers understood the various forms of bullying better than the students, the students indicated being bullied more often than parents and teachers acknowledged (Stockdale et al., 2002).

Many times teachers projected their own experiences with bullying onto how they dealt with situations (Bradshaw, Sawyer, & O’Brennan, 2007). Elementary school staff tended to underestimate the frequency of bullying in school (Bradshaw et al., 2007). McAdams and Schmidt (2007) stated, “Teachers have reported that they feel unprepared to recognize and handle the kinds of bullying that they are encountering in the classroom” (p.1).

A unique look at children’s perspectives was through a study that examined the drawings of children as they depicted bullies and bullying situations. Bosacki, Dane, and Dane (2006) polled 30 nine year olds, 18 nine to ten year olds, and 34 twelve year olds. The children were asked to draw someone being bullied, and then interviews were conducted to ask open-ended questions to get a brief story of their drawing. They were asked questions such as:
...How do you think the bully feels? What is the bully thinking? Why would he/she want to bully? How do you think the one being picked on...feels? What is she/he thinking? Why is he/she being picked on? What could he/she do so that he/she is not picked on? (Bosacki et al., 2006, p. 234)

Children's responses overall correlated with the current research (Bosacki et al., 2006). Approximately 70% of the children said the bully was trying to make the other child feel sad. Half of the children felt as if the bully had positive emotions from inflicting harm. Of the children asked, 98% felt the victim was having negative emotions. When asked about reacting to the bully, 40% said to tell a teacher, 27% suggested making friends with the bully, 23% stated to walk away, 17% suggested ignoring the bully, and only 12% said to confront (Bosacki et al., 2006). Though the sample was small and homogenous in race and socioeconomic standing, the qualitative procedure asking children open-ended questions provided much insight (Brown et al., 2006).

Smith, Schneider, Smith, and Ananiadou (2004) studied 14 whole school bullying prevention programs and demonstrated that slight changes, if any, were found with student self-reports of bullying behaviors. It could be, however, that the perceived increases were due to an increase in awareness. Within bullying intervention studies, the validity of self-reports were seldom questioned (Swearer et al., 2010). Self-report studies were rarely questioned, predominately because they were used most frequently to assess schools and program implementation.

In the United States, one in five children in elementary school suffered from bullying (Brown et al., 2005). Both the bully and the victim experienced health consequences, such as headaches, stomachaches, insomnia, anxiety, and depression (Brown et al., 2005). Goldstein,
Young, and Byrd (2008) stressed that loneliness, anxiety, and peer difficulties were evident. Houbre et al. (2006) concluded that the deviant child, or the bully, would follow the deviant pattern and end up with a type of substance abuse problem. Bully-victims were shown to have more psychosomatic difficulties (Houbre et al., 2006).

Victims tended to be insecure, depressed, and more quiet and cautious than their friends (Olweus, 1993). Sheras (2002) indicated that the drastic drops in a victim’s self-esteem could have affected his or her later years. McAdams and Schmidt (2007) stated that possible consequences of physical harm, mental harm, attendance problems, and so on, existed for the victims, who suffered from feelings of loneliness, anxiety, and academic difficulties. In rare cases victims retaliated with violence or harmed themselves (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). Stockdale et al. (2002) elaborated:

It appears that no culture and no geographic area are immune from bullying. Furthermore, cumulative evidence suggests that bullying has acute consequences that range from suicide, murder, and absenteeism at school to medical conditions such as fits, faints, vomiting, limb pains, paralysis, hyperventilation, headaches, visual symptoms, stomachaches, fugue states, and long-term psychological disturbances such as anxiety, depression, loneliness and hysteria. Thus bullying should not be dismissed as a normal developmental process. (p. 266)

Stockdale et al. (2002) contended that bullying should not be considered a normal rite of passage for children. Physical and psychological effects, such as vomiting, fainting, headaches, stomachaches, anxiety, depression, and even suicide, can linger. Throughout life,
relationships were of the greatest importance for a healthy wellbeing. If peer relations were strained, consistently normal social development became difficult.

Holt, Finkelhor, and Kantor (2007) diagnosed the possibility that bullies, victims, and bully/victims would be at an increased risk for crime, child abuse, sexual abuse, and other victimization. Participants in this study were 689 fifth grade students with varying backgrounds (Holt et al., 2007). Students answered a demographic questionnaire followed by two instruments: the University of Illinois Bully Scale and the University of Illinois Victimization Scale. Using the two measures, a two-analysis variance was used. Results suggested that those who sensed they were bullies, victims, or both had higher reports of other victimization (Holt et al., 2007).

Bullies were likely to suffer from incompetence, exhibit low social bonding, and be involved in self-destructive behaviors, such as stealing, vandalism, and fighting with weapons (Brown et al., 2005). Bullies were described as being at risk for unfortunate physical injury as well as suffer from feelings of guilt (McAdams & Schmidt, 2007). Research indicated that bullies often become criminals when their early childhood behavior goes uncorrected by adults (Sheras, 2002).

It was suggested that nearly one in five elementary students will be victims of bullying, which would have emotional, physical, and social consequences for the aggressor as well as the victim (Brown et al., 2005). Consequences were not only reserved for the victim of bullying. While victims suffered from absenteeism, which led to academic difficulties, some resorted to violence themselves as a reaction to their torment. Bullies have suffered long-term consequences, such as psychological issues and even criminal activity later in life (Smokowski & Kopasz, 2005). Veenstra et al. (2005) predicted that not only can
a bully become a delinquent and a criminal later, but also substance abuse could follow. Children who bullied were typically maladjusted demonstrated lower competence, and exhibited increased absenteeism (Brown et al., 2005). Children were negatively affected no matter which role they play.

**Approaches To Deal With Bullying**

According to Sheras (2002), a strategy was a simple fix, such as moving the child away from the aggressor, having the child ignore the harassment, or asking the child to tell the teacher when the problem persists. A program included a formal implementation either with individuals, classes, or the entire school. A program was research-based and would have included a multitude of approaches.

**Strategies.** Schools and other public facilities chose to implement interventions to discourage, slow, or stop bullying. Strategies were many and could include teachers, camp counselors, peers, media, literature, and more.

**Help seeking.** An adaptive strategy called Help Seeking was studied by Newman (2008), which focused on students’ help seeking skills when being harassed by peers. Newman addressed the fact that dealing with conflict was a daily issue for most; children were expected to learn to resolve conflict on their own, but in what situation is help warranted and at what social cost. It seemed irrational for a child to keep quiet about such a thing; sometimes the cost was too high (Hunter & Boyle, 2002). A child believed that suffering in silence was easier than suffering retaliation. The teasing would have become worse if they told. Newman focused on two theoretical perspectives of adaptive help seeking: coping and self-regulation. It was also pointed out by Newman that age and gender greatly influenced decisions and methods used in adaptive and non-adaptive help seeking. He
theorized that coping strategies were a more ideal and effective help seeking method. Furthermore, Newman hypothesized that to better understand help seeking, more research was needed in adaptive measures relating to bullying behavior.

**Peer support strategy.** Cowie (1998) studied bystanders and their roles to eliminate bullying. Nine schools in the United Kingdom participated for one year in a peer support system, which used befriending programs, conflict resolution programs, and peer counseling. Peers took those who were victimized under their wings to support and listen to them. Coloroso (2008) argued that these peers are not innocent; they were either disengaged onlookers or participants. Cowie’s study assumed that peers wanted to help those who were victimized, so data was collected through interviews with peer helper benefits and victim benefits in mind. Some problems mentioned were lack of a private place for counseling, lack of adult support, and lack of training for the peer helpers (Cowie, 1998). Time and resources were also mentioned as limitations. The study concluded by noting improved self-esteem, responsibility, and teamwork within the peer helper group, which led to an improvement in school atmosphere (Cowie, 1998). Teaching students to deal with bullying on their own could change the school by changing the peer groups first (Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005).

Lodge and Frydenberg (2005) looked at the role peers play as bystanders of bullying. The research studied perceptions after students were given vignettes displaying verbal attacks on a student. The vignettes were of a weight insult, a clothing insult, and a social rejection. Self-reporting was used with the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory-Short Form and The Children's Coping Scale-Short Form. Nine schools in Australia participated totaling 379 students ages 10 to 13. Lodge and Frydenberg found that several factors played into the participation of bystanders to watch, join in, support the bully, or support the victim,
including whether the person was a friend of the bully. Bystanders may not become involved for fear of being the next victim, lack of self-esteem, or lack of acceptable strategies. It was clear that anti-bullying interventions are important, as well as addressing bullying earlier in school than later (Lodge & Frydenberg, 2005).

**Using children’s literature as a strategy.** Another strategy was using children’s literature to guide children’s decision making in regard to bullying situations. Entenman, Murnen, and Hendricks (2005) identified this strategy to deal with bullying. By surveying teachers and librarians and referencing the Amazon online store web site, the researchers were able to gather a list of books that dealt with bullying. The final list was narrowed to books published between 1995 and 2003. Jalongo's (1983) guidelines were used to select the 25 books to be used. Criteria identified included characters, bullying behavior portrayed, setting, gender of bully, the role of bystanders, adult involvement, and resolution. As other literature has supported, the gender of the bully tended to be male, the characters were mostly animals, the setting was typically school or home, 88% of the stories involved bystanders, over half displayed adult involvement, and the most often used problem resolution was the bystander or adult intervening to stop the bullying (Entenman et al., 2005). The researchers found that reading a book to the children allowed them to relate to the characters, which in turn caused them to show compassion and knowledge of the happenings in the classroom. This could have encouraged more children to bring issues to the teacher (Entenman et al., 2005).

**Counselor intervention strategy.** Kimberly Hall (2006) studied a psychoeducational group model for working with bullies. Using Solving Problems Together (SPT), a counselor met with a small group to encourage discussion and problem solving strategies to deal with
bullies and other issues in life. With SPT, students took control of their own problems and learned to gain the confidence and skills to deal with them. A school-wide survey identified five students to participate (Hall, 2006). The counselor operated within a framework to set a purpose, identify goals, set objectives, and select the curriculum. The researcher initiated a pre/post test design to evaluate the students’ progress and the program's effectiveness. While this study presented promise, it was mentioned that comparing SPT with traditional counseling programs might be beneficial (Hall, 2006).

**Media intervention strategy.** McLaughlin, Laux, and Pescara-Kovach (2009) conducted a study on multimedia to decrease bullying with two hypotheses. First, having any intervention for anti-bullying would decrease the self-reports of bullying, and second, the group with the addition of multimedia would further increase the drop in bullying episodes. McLaughlin et al. studied three groups; one group had a teacher/counselor intervention, the second had the addition of videos, and the third had all the other interventions plus a compact disc students watched. Pre- and post-treatment data were collected. Results were in line with the hypotheses. By adding more interventions, levels of bullying decreased (McLaughlin et al., 2009).

**Peaceful Schools Experiment strategy.** In the Peaceful Schools Experiment, a philosophy was adopted, not a program (Twemlow, Fonagy & Sacco, 2005). The philosophy began with positive climate campaigns led by the counselor to modify the beliefs of all people involved with the school. A classroom management philosophy was adopted to find the cause of the problem and not just administer consequences. Peer and adult mentorship were mediated to advance the classroom management techniques over into the entire system of adults. The Gentle Warrior physical education program combined role-play with martial
arts defensive moves and relaxation techniques. Reflection time was implemented daily to give the teachers and students time to analyze the events of the day. These interventions were measured by self-reports of bullying, bystanding, empathy toward victims, aggression appropriateness, and observations of disruptive behavior. Twemlow et al. concluded this intervention was successful in reducing aggressive behaviors and disruption and increasing bystander willingness to intervene. Bystanders were suggested to be the most important role to stop bullying (Brown et al., 2005).

Programs. Schools or other public organizations had the autonomy to decide that a specific program was needed, rather than just implementation of a strategy or one basic intervention. Programs involving the entire school were predicted as more effective or fluid. Whether the program was used in a school, a summer camp, or a youth center, research should be conducted to gauge its effectiveness.

According to Baldry and Farrington (2007), "bullying is physical, psychological, or verbal actions perpetrated by a more powerful person or group of persons against a weaker person with the intention of causing harm" (p. 183). Baldry and Farrington evaluated sixteen programs attempted all over the world to alleviate bullying. The programs included:

- the Bergen Program.
- the Rogaland Project.
- the Sheffield Project.
- a project in Liverpool, England.
- a project in Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
- a project in South Wales, Australia.
- the Donegal Primary Schools Antibullying Project.
• a Finnish study.
• the Flanders Project.
• the Expect Respect Program.
• the Berne Study.
• the Italian study by Bulli and Vittime.
• the SAVE Project.
• the Australian Friendly Schools Project.
• the Steps to Respect Program.
• the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program

Baldry and Farrington (2007) identified criteria to establish which programs would warrant study. They evaluated the programs that used quasi or experimental design, pre and post measures, or age cohort design; gave definitions and a program to be used in schools; had bullying measured by self-report questionnaires, teacher ratings, peer rankings, or observations; included at least 200 students; were published in English only; and used percentages to quantify increases and or decreases in behavior. A table disaggregated program components, participant information, methods of evaluation, and design of research. Summaries of the programs and their results indicated that eight had positive results, two had mixed results, four had minimal results, and two had negative results. Overall research discovered anti-bullying programs to be positive, with the OBPP showing the most positive results. Future research would need to assess each program’s number of components related to success rate (Baldry & Farrington, 2007).

**School based program.** Did adding more interventions help with bully prevention? What about the involvement of other resources such as camp or a health department
intervention? Edmonson and Hoover (2008) conducted a three-year study of an evaluation of a school based violence intervention program. It was modeled after Olweus's work. The school was located in a rural mid-western county, involved 32 teachers, and by year three had 752 students. Approaches taken in this study included surveys of students, class meetings, adult awareness training, and conferences between victim, bully, and both sets of parents. Anti-bullying class rules were utilized as well. The training expanded each year, and so did the scope of the program. Attitudes improved and the reaching out of students who felt victimized increased, leading to more reports of bullying; however, this did not impact feelings of safety (Edmondson & Hoover, 2008). Feelings of safety would be the ideal conclusion for any program implementation focused on bullying.

**Bully Busters Program.** Many schools have bully prevention programs in place, but other student-centric venues do not. Carney and Nottis (2008) explored the effects of applying a school intervention to a less structured schema, like a summer camp. A one-group pre-/post-test design was used to collect and analyze numbers of bullying incidents, discipline referrals, and counselor perceptions. The Bully Busters Program was used in this instance and implemented over a 10-week period. The camp counselors had varying degrees of education, which was a possible limitation to the implementation of the program. A more educated counselor may have implemented with more fidelity than a less educated counselor. A small sample size was also a limitation. Results were unclear, but if used on a larger group it would be interesting to identify if adding an established program into a summer camp setting would be beneficial.

Beightol, Jeverstson, Gray, Carter, and Gass’s 2009 study looked at an adventure based anti-bullying program. Similar to the summer camp trial, this study placed anti-
bullying initiatives into a less structured setting in an attempt to identify vital components of an adventure-based anti-bullying program. The mission was to reduce bullying behavior while making for a safer school atmosphere in an elementary school in New Mexico. An Anti-Bullying Initiative survey was used along with role-play school sessions. Limitations of ceiling effect, abnormal data distributions, and low correlation coefficients were acknowledged. It was documented that increased responsibility was produced and helped with peer relations (Beightol et al., 2009).

**Youth Matters program.** Simply teaching vital social skills could prevent victimization in elementary schools. Jenson and Dieterich’s 2007 study involved using a program called Youth Matters in 28 fourth grade classrooms and comparing it to a no-treatment control group. They researched from the premise that skills for social and emotional conditions could be taught. The program was interactive; it “used a modified systemic approach to bullying prevention” (Jenson & Dieterich, 2007, p. 287). The results were promising with a decrease in victimization; however, bully and victim roles overlapped at times (Espelage & Swearer, 2003), and about half of bullies reported being victims as well (Veenstra et al., 2005). The growth modeling of binary outcomes may not have been the best choice, and Jenson and Dieterich did acknowledge that there are not many accepted programs in the U.S. that have been studied sufficiently. Changing the culture of the school may be a beneficial strategy.

**Steps to Respect program.** Bullying was identified as a quandary that affects learning, social connections, and the overall classroom atmosphere (Frey et al., 2005). Jenson and Dieterich (2007) found that a school based intervention program was a good start to decrease bullying at school. The Steps to Respect program was a multi-faceted program involving a
change in the school environment. It encompassed a set curriculum and training among staff, classrooms, and a parent outreach component. It also addressed the bystander issue (Committee for Children, 2009). Two years worth of playground observations were conducted to determine the effectiveness of the program (Frey et al., 2005). Teacher ratings and student surveys were also collected over a two-week period in the fall and spring of each observation year. Overall, bullying decreased for the intervention group. Results were more substantial for the teachers who were vigilant with their coaching. Adult responsiveness did not increase. Following the control group for the same two years that the intervention group was followed would have given better results (Frey et al., 2005). This limitation of time discrepancy is substantial and brings reliability into question. Following both groups would seem more appropriate.

**BEE Program.** Researchers from the University of Georgia accessed a large Clarke County elementary school to distribute student surveys to obtain a clear picture of the bullying environment (Orpinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003). After the results were analyzed, a plan was put into place to transform the entire school. A BEE theme permeated the school. The Five BEEs are Be Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Honest, Be Ready To Learn, and Be Your Personal Best. Successes with this strategy were indicated with pre-assessment surveys in 1998 and post-assessment in 1999 using Aggression and Victimization Scales. A 59% reduction in both self-reported aggression and in self-reported victimization were shown to be a result (Orpinas et al., 2003). This collaborative approach between teacher, university, and student produced a positive transformation in this school (Orpinas et al., 2003).
**The Bergen Program.** Norway implemented the first program to be carried out across the nation (Baldry & Farrington, 2007). The Bergen Program involved informing all stakeholders in the school system of ways to deter bullying. Conference days were used to address the bullies and the victims; the idea was to create the same attitude about the problem school-wide. Questionnaires were used for a pre- and post-test to assess effectiveness of the intervention for boys and girls. Success rates were high. After twenty months, 74% of girls reported a decrease in bullying behaviors, and boys reported a 35% decrease (Baldry & Farrington, 2007).

**Sheffield Anti-Bullying Project.** London invested in the Sheffield Anti-Bullying Project of 1991-1994. This program supported the whole school approach and gave way to laws requiring that schools be active in bully prevention (Smith, Smith, Osborn, & Samara, 2008). The state of Georgia passed House Bill 247 (1999) requiring some semblance of a local school program to discourage bullying; however, the gap was significant between the law’s request and the lack of data collection and follow through (Walker, 2009). Walker (2009) reported that little has been done to ensure policies and consequences are enforced and reported.

**Olweus Bullying Prevention Program.** The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP) was designed to reduce bullying issues, prevent new situations, and facilitate better student interactions (Olweus et al., 2007). The OBPP was devised as a school based program with four components: school level, which consisted of a committee that held staff meetings, planned a kickoff, introduced school rules against bullying, and involved parents; classroom level, which consisted of regular class meetings to reinforce the rules and parent meetings; individual level, which consisted of supervision of students, individual meetings with bullies
and victims, immediate intervention, and individual plans for those involved with bullying behaviors; and community level, which consisted of dissemination of anti-bullying messages to the community and school, and support of the local community in the program (Olweus et al., 2007).

The OBPP was the most researched anti-bullying program available and earned the honor of a Blueprint Model Program by the Substance Abuse and Mental Health Services Administration (SAMHSA) as a model program (Olweus et al., 2002). As of 2007, the OBPP was only one of eleven with this distinguished award (Olweus et al., 2007). Baldry and Farrington (2007) reported that when Dan Olweus presented data on his program, there were significant reductions in bullying; specifically, Olweus reported a 42% reduction for boys and a 48% reduction for girls. Baldry and Farrington expounded, “More research is especially needed on the Olweus bullying prevention program to try to establish why it seems to be so much more successful than other programs” (p. 201).

Additional research. In 2008, an investigation of 16 studies between 1980 and 2004 shed light on a disappointing conclusion with anti-bullying programs’ effects (Swearer et al., 2010). The investigation examined grades K-12 in Europe, the U.S., and Canada. The examination of self-reports showed no change in bullying behaviors. Only one-third of the variables concluded with changes in perceptions, knowledge, and even attitude (Swearer et al., 2010).

Ttofi, Farrington, and Baldry (2008) produced a report with slightly better results. Within a report for the National Council for Crime Prevention, 30 interventions were reviewed. Thirteen of the 30 were founded upon the OBPP. By using experimental and
control schools and rigorous study selection procedures, the results were remarkable, indicating 17% to 23% reductions in bullying behaviors (Ttofi et al., 2008).

These discrepancies were worrisome. A randomized, large-scale school wide bully prevention program should be administered to assist researchers in pinpointing the reason behind the variations of results (Ttofi et al., 2008). The differing outcomes showed that at each school, each program yielded varied results and there was no promise of success. It was notable that over half of other programs studied were based in some way after Dan Olweus’ work (Ttofi et al., 2008).

Farrington and Ttofi (2009) identified 622 reports as being related to bully prevention. To allow for effect size calculation, the researchers focused on 44 of these reports. Four types of design were used including randomized experiments, experimental control comparing before and after, other experimental control comparisons, and quasi-experimental designs and age cohort designs. To be included, bullying and victimization had to be the measured outcome of the study. The researchers demonstrated that bully prevention programs showed a 20 to 23% decrease in bullying and a 17 to 20% decrease in victimization. Programs that included peer work created an increase in victimization. Farrington and Ttofi suggested an accreditation process for bully prevention programs and also recommend that design of programs, as well as implementation, be studied.

Federal Law on Bullying

The 111th congress second session proposed an amendment to the Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2010, which included bullying and harassment prevention programs. Within this act, bullying was defined as:
conduct that adversely affects the ability of one or more students to participate in or benefit from the school’s educational programs or activities by placing the student (or students) in reasonable fear of physical harm; and (B) includes conduct that is based on (i) a student’s actual or perceived (I) race; (II) color; (III) national origin; (IV) sex; (V) disability; (VI) sexual orientation; (VII) gender identity; or (VIII) religion; (ii) any other distinguishing characteristics that may be defined by State or local educational agency… (p. 6)

This act mandated that state agencies would assist school districts with a process for bully prevention and would respond appropriately to reports of bullying (Safe Schools Improvement Act, 2010). It required programs to address bullying along with training for all staff. It required annual notification of parents and students regarding discipline policies. The act placed bullying and harassment with disorderly conduct within the discipline code. Procedures were expected be in place to handle parent and student complaints regarding bullying and timelines were projected to be followed (Safe Schools Improvement Act, 2010).

National School Safety and Security Services (2010) argued that policy makers may push for legislation but would not fund mandatory anti-bullying programs. They suggested it was hype and attention seeking to propose legislation. Schools suffered from other problems, such as gangs, relationship stress, and rumors, but bullying maintained media attention because the word seemed to be a catch phrase. Discipline strategies that focused on creating a positive school climate and dealt with the hot spots within the school would reap safer and more secure environments (National School Safety and Security Services, 2010).

On October 26, 2010, the United States Department of Education (DOE) and the Office for Civil Rights (OCR) wrote a letter addressing harassment and bullying within
schools. Russlynn Ali, Assistant Secretary for Civil Rights, signed the letter, which summarized the effects of bullying as causing greater absenteeism, greater anxiety, depression, academic repercussions, health decline, and self-harming thoughts and behaviors (United States Department of Education Office for Civil Rights (U.S. DOE OCR), 2010a). The letter served to clarify the correlation between bullying and discriminatory harassment under the OCR through the DOE. Certain bullying behaviors would fall under enforcement of the OCR. Specifically, OCR enforced Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, which prohibited racial discrimination. The letter gave examples of this violation. If anonymous racially charged notes were placed into African American students’ lockers, and the school became aware of the racial tension occurring, this would fall under the purview of OCR (U.S. DOE OCR, 2010a).

Title IX, the educational amendment of 1972, which prohibited discrimination based on gender, was also enforced [by OCR] (U.S. DOE OCR, 2010b). An example of this violation was given of a new female student called sexually explicit names over a break up with a boy. Title IX also included any discrimination based on sexual orientation.

Section 504 and Title II prohibited discrimination based on disability; this might include, but is not limited to, the example of a learning disabled student being called words like stupid and retard. Harassment such as this could impede the student’s academic performance and possibly the student’s attendance (U.S. DOE OCR, 2010b).

Schools have clearly defined responsibilities under these statutes (U.S. DOE OCR, 2010b). Once a school knew or should reasonably have known about harassment between students, actions to investigate must have been swift. The school must have ended the harassment, eradicated the hostile environment and prevented future harassment. Regardless
of whether the students’ actions fell under anti-bullying policy, regardless of whether the student complained, and regardless of requests for action or identification of the harassment as discrimination, the school must have initiated action (U.S. DOE OCR, 2010b).

Secretary of Education Arne Duncan distributed a memo on December 16, 2010, outlining crucial components of robust state bullying laws and policies (United States Department of Education, 2010). Education officials will compile a list of state laws and will study implementation of those laws. For example, Massachusetts provided extensive training for a long list of staff members to educate them in bully prevention. Kansas’s law emphatically speaks to cyber-bullying. Washington State has mandated reporting of bullying incidents, and Florida law details specific prohibited conduct by students. Georgia disallows retribution against those who report bullying (United States Department of Education, 2010).

**Georgia Law on Bullying**

The amendment to the Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2010 required districts to have some variety of anti-bullying program. Georgia eagerly participated with State Bill 250 in August, 2010; this was an extension of House Bill 84 from 1999, which simply required a character education program for all grade levels to discourage bullying. State Bill 250 defined bullying as willful threats, displays of force, verbal or written threats, or actual physical harm. These events would be severe and persistent to qualify as bullying. State Bill 250 specified these events could happen on school property, district owned buses, bus stops, during school activities, or through a computer network. It required school districts to implement the following no later than August 1, 2011: adopt a policy grades 6 through 12, allow for possible alternative school assignment for proven violations, and develop a method to notify parents. By January 1, 2011, school boards must have established a statement to
prohibit bullying, required methods to investigate and report bullying, suggested for age appropriate consequences, and provided anonymous reporting procedures (Safe Schools Improvement Act, 2010).

**Summary**

Bullying was determined to be a pervasive problem with different players and dynamics. With media attention and recent bill passage, it was crucial that effective solutions be found and utilized to stop the bullying phenomenon. The following is a letter retrieved from Barbara Coloroso’s 2008 book, *The Bully, the Bullied, and the Bystander* (p. 11):

**The Bully**

Can we not teach children, even as we protect them from victimization, that for them to become victimizers constitutes the greatest peril of all, specifically the sacrifice – physical and psychological – of the well-being of other people? And that destroying life or safety of other people, through teasing, bullying, hitting, or otherwise “putting them down,” is as destructive to themselves as to their victims.

Chapter 3: Methodology

A lesser-used alternative to the standard quantitative and qualitative methodology was mixed method design (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). They identified that mixed method research allowed more freedom to answer questions using the most appropriate quantitative and qualitative designs for the study, and analyzed the data from both numerical and narrative perspectives (Teddlie & Tashakkori, 2009). It was determined that qualitative and quantitative methods had their own weaknesses; combining the two improved the quality of research (Johnson & Christenson, 2008).

This was a mixed methods research design, combining a quantitative survey with qualitative interviews. This chapter details the methodology, including identification of the problem studied, the research questions that guided the study, and procedures used to answer the research questions. In addition, this chapter defines the population and sampling procedures, material used, and examines validity, reliability, data collection and analysis, as well as ethical considerations.

Statement of the Problem

Measuring school safety has been identified as paramount to maintaining a safe learning environment (Dewey & Mayer, 2010). Data should navigate one’s understanding of the specific problems and light a way to provide a solution (Dewey & Mayer, 2010). Many times student self-report surveys were used to collect data on school safety; however, this was suggested to be methodologically deficient, as the validity and the administration of the survey could potentially be called into question (Dewey & Mayer, 2010). Questions could be removed from the survey at the principal’s request, and survey administration was not usually standardized. Schools may have expected teachers to read the survey aloud to the
children, while other schools may have left them to read it independently. Schools could have chosen to omit certain grade levels from participation, while other schools included all grade levels. Data collection led to programs, policy, and new decisions within the school system; therefore, data should have been methodologically sound (Dewey & Mayer, 2010).

The OBPP was implemented in 15 of 23 elementary schools in a large school district in north Georgia. No data had been collected to examine the perceptions of the principals and the teachers with respect to the OBPP’s effectiveness. It was not known how principals and teachers perceived the OBPP to be working. Perceptions of the OBPP’s effectiveness in three elementary schools were studied using principal and teacher surveys and follow-up principal interviews.

It was troublesome that in the public school system many children felt unsafe at school. In Maslow’s (1943) Hierarchy of Needs, safety was a key component to wellness and learning. Some research established that an anti-bullying program would positively affect school achievement and performance. In a study where a school-wide program had been in place for two years or more, achievement was higher when compared to a school without the program (Twemlow et al., 2005). This north Georgia school district acknowledged that bullying behaviors are unacceptable and implemented the OBPP accordingly.

Principals and teachers mediated bullying issues daily. They were seen as responsible for how each situation was solved, and they witnessed firsthand any problems in their schools. Knowing that many school districts had adopted the OBPP as the answer to the bullying problem, more information was needed to determine how effective the program was according to those people who are accountable; therefore, the purpose of this study was
to examine if the OBPP was perceived as being effective within the elementary schools that have been trained in this northern county.

Information provided by principals and teachers revealed the perceived effectiveness of the program. Indicators such as time, money, and effort in program expansion were analyzed to determine if levels of bullying deviated significantly. A secondary purpose to this research was to create a bibliography of literature related to bullying for school district personnel. This study met the approval of all committee members (see Appendix A).

**Research Questions**

The research began with quantitative surveys from three principals and the teachers of Kindergarten through fourth grades within their schools. This took place in a large county in north Georgia. Research questions to be answered in this quantitative and qualitative study were:

- R1 What were principals’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
- R2 What were teachers’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
- R3 What were some unintended consequences of the OBPP?

**Research Methodology**

This mixed method study was conducted using the sequential explanatory design (Creswell, 2009). Permission to conduct research was attained first through the Institutional Review Board (IRB) on April 22, 2010 (see Appendix B), and then through the Office of Assessment of the Georgia school district prior to the study (see Appendix C). A cover letter was utilized to explain the study to the participants (see Appendix D). An acceptable survey could not be found to appropriately determine the perceptions of the OBPP’s effectiveness, so one was created and piloted to establish reliability and validity. The principal and teacher
surveys were created by reviewing a website on bullying prevention (Staff Survey, n.d.). The president of the company, Jim Jordan, who also owns the web site, agreed via electronic mail that all information on the web site, including surveys, was open to use for anyone wishing to use them (see Appendix E) (Anti Bullying, n.d.). The researcher used the staff survey from the website to create a new survey to better serve this research study (see Appendix F).

In an effort to establish reliability, the survey was pilot tested using a paper and pencil method in a small rural school within the same north Georgia County. Afterward, survey questions for the research were typed into an online survey tool and distributed electronically through the school district’s email service. The researcher chose a small population to survey based on county restrictions specified by district level personnel. This was a limitation to the study.

Quantitative data were collected using surveys with elementary school principals and teachers. The survey results, both commonalities and outliers, guided the researcher’s development of interview questions (see Appendix G). Interview participants signed an informed consent before participating (see Appendices H through K); interviews (see Appendix G) were audio recorded and field notes were taken. A reflective journal was used to log similar themes throughout the interview process. Interviews were transcribed (see Appendix L), and the qualitative data were analyzed by reviewing the audio recordings, transcriptions, field notes, and the reflective log for similarities and differences. As suggested by Creswell (2009) a description of common and differing themes was presented in narrative form. Quantitative data was then explained in more detail through the qualitative principal interviews.
Research Design

Mixed method design. The researcher needed a means to extrapolate the most data for this research. One measure did not seem to fit this research, so a mixed method design was chosen. This mixed model study was conducted using the sequential explanatory design (Creswell, 2009). This design began with surveys and then added interviews to better explain the surveys. Using quantitative surveys followed by qualitative interviews allowed the researcher to build a more complete picture of results. Specifically, the quantitative survey asked questions regarding teacher and principal perceptions of the effectiveness of the OBPP. Then, the qualitative interviews posed questions to the principals, which clarified the survey results and better informed the research.

The goal of using descriptive statistics was to understand the data and adequately communicate the results. Descriptive statistics summarized results in an easily interpretable manner (Teddle & Tashakkori, 2009). The use of descriptive statistics enabled appropriate description of numerical data (Neuman, 2003). Descriptive research was chosen due to its ability to explain phenomena and the opinions of people about these phenomena (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). This research primarily examined attitudes about the bullying phenomenon, not variables; therefore, descriptive statistics were used. According to Neuman, the “easiest way to describe numerical data of one variable is with a frequency distribution table” (p.5).

Instrumentation. The instrumentation used in this study included a pilot survey, a survey, a digital audio recorder, and a scripted interview.
*Pilot survey.* A pilot survey was utilized to obtain validity of the survey questions used in this research. Administering the pilot survey at two different times had been shown to demonstrate validity through consistency (Cox, 1996). The survey was administered, a week passed, it was administered again to the same teachers, and it was reviewed for consistency. Creswell (2009) suggested that dispensing two administrations facilitated establishing “predictive or concurrent validity” (p.149) by verifying that the results correlated through each administration. Teacher perceptions were analyzed through this pilot.

The pilot survey was completed using paper and pencil. Using a qualitative random iteration of questions, teachers explained why they answered in the manner they did; this helped to establish content validity by making sure questions measured what they were intended to measure (Creswell, 2009). This random iteration of questions was attached to the pilot survey as a second page. The second page listed five questions, which read, “Why did you answer question number ___ in that way?” Teachers briefly narrated the reason for their answer for five random question numbers from the survey. This helped ensure the questions were clear to each participant.

Quantitative results were interpreted through descriptive statistics to compare two groups’ perspectives and Microsoft Excel to obtain data results. The pilot survey provided an appropriate consistency of 72.9%. Cox (1996) states that 70% makes for a reliable survey; therefore, the questions were perceived to be viable for research.

*Survey.* The pilot survey yielded an appropriate consistency to proceed with the actual survey research. The survey was created through an online survey tool using the questions piloted for this research. A cover letter was included electronically (see Appendix F), which explained the study and the ethical considerations including complete anonymity.
of participants, and a link to the Internet-based survey. The cover letter and survey were delivered to all Kindergarten through fourth grade teachers at each of the three schools. This eliminated bias.

**Interviews.** The researcher interviewed the three principals of the schools to which the surveys were distributed. They were asked questions (see Appendix G) based on any outliers and commonalities found in the analysis of the teacher surveys. The interviews were structured and incorporated the qualitative data by using open-ended questions (Johnson & Christenson, 2008). Interviews were scheduled via electronic mail during the last week of April, 2010. All principals asked to participate did so. The first interview was held on May 24, 2010, at 3:00 p.m. It lasted approximately 22 minutes. The second interview was held on June 3, 2010, at 8:00 a.m. and lasted five minutes. The third and last interview was held on June 3, 2010, at 3:00 p.m. and lasted 21 minutes. The interviews were recorded using a digital recording device. Interview participants each signed a consent form (see Appendices I through K). Interview transcriptions (see Appendix L) were reviewed to find common themes between the three and a master list of coded themes was created (see Appendix M).

**Population and Sampling Procedures**

Teachers \(n=150\) and principals \(n=3\) were sent a survey in each of the three schools \(n=153\) in the south end of this north Georgia school district. The sampling was a convenience sampling (Creswell, 2007). These three schools were chosen because the district employee over the OBPP observed them as implementing the OBPP with fidelity. According to the district staff member, these three schools were implementing the program according to
guidelines based on her observations and communication with the school liaison over the OBPP.

The three schools also represented a slight range of socioeconomic levels including a Title I school, a School of Excellence, and one between the two. Population numbers as well as demographics are representative of this school district. Grade levels were chosen because two of the three schools only serve Kindergarten through fourth grade. To ensure consistency the only teachers surveyed in the Kindergarten through sixth grade school were the Kindergarten through fourth grade teachers.

The total number of teachers who were sent a survey was one hundred fifty \((n=150)\). Teacher surveys returned were one hundred nineteen \((n=119)\). One principal from each of the three schools were asked to answer the survey; therefore, a total of one hundred fifty-three surveys should have been gathered for data collection purposes \((n=153)\). Two additional principals took the survey yielding the total for administrator surveys returned as five \((n=5)\) and the total number of surveys returned was one hundred twenty four \((n=124)\). Three principals were interviewed following the online survey.

**School One.** School One was located in the middle of a high socioeconomic area. It was nestled on a hill overlooking a park and the local library. A blue ribbon hung outside displaying its School of Excellence award. The following information was retrieved from the 2009-2010 School Improvement Plan available online to the public on the school’s website.

**Socioeconomics and demographics.** School One was a School of Excellence and catered to a majority of middle to upper class families. The free and reduced lunch rate was approximately 6.8\%, according to the school’s 2009-2010 School Improvement Plan. The population of white students was approximately 88\%, while multi-ethnic groups made up
African American shared in .03% of the population and the Asian population was .01%.

**Size and history.** The total enrollment was approximately 1,125 students in grades Kindergarten through fourth grade. School One was located approximately thirty miles north of Atlanta. It opened in August of 1995 with 1,150 children and served Kindergarten through sixth grades. Over the next five years the population grew and this school was bursting with more than 1,700 students. With a new school built in 2000, the enrollment dropped back down to 1,125 for the 2009-2010 school year.

**Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) status.** Through No Child Left Behind (NCLB) in 2001, the federal government requires a measurement of mastery of standards for each state. Georgia used the Georgia Criterion Referenced Competency Test (GCRCT). Mastery was measured through Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) using a variety of indicators such as scores, participation rate, and achievement of minority and Special Education populations. School One has made AYP every year since NCLB was authorized in 2001. The children there were high achievers according to their results on the GCRCT.

**Teacher population surveyed.** The teachers at School One had an average of 15.4 years of experience, 7.3 of which had been at School One. Sixteen teachers held a Bachelor’s degree, thirty-five held a Master’s, seventeen held a Specialist, and two held Doctoral degrees. Eight Kindergarten teachers, 10 first grade teachers, 11 second grade teachers, 11 third grade teachers, and 10 fourth grade teachers were sent a survey. All teachers surveyed were female.

**School Two.** School Two was located down a long driveway behind a church off of a main road near a park. It was surrounded by trees and was fairly isolated for this area. The
following information was retrieved from the 2009-2010 School Improvement Plan available online to the public on the school’s website.

**Socioeconomics and demographics.** School Two was a Title I school and housed children of which 56% are on free or reduced lunch. The socioeconomic status was that of middle to lower class residents. The students came from houses, six mobile home parks, and a subsidized housing area. Demographics included 57% white and 43% minority population, including 28% Hispanic and 7% African American.

**Size and history.** School Two opened in 1988 with 630 students from Kindergarten to sixth grade. Within seven years, the population soared to 1,618 students. The school district added on to the building with new construction, shared students with a new elementary school, and still served 1,170 children. With an additional school being built, School Two finally had relief, housing only Kindergarten through fourth grades and containing 830 students by the year 2000. The enrollment was approximately 830 students in Kindergarten through fourth grade at the time of this study.

**AYP status.** School Two has met AYP since authorization of NCLB in 2001.

**Teacher population surveyed.** Twenty-two percent of teachers had over 22 years of experience, 26% had four to nine years, while 18% had less than three years, and another 18% had 10 to 15 years of experience. Of those surveyed, 65% hold advanced degrees, including three doctorates, and 7% were pursuing advanced degrees. Ten teachers from Kindergarten through second grades were surveyed, as well as 11 third grade teachers and eight fourth grade teachers.

**School Three.** School Three was on a long stretch of country road across from two neighborhoods. It was near a dairy farm and the school district’s bus shop. The following
information was retrieved from the 2009-2010 School Improvement Plan available online to the public on the school’s website.

**Socioeconomic status and demographics.** The free and reduced lunch rate was around 28%. The families in the district served by School Three were lower-middle to middle income. School Three’s students were nearly 80% Caucasian, 8% Hispanic, 6% African American, and 5% Other.

**Size and history.** School Three had an approximate total population of 1,126. School Three serves Kindergarten through sixth grades; however, only teachers from Kindergarten through fourth grades were surveyed to keep consistency throughout the research. School Three was built in 1999. Mobile unit classrooms were used to relieve some overcrowding. Enrollment had rested near 1,126 for the 2009-2010 school year.

**AYP status.** School Three had met AYP since NCLB was authorized in 2001.

**Teacher population surveyed.** Ten Kindergarten teachers, nine first grade teachers and nine second grade teachers were surveyed, along with eight third grade teachers, and six fourth grade teachers. All teachers were female. School Three did not report teacher demographic data. This was both a limitation to the study and a recommendation for further research.

**Materials**

Institutional Review Board (IRB) approval was obtained on April 22, 2010 (see Appendix B). Permission from the north Georgia County was obtained prior to any research (see Appendix C). Once IRB and district approval were obtained, the pilot was administered to address validity and reliability. Once the survey questions were found to be valid and reliable, an online survey tool was utilized
to distribute the cover letter and survey. Interviews were set up via electronic mail and an audio recorder, notebook, and paper were used for notes and reflections.

**Pilot survey materials.** The survey from the Anti Bullying website (n.d.) was adjusted to create better instrument to serve the needs of this study. To pilot the chosen survey questions, ten printed surveys with the random iteration of responses attached were used. The random iteration of responses asked teachers to explain why they answered questions in the manner they did. Question numbers asking for narrative responses varied for each of the 10 participants. For example, teacher one may have been asked to explain why she answered question numbers 5, 7, and 9 the way she did, while teacher two may have been asked to explain why she answered question numbers 6, 8, and 10 in the manner she did. This was done to verify that the questions were soliciting the responses they were intended to solicit for content validity (Creswell, 2009). This technique was used in the first and second administration of the pilot survey. A third party, the assistant principal, randomly chose the 10 teachers to participate. Pilot surveys were placed teacher’s school mailboxes and the teachers returned them anonymously to the researcher’s school mailbox. To analyze results Microsoft Excel (2003) was utilized.

**Survey materials.** When the pilot was complete, an electronic survey tool called SurveyMonkey was used to gather data from the principals and teachers (see Appendix F). Electronic mail was utilized to disseminate the cover letter and electronic link to the survey. SurveyMonkey allows quick creation of original surveys, easy data collection and analysis. It has been in use since 1999 and has a free package as well as more advanced options with monthly fees (Creswell, 2009).
Interview materials. A digital voice recorder was used to conduct principal interviews. A typed list of interview questions was used during the interview to guide the discussion (see Appendix G). Interview questions were created with the data from the surveys in mind to look more deeply at common and differing perceptions.

Validity

Content validity was established by reviewing the piloted survey questions and responses to verify that the questions were measuring what they were intended to measure. By administering the pilot twice, with ten days between administrations, concurrent or predictive validity was established (Creswell, 2009). Validity refers to the accuracy of the test responses (Johnson & Christensen, 2008).

Response to the pilot survey. A suitable survey could not be found to answer the following research questions:

R1 What were principals’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
R2 What were teachers’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
R3 What were some unintended consequences of the OBPP?

A survey was developed by reviewing the Anti Bullying website (n.d.) from which the researcher compiled questions to use for this research. The survey had not been validated according to Jim Jordan, the president; therefore, the survey was piloted to establish validity.

According to Johnson and Christensen (2008), a pilot should be conducted using a minimum of five to 10 participants, and the participants should be similar to those being surveyed in the actual research. Using a small, rural school, 10 surveys were anonymously placed in teachers’ school mailboxes by a third party, the assistant principal, on March 29, 2010, with a cover letter (see Appendix D), survey questions, and a qualitative iteration of
responses (see appendix N). Johnson and Christensen (2008) recommend five to 10 people for a pilot. Two teachers from each grade level, Kindergarten through fourth grade, were chosen to complete the pilot survey ($n=10$). The completed surveys were returned via a school-based mailbox. Two weeks later, on April 12, 2010, the surveys were distributed and returned in the same manner to establish consistency of the question responses.

The percentage of overall consistency of the survey was 72.9%. Consistency by question was 73%. According to Cox (1996), achieving 70% consistency makes for a reliable survey. The qualitative iteration for question responses added to the reliability. The return rate was 100% for the pilot. Since questions one, two, and three were demographic in nature, they were omitted from the chart shown in Table 1. Questions four through 10 asked perceptions of the OBPP using the following Likert scale: Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. In the pilot survey question number nine, “The severity of reported bullying incidents has decreased,” showed the least amount of consistency. During data collection, question nine solicited the most “no opinion” responses. This was addressed through interviews to better explain those responses.
Table 1

*Pilot Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Teacher</th>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>Consistency by test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>42.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>71.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Consistency by question: 90.0% 80.0% 60.0% 90.0% 70.0% 50.0% 70.0% 72.9%

Note. Overall consistency was determined by a two trial administration.

**Reliability**

Reliability refers to consistency of answers (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). The created survey was shown to be consistent through the pilot study by using quantitative consistency with survey answers, while providing a qualitative piece to explain why the
respondent answered the question in that manner. Knowing the survey was consistent over the two administrations helped establish reliability.

**Data Collection Method**

While the pilot survey was paper and pencil and delivered and collected via a third party, a web-based survey tool was used for the actual data collection. An online survey tool was used to collect data in a secure, anonymous way. The researcher established and paid for an individual personal account to effectively conduct this research.

The Anti Bullying survey has been online and used by private and public schools for seven years. The researcher used the questions on that survey to inform a new survey and piloted the newly created survey to validate the instrument. In a small Pre-K through sixth grade school within the same North Georgia county, the survey was given to two teachers per grade level in Kindergarten through fourth grades via a third party to ensure anonymity for the teachers \(n=10\). The same survey was given to the same participants 10 days later (Cox, 1996). The two surveys proved to be consistent, which is vital in proving reliability. The survey participants were advised to answer each survey as to how they felt that day and not try to remember their previous answers. To establish reliability, the researcher identified that at least 70% of answers were identical (Cox, 1996).

As a qualitative component to the survey pilot, random iteration of questions were used to provide the respondent a line to answer why they responded to that particular question that way. A random numbered table was used to display the consistency of the rationale behind those answers (see Appendix N).

One threat to validity could have been diffusion of treatment (Creswell, 2009). Participants worked together closely and could have communicated, thus affecting the survey
outcomes. Another threat could have been the maturity of the responders (Creswell, 2009). If the teacher were new, she may not have had a full awareness of the bullying dynamic or how to effectively implement the OBPP.

**Data Collection Procedures**

The data collection for the survey pilot proceeded with coded surveys to correlate the same participant for the first and second survey given. For example, one first grade teacher receiving the survey had 1A on both of the surveys, and the second teacher had 1B on her survey at the top of survey one and survey two. The number referred to the grade level and the letter A referred to teacher one, while the letter B referred to the teacher two within that grade level. The researcher was then able to identify the consistency between the 10 days to individual participants without knowing their identity.

Data collection for the actual research study was gathered through an online survey tool. A cover letter (see Appendix D) and each teacher and principal survey (see Appendix F) was delivered electronically through electronic mail. The cover letter gave the option of participation, as well as the information that by completing the survey the participant was giving consent to participate.

For the qualitative portion of this research, thematic code development using a master list of codes (see Appendix M) was utilized (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). When analyzing the transcriptions of the interviews the researcher noted words that were repeated in all three interviews, such as, awareness. These common emergent themes were then presented in narrative form.
Data Analysis Procedures

The quantitative surveys were analyzed with descriptive statistics to compare two groups’ perspectives, and Microsoft Excel was used to obtain data results such as mean and range of scores (Johnson & Christenson, 2008). A comparison was made between teacher perceptions and principal perceptions, and any outliers and commonalities were noted. Interview questions were created from the survey results. From the qualitative interviews, audio recordings, and a reflective journal, common themes were identified using a master list of codes and presented in narrative form.

Ethical Considerations

The name of the school district was kept completely anonymous. It was only referred to as a north Georgia school district. School names, principal names, and teacher names were also kept anonymous. The design of this study met the guidelines of the National Institutes of Health. This research falls into the Exempt Review Category because it was research conducted in a commonly accepted educational setting, and participants were fully disclosed of the research study with no deception. No risk was assumed and anonymity was kept. No children participated in this study. The researcher successfully completed the NIH course (see Appendix O). Principals signed a consent form before the interview began (see Appendices I through K). Audio recordings will be destroyed May 7, 2011.

Annotated Bibliography

A secondary purpose of this study was to create an annotated bibliography of literature related to bullying for educational practitioners (see Appendix P). This work originated in a previous scholarly endeavor (Daugherty, 2009) and is organized to assist school practitioners seeking professional guidance related to bullying. The rationale for
inclusion of works encompassed literature referencing research from 1993 to 2009, a bulk of the research being more contemporary. The resource is organized by introduction and background on bullying and various programs, types of bullying, bullying roles, perceptions of bullying, approaches to deal with bullying, anti-bullying programs, consequences of bullying, and miscellaneous additional resources.

**Limitations**

One limitation of this study was the size of the sample. Surveying all teachers in all grades at each of the 15 schools using the OBPP could possibly give more accurate results; however, this was not possible according to the participating county. Surveying teachers in three schools was less distracting to the educational environment. To survey children would also have given more information, but time was a limitation in regard to having parental permission and IRB approval. The results cannot be generalized to other schools.

The researcher chose not to include disciplinary data. NCLB created a dangerous school label linked to reporting of certain disciplinary infractions (Strengthening School Safety, 2009). A school labeled as dangerous provided students a chance to transfer to a safer school. Data was vital to allow school principals and support staff to effectively address situations; however, under-reporting was a problem. In New York State, for example, the comptroller’s office found that nearly 80% of incidents were documented but not reported to the state (Strengthening School Safety, 2009). Incident-based data was deficient. The federal government relied on various surveys, mostly academic in nature, to gauge the number and level of incidents within a system. The surveys, and therefore the data, brought limitations such as the fact that some are self-report surveys and some come from various sources. This made it a challenge to assess a trend. Data drove implementation of programs
and if the data was in question, it became doubtful that the appropriate issues were being addressed (Strengthening School Safety, 2009).

According to Trump (Strengthening School Safety, 2009), the main source for federal data on school crime and violence was the Indicators of School Crime and Safety report. A summary of this report stated the sources of the data were the National Center for Education Statistics, the Institute of Education Sciences, the U.S. Department of Education, the Bureau of Justice Statistics, and the U.S. Department of Justice. The most notable information to be derived from this report was the footnote, which reported the vast limitations of the data (Strengthening School Safety, 2009).

Two additional principals completed the survey making the principal total n=5, instead of n=3. It is unknown who the two principals were; therefore, interviews with the two additional participants did not take place. Only three were initially invited to take the survey, and, due to the anonymity of results, the identities of the additional two principals were not violated. This was a limitation to the study.

A final limitation to this research was the discrepancy of implementation. One of the three schools did not hold a beginning of the year kick off for students and staff. This could have influenced the principal and teacher perspectives of the OBPP’s effectiveness. One school removed questions from the OBPP survey, which could have invalidated results gathered to guide implementation. One school did not divulge teacher demographic data. This could have been used to make comparisons as to teacher experience and education with regard to the OBPP’s implementation.
Delimitations

The researcher chose to survey principals and teachers on the perceived effectiveness of the OBPP. The district superintendent was not questioned about the decision to adopt the OBPP, because it seemed more relevant to keep the research at the school level. The children were not involved in the research due to time constraints of IRB approval to include children in the study. Disciplinary data was not used due to known underreporting, which occurs to avoid the NCLB dangerous schools list. The researcher limited the scope of this study to elementary schools only. This was decided due to the researcher’s knowledge, background, and understanding of the elementary school as opposed to middle school. It was decided that surveying principals and teachers with follow up principal interviews would best explain perceptions in regard to the OBPP’s effectiveness.

Summary

A sequential explanatory mixed method design (Creswell, 2009) guided this examination to interpret quantitative results with qualitative interviews. This research examined the perspectives of both principals and teachers on the effectiveness of the OBPP and any unforeseen consequences from implementation. Evidence from this sample alluded to a positive impact on the schools surveyed.
Chapter 4. Data Collection and Analysis

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to determine the perspectives of principals and teachers with respect to the effectiveness of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP). The study was conducted using a mixed methods approach, including quantitative surveys followed by qualitative principal interviews. Quantitative data were compiled using descriptive statistics, specifically range, mean, and mode. Qualitative data were compiled using a theme similarity method from interview transcripts (see Appendix L).

This chapter presents the results of the research. The findings represent perspectives of the respondents on the effectiveness of the OBPP. The following three research questions were addressed:

R1 What were principals’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
R2 What were teachers’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
R3 What were some unintended consequences of the OBPP?

This chapter details the results from the survey and the interview portion of the study, as well as respondent characteristics, data analysis, interview procedures, interview analysis, and final results.

Survey Questions

Frequency distribution tables are used to display an arrangement of data for each individual value (Johnson & Christensen, 2008). Frequency distribution tables were chosen to create a straightforward representation of each unique item from the survey.

Question 1. Survey question 1 asked, “What is your position?” Answer choices were teacher and administrator. Results are displayed in Table 2.
Table 2

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 1*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Choice</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teacher</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>96.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 124 100%

*Note:* Three administrators were asked to take the survey. Two additional administrators answered the survey. See Limitations for further explanation.

**Question 2.** Survey question 2 asked, “How long have you been at your school?”

Answer choices were under 12 months, one to five years, six to 10 years, 10 to 15 years, and 16 or more years. Results are displayed in Table 3.

Table 3

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 12 months</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One to five years</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to 10 years</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 to 15 years</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 or more years</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*n = 124 100%

*Note:* The highest frequency indicated those teaching 1-5 years in the same school.

**Question 3.** Survey question 3 asked, “How long have you been teaching?” Answer choices were one to five years, six to 10 years, and 11 or more years. Results are displayed in Table 4.
Table 4

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 3*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One to five years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Six to 10 years</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>18.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 or more years</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>123</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The highest frequency fell with those teaching 11 or more years.

**Question 4.** Survey question 4 asked respondents to choose the answer that best matched their perception of the statement, “School personnel use more effective strategies to stop bullying.” Answer choices were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Results are displayed in Table 5.

Table 5

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 4*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>n</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The highest frequency fell in the agree category.

**Question 5.** Survey question 5 asked respondents to choose the answer that best matched their perception of the statement, “Students use more effective strategies to stop bullying.” Answer choices were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Results are displayed in Table 6.
Table 6

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 5*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The highest frequency fell within the agree category.

**Question 6.** Survey question 6 asked respondents to choose the answer that best matched their perception of the statement, “There is greater understanding about the nature of the bullying problem at our school.” Answer choices were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Results are displayed in Table 7.

Table 7

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 6*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The highest frequency fell in the agree category.

**Question 7.** Survey question 7 asked respondents to choose the answer that best matched their perception of the statement, “More stakeholders (staff, administrators, community members) are involved in solving the bullying problem at our school.” Answer
choices were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Results are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 7*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 122 \quad 100\% \]

*Note:* The highest frequency fell in the agree category.

**Question 8.** Survey question 8 asked respondents to choose the answer that best matched their perception of the statement, “The number of bullying incidents has decreased.” Answer choices were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Results are displayed in Table 9.

Table 9

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 8*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 120 \quad 100\% \]

*Note:* There was an overwhelmingly high frequency of no opinion responses for this question.

**Question 9.** Survey question 9 asked respondents to choose the answer that best matched their perception of the statement, “The severity of reported bullying incidents has
decreased.” Answer choices were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Results are displayed in Table 10.

Table 10

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 9*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 121 \quad 100\% \]

*Note:* There was an overwhelmingly large frequency for no opinion responses for this question.

**Question 10.** Survey question 10 asked respondents to choose the answer that best matched their perception of the statement, “The atmosphere at the school has been more positive and peaceful.” Answer choices were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, No Opinion, Agree, and Strongly Agree. Results are displayed in Table 11.

Table 11

*Frequency Distribution of Survey Question 10*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Opinion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ n = 122 \quad 100\% \]

*Note:* There was a somewhat notable frequency of no opinion responses for this question.
Survey Participants

The survey participants included teachers and principals in a North Georgia school district. Teachers and principals from three schools were surveyed ($n=155$). Because there were a greater number of teachers than principals per school, naturally, the ratio of teacher to principal responses was unbalanced, with teachers representing 96% of all respondents.

The amount of experience in the respondent group was exceptional. Twenty-four respondents (19.5%) acknowledged they had been teaching from one to five years, 23 (18.7%) stated they had been teaching from six to 10 years and 76 (61.8%) stated they had been teaching for 11 years or more. Experience could have played a part in the fidelity of implementation and perceptions of the program. Experience may have influenced perspectives and thus influenced the data. While the OBPP has been the only program implemented in each of the three schools, it is unknown whether some teachers may have experienced another bully prevention program in a different school, possibly in a different state or county. Table 12 displays the aggregate results of all the opinion questions posed to the respondent group.

Interestingly, the distribution of answers to the question, “How long have you been at your school?” was quite different from that of years of experience. Specifically, two respondents (1.6%) reported they had been at their respective schools less than one year, 53 (42.7%) communicated they had been at their schools from one to five years, 36 (29.0%) answered they had been at their schools from six to 10 years, 26 (21.0%) stated they had been at their schools from 11 to 15 years, and seven (5.6%) acknowledged they had been at their schools 16 or more years. The amount of time teachers have been with a specific school could have influenced attitude, thus perspective, during data collection.
Survey Responses

On April 27, 2010, using the school district’s email system to facilitate distribution, 150 surveys were distributed via an online survey mechanism, SurveyMonkey. Reminder emails were sent on May 5, 2010, and again on May 17, 2010. In total, 124 responses were received, which represented a return rate of 83.3%.

The demographic survey questions asked for discrete answers or ranged answers, and the answers for the actual perception questions required a Likert scale response. The Likert categories used were Strongly Disagree (SD), Disagree (D), No Opinion (NO), Agree (A), and Strongly Agree (SA). Results of the perception questions for the entire sample are included in Table 12.
Table 12

*Aggregate Survey Results*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School personnel use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>35.5%</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>13.7%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>69.4%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
<td>3.85</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is greater understanding about the nature of the bullying problem at our school.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>49.6%</td>
<td>46.3%</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stakeholders (staff, administrators, community members) are involved in solving the bullying problem at our school.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
<td>29.5%</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of bullying incidents has been decreased.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>17.5%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The severity of reported bullying incidents has decreased.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
<td>22.3%</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere at the school has been more peaceful.</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
<td>53.3%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* The answers fall mostly within the agree category.
Principal and Teacher Perspectives. Both principals and teachers expressed overall positive perspectives on the effectiveness of OBPP. Most respondents agree or strongly agree with the statements within the survey. Principal responses were also positive with regard to the OBPP’s effectiveness, as illustrated in Table 13.

Table 13

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School personnel use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is greater understanding about the nature of the bullying problem at our school.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stakeholders (staff, administrators, community members) are involved in solving the bullying problem at our school.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of bullying incidents has been decreased.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The severity of reported bullying incidents has decreased.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere at the school has been more peaceful.</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: A preponderance of answers fall into agree and strongly agree categories.
Of note in the principal data was the negative response to the question, “The severity of reported bullying incidents has decreased.” This difference was explained later in the interview analysis section. More variance exists in teacher responses, as illustrated in Table 14.

Table 14

*Teacher Perspectives*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>NO</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>Avg.</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School personnel use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>58.8%</td>
<td>35.3%</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>14.3%</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>68.9%</td>
<td>15.1%</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is greater understanding about the nature of the bullying problem at our school.</td>
<td>0.8%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
<td>45.8%</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stakeholders (staff, administrators, community members) are involved in solving the bullying problem at our school.</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>58.1%</td>
<td>28.2%</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of bullying incidents has been decreased.</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
<td>13.0%</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The severity of reported bullying incidents has decreased.</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>23.3%</td>
<td>53.4%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere at the school has been more peaceful.</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td>10.3%</td>
<td>52.1%</td>
<td>24.8%</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>117</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* It is important to note that some respondents did not answer all questions.
Interview Procedure

Interviews were conducted with two principals and one assistant principal. The assistant principal was selected in place of the principal in one school because of her knowledge and involvement with the program in that particular school.

The interviews were structured with questions (see Appendix G) read aloud in each principal’s office. The first interview was held on May 24, 2010, at 3:00 p.m. at School One; the interview lasted 22 minutes. The second interview was held on June 3, 2010, at 8:00 a.m. at School Two; the interview lasted five minutes. The interview was short due to the short answers given and the lack of elaboration on the part of the participant. The third interview was held on June 3, 2010, at 3:00 p.m. at School Three; the interview lasted 21 minutes. Each participant signed a consent form (see Appendices H through K).

All three interviews were recorded using a hand-held digital recording device. The interviews were then transcribed for analysis (see Appendix L) and coded based on themes that emerged during the sessions (see Appendix M). In addition to thematic similarities, the interview question responses illustrated some differences in program implementation.

Interview Respondent Characteristics

The characteristics of each principal and the role she played with the OBPP were varied. The principal of School One was incredibly positive about the OBPP. School One served 855 children in Kindergarten through fourth grades, and the principal has held her position for five years. She participated in the inaugural launch of the OBPP within the county. School Two serves 1,250 children in Kindergarten through sixth grades. The assistant principal of School Two, who has held her position for 12 years, brought up the issue of different school types; specifically, she expressed concern that schools that served
Kindergarten through fourth grades might see different results of the OBPP than schools that served Kindergarten through sixth grades. Even though only Kindergarten through fourth grade teachers from School Two were surveyed, the assistant principal felt the presence of [fifth and] sixth graders substantially affected the tone and climate of her school. At the time of the interview, the OBPP implementation at School Two was going through a re-introduction phase.

The principal of School Three served in the most affluent of the three schools. School Three served 1,135 children in Kindergarten through fourth grades. The principal held her position three years, and she was not part of the initial implementation of the OBPP. School Three experienced very few bullying issues had an active anti-bullying committee. Even though class meetings were required as part of the OBPP; the principal of School Three observed that only 70% of teachers participated.

**Interview Questions**

Interview questions (see Appendix G) were developed based on themes that emerged from the responses from the survey. In addition, some questions were included to confirm answers collected during the survey process. Interviews were transcribed (see Appendix L)

**Question 1.** Interview question 1 asked, “What grade levels does your school serve?” The participants from Schools One and School Three answered “K-4;” the participant from School Two answered, “K-6.”

**Question 2.** Interview question 2 queried, “How many children do you serve?” The participant from School One answered, “Currently around 855; we fluctuate, but that is a good estimate.” The participant from School Two stated, “1,250”, and the School Three interviewee responded, “This year we have 1,135.”
Question 3. Interview question 3 asked, “How long have you been with this school?” Participants One, Two, and Three answered, five, 12, and three years respectively.

Question 4. Interview question 4 requested, “Do you perceive that bullying has increased or decreased since implementation of OBPP?” The principal of School One stated that bullying had not increased; if anything, it had decreased and there was more open discussion and more awareness about bullying. Principal Two alleged some improvement, but indicated that the school was mostly the same in regard to bullying. Principal Three detailed that bullying was not a big problem, but that awareness had increased, thus reporting had increased.

Question 5. Interview question 5 probed, “Approximately 35% of teachers had no opinion on Question 4 of the survey. Why do you think that is so?” The participant from School One perceived that it was possible the teachers had not seen a decrease in their classroom environment. Principal One argued that reliable data was difficult to obtain, and then continued that the children tended to contradict themselves and became confused with the proper definition of bullying. The participant from School Two perceived that teachers were not always aware of bullying issues outside their classroom. The participant from School Three explained that bullying had not increased, in fact it wasn’t much of a problem, but awareness had certainly increased.

Question 6. Interview question 6 asked, “Did you implement OBPP, or was it already in place?” The participant from School One was part of the inaugural implementation within the first year. The second participant was also part of the initial implementation process. The third interviewee was not serving in School Three when the OBPP was initially implemented,
but School Three did implement the OBPP during the same school year as Schools One and Two.

**Question 7.** Interview question 7 solicited, “How much training was done with your staff?” All three schools had members attend a district level training and had involvement with the OBPP National Trainer, Mike Carpenter. Two to three days were spent training a team, who then went back to the school to redeliver the information; this was a train the trainer method. Schools One and Three had a kick-off to launch the OBPP. School Two did not; the principal reported it was, “a timing thing.”

**Question 8.** Interview question 8 asked, “What about training for new staff?” School One trained new staff each October with the school counselor taking the lead with the training. School Two had a staff member who was instrumental in county implementation who was in charge of training new staff. School Three had a committee member per grade level to assist new staff with training and procedures.

**Question 9.** Interview question 9 asked, “Are there components of OBPP with which you disagree? If so, which ones?” The participant in School One articulated that the OBPP survey is difficult and long. The principal was not confident in the reliability or validity of the OBPP survey. Principal Two answered, “not totally.” Principal Three perceived the survey was inappropriate and had too many sexually oriented questions, and School Three removed a few questions for that reason.

**Question 10.** Interview question 10 asked, “Are there components of OBPP about which you feel strongly in a positive way?” Principal One identified that it was beneficial that the OBPP discussed the specifics of behavior. The class meetings were also very important. Principal One also communicated that the emphasis on the bystander role was
key. Principal Two stressed the importance of the class meetings; this participant indicated that it gave the kids a chance to vent and the teachers a chance to really get to know their kids. Principal Three perceived the program overall was beneficial. The posters were good reminders, and the awareness component was crucial. The OBPP brought awareness, and there was something that the victim and the bystander could do; the sole focus was not only on the bully.

**Question 11.** Interview question 11 inquired, “Do you feel the time expended has benefited your school?” The principal in School One suggested that it had been worth the expenditure. Principal One stated, “The key to it is whether you call it Olweus or not, if you can create a school where all kids belong, and I know that’s their theme, that’s what it’s all about.” Principal Two communicated that anytime you receive resources, it was beneficial. Principal Three professed, “Absolutely!”

**Question 12.** Interview question 12 asked, “What has been the overall effectiveness of OBPP?” Participant One declared that it had brought awareness to adults in the building. It brought a mindfulness of things to look for besides the physical evidence of bullying. Exclusion, name-calling, and cyber-bullying were things principals and teachers dealt with. Participant Two indicated that morale with the kids had improved. Sometimes bullying was reported but was not really bullying; however, the kids still felt supported. Participant Three perceived that awareness had been the overall effect of the OBPP.

**Question 13.** Interview question 13 asked, “What have been some unintended consequences of OBPP?” Principal One detailed that reporting had increased; however, the positives outweighed the negatives. Principal Two also observed that they received more parent phone calls. The participant said, “It’s almost like we put the word out there, so now
that’s the word that is coming back to us.” Principal Three expressed that the school had things reported as bullying that were not necessarily bullying. “That is the hardest thing to overcome is what is truly bullying and what is just someone not being nice to your child,” Principal Three acknowledged.

**Data Analysis**

The following research questions were addressed using the survey of principals and teachers in three elementary schools of this north Georgia school district and the interview portion of this research:

- **R1** What were principals’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
- **R2** What were teachers’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
- **R3** What have been some unintended consequences of the OBPP?

By combining descriptive statistics utilized during analysis of the survey and narrating common themes found during the interview phase, this research allowed for inferential answers to those questions.

**Interview Data Analysis**

All three interviews were audio recorded with a digital recording device. The researcher transcribed all three interviews. Overall, principals agreed to all statements regarding the effectiveness of the OBPP. Finding emergent themes and creating a master list of codes throughout each of the three interviews, through narration, was the process used for interview analysis.

**Results**

Based on quantitative surveys of principals and teachers of three elementary schools in a North Georgia county, it appeared that overall perceptions of the effectiveness of the
OBPP were positive. Participants mostly agreed or strongly agreed with all statements inquiring about OBPP effectiveness. In expanding on those perceptions during the interview phase, principals indicated that the OBPP brought a needed awareness to students and staff. They all agreed the downside was the OBPP survey. They reported some items seemed inappropriate for elementary students in content and length, and it was agreed that awareness brought the unintended consequence of over reporting by students and parents. The interviews indicated that the benefits of having the OBPP outweighed any negative consequences. It was also mentioned that having any kind of bullying program would be helpful. The OBPP might not be the only program that could bring awareness to a school community.

**Summary**

Since the researcher used a mixed method utilizing sequential explanatory design the research was expansive (Creswell, 2009). Quantifiable results were obtained through an online survey tool, and qualitative interviews were utilized to further explain some survey responses. The use of descriptive statistics in the data analysis portion of the survey merged conveniently with the data derived from the interview component. The data revealed clearly that there were overall positive perceptions of the effectiveness of the OBPP from respondents in the participating elementary schools.
Chapter 5. Discussion, Recommendations, and Implications

Introduction

This chapter provides a summary of the research study, discusses results, provides recommendations for future research and practice, and concludes with implications of recently enacted state and federal laws requiring bullying prevention plans in schools and provides an annotated bibliography of literature related to the bullying phenomenon for educators (see Appendix P).

Summary of the Study

Through review of the literature, it was noted that bullying was serious and pervasive. It could have long-term effects on not only the victim, but the bully as well. There were many strategies and programs available to address bullying in a school setting. A program that has shown success and consistency was the Olweus Bully Prevention Program (OBPP).

The OBPP was adopted by a north Georgia school district. Three elementary schools were selected through a convenience sampling to investigate principal and teacher perceptions of the effectiveness of the OBPP within this north Georgia school district. After a pilot survey established reliability for survey questions, an online tool was used to survey teachers and principals to examine perceptions of effectiveness. Follow up interviews conducted with three principals further explained the results of the survey. This study was a mixed model method using a sequential explanatory design.

Survey data were collected and analyzed using descriptive statistics. Interview data were analyzed through common emergent themes and presented in narrative form. Principal and teacher perceptions were examined comparatively and individually to assess the
perceived effectiveness of the OBPP. An annotated bibliography was compiled as a resource for school administrators related to the bullying phenomenon (see Appendix P).

**Discussion of Results**

The results of the research study indicated that principals and teachers alike perceived that the OBPP was effective. The research questions were answered in the following manner:

**R1** What were principals’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?

Principals were surveyed and interviewed. Principal survey results revealed they perceived the overall effect of the program as positive and beneficial to their schools with over 50% answering in the agree or strongly agree categories for the positive statements regarding the OBPP’s effectiveness. During the interview phase principals made the following statements, “there is more awareness” and “[bullying] has decreased”.

**R2** What were teachers’ perceptions of the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?

Teachers were surveyed, and a majority agreed with all statements regarding the OBPP’s effectiveness. Two statements brought a significant percentage of no opinion results. The statement “The number of bullying incidents has been decreased” resulted in 18.3% no opinion responses. The statement “The severity of reported bullying incidents has decreased” showed 23.3% no opinion responses. The principal interview component provided insight to this outlying data. One principal stated, “Maybe teachers haven’t seen a change within their classroom.” Another participant responded, “Teachers handle things in their own classroom.” A third stated, “They perceive it hasn’t increased or decreased; there is just more awareness.”

**R3** What were some unintended consequences of the OBPP?
During the principal interviews, each participant explained that there had been over-reporting. One explained, “There is confusion with the definition [of bullying].” Another stated, “Things are reported that aren’t necessarily bullying.” Another professed, “We have had more parent phone calls about their child being bullied.”

The three interviews yielded similar opinions that the OBPP brought an awareness of the bullying problem to schools. All three interviewees alluded to an increase in reports by students and parents. The overall effectiveness of the OBPP was positive based on the survey and the contents of the interviews. Based on principal interviews the only unintended consequence seemed to be an over-reporting of bullying behaviors.

The interviews provided further explanation for the high percentage of “no opinion” responses for questions eight and nine. Addressing the statement within the survey “the number of bullying incidents has decreased” showed a high frequency of “no opinion” responses could be explained by the suggested over-reporting. The “number of incidents” was not perceived as declining. Also, the phrase of question nine as “severity of reported bullying incidences” was not perceived to have decreased due to possible over-reporting. Interviewees also mentioned teachers were not always aware of bullying events outside of their classrooms.

**Recommendations**

Data provided in this study support recommendations for practice and future research. Implications of recently enacted state and federal legislation have increased the importance of bullying prevention in schools.
**Recommendations for practice.**

**Recommendation 1.** The federal government should support, not penalize, a school labeled as dangerous through the NCLB mandate. Within the review of literature, several areas of weaknesses came to light and need to be addressed. The NCLB mandate, which hinders schools from accurately reporting bullying incidents, is a problem. Data is vital to allow school principals and support staff to effectively address bullying; however, under-reporting is a problem. In the state of New York, for example, the comptroller’s office found that nearly 80% of incidents were documented but not reported at the state level (Strengthening School Safety, 2009). Incident-based data is deficient. Intentions to monitor and assign consequences to schools seem noble; however, being labeled as a dangerous school is not motivating schools to accurately report bullying issues. The short falls on data collection impede educated choices on bully prevention decisions.

**Recommendation 2.** School districts across the United States need a universal procurement of data to accurately assess the need with regard to bully prevention programs. Student self-reporting is often used, but different surveys are used across the country. Data cannot be adequately compared due to different surveys and different methods of survey administration. Districts should be given research-based choices of bully prevention programs, and a uniform survey should be used nationwide to accurately assess each district’s weak areas. While bullying is serious and pervasive, proper data collection should precede any federal mandate. When data is sufficiently gathered, and the federal government has the monetary support to give, a choice of program can be suggested. Local districts should be able to choose the appropriate program for them; however, every district should be required to have a solution in place to protect children.
Recommendation 3. To provide effective programs for school districts to choose from, this researcher agrees with Farrington and Ttofi (2009) that an accreditation process should be implemented. To provide choice to school systems seeking an appropriate bullying prevention program is ideal; however, the choices should demonstrate efficacy. Programs should each be examined through a rubric for accreditation.

Recommendations for future research. Through the conclusion of this research study, several possibilities for future research were noted. Recommendations for future research are as follows:

Recommendation 1. A quantitative comparison of similar schools or districts implementing the OBPP and schools or districts utilizing different programs should be conducted. Ideally, comparing several schools implementing the OBPP and measure that data against schools using a different program may indicate the benefits of the OBPP versus other programs. Through the principal interviews conducted in this research, participants shared that having any program in place would be beneficial. It would be interesting to test their hypothesis.

Recommendation 2. A collection of disciplinary data throughout a school implementing the OBPP and a school not implementing any type of anti-bullying program could shed light on the effects of providing a bullying program. The schools would certainly need to be similar in demographics.

Recommendation 3. Replication of this study using a larger sample of schools, teachers, and administrators is recommended. Due to school district restrictions imposed on this examination, only three schools were surveyed and only three principals were interviewed. It is possible that more information could be gleaned with a larger sample size.
Surveying many schools and interviewing many principals could further add to the results from this study.

**Recommendation 4.** A quantitative survey should be conducted to measure teacher experience and education level with the implementation and effectiveness of the OBPP. Farrington and Ttofi (2009) report that implementation is key. The manner in which a school implements a program with the variables of time and intensity are crucial to ensure the success of a program. It might be beneficial for an administrator to link teacher experience and education with the fidelity of implementation. This might lead school districts to train staff in a varied manner.

**Recommendation 5.** A mixed method study should be conducted to assess the effectiveness of the OBPP at the middle school level. Brown et al. (2005) suggested that a majority of bullying issues occur in a middle school setting. Farrington and Ttofi (2009) suggested that most programs are more effective with children over the age of 11. Quantitative surveys and qualitative interviewing strategies could explain the bully phenomenon at the middle school level.

**Recommendation 6.** A quantitative study examining the effects of an individual bullying prevention program being implemented by multiple demographic environments might be beneficial. It is unknown whether the OBPP, or any differing program, would yield similar results when applied to high socioeconomic areas, low socioeconomic areas, school environments with predominately minorities versus Caucasian students, or urban compared to rural school populations.

**Implications.** Bullying moved to the forefront of national and state legislation with the enactment of the federal Safe Schools Improvement Act of 2010 and Georgia House Bill
250 in 2010. Legislators have petitioned for federal funding for mandatory anti-bullying programs. The subcommittees on Healthy Family and Communities, the subcommittee on Early Childhood Elementary and Secondary Education, and the Committee on Education and Labor united on July 8, 2009, to discuss the *Strengthening of School Safety through Prevention of Bullying*. The policy examined the thoughts from various stakeholders related to strengthening school safety through bullying prevention.

The policy addresses federal legislation of anti-bullying regulation. The potential problem could be funding. Should the federal government impose a mandated bully prevention program, would funding be available for such implementation and training? The policy question at hand is whether or not federal legislation is needed to have appropriate school safety.

The United States Office of Civil Rights (OCR) declared that certain bullying behaviors could fall under violation of civil liberties afforded by Title VI and the Civil Rights Act of 1964 prohibiting discrimination based on race, color, or ethnicity; Title IX and the Educational Amendment of 1972 prohibiting discrimination based on gender or sexual orientation; and Section 504 prohibiting discrimination based on disability. Once a school has or should have reasonable knowledge of such acts, action must be immediate, restoring a civil environment for learning and preventing future occurrences. Failure to do so is a violation of OCR policy and could warrant legal action.

The state of Georgia has already ruled that by January 1, 2011, school boards must establish a statement prohibiting bullying, require methods to investigate and report bullying, suggest for age appropriate consequences, and provide anonymous reporting procedures
(Georgia Bullying Law, 2010). School districts have a limited time to make decisions and move forward with plans for bullying prevention. This research indicates that according to principals and teachers in this north Georgia district, the OBPP is effective.
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<td>Participants may experience mental discomfort.</td>
<td>Yes x No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrical equipment will be used.</td>
<td>Yes x No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants will be tape recorded, photographed, or videotaped.</td>
<td>x Yes No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

b. Does any part of this activity have the potential for coercion of the subject? If yes, explain and describe the proposed safeguards.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHECK ONE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes x No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

No negative consequences will result from participation in this study.

---

c. Assess the likelihood and seriousness of risks (physical, mental, or other) to the subjects. Describe alternative methods that would not entail comparable risks and why these were not used.

*Minimal risk*
d. Description of the anticipated benefits to subjects and contributions to general knowledge in the field of inquiry:

The purpose of this study is to examine if the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program is working within the elementary schools that have been trained in this northern county. Information provided by principals and teachers may reveal the perceived effectiveness of the program. It may indicate whether or not the time, money, and effort expended on this program has made a difference in the bullying issue in general.

e. If the research subjects will be compensated or rewarded, indicate the type and amount of compensation and the milestone for each payment. If subjects are being recruited from LMU classes, indicate whether students are receiving course credit (regular or extra credit) and, if so, what alternatives are offered to those students who do not wish to participate in the research.

12. Submission Material

The IRB must review copies of all final material presented to subjects. The IRB cannot approve a project without a complete and accurate application and final copies of all supporting materials. Please indicate below what materials have been attached to this application (check all that apply):

- Recruitment material (flyer, announcement, oral script, email, letter, etc.)
- Data instruments (surveys, interview questions, tests, web-survey, etc.)
- Informed consent
- Debriefing statement
- Video clips, music CDs, photos, etc.
13. Certification Statement
In making this application, I certify that I have read and understood Lincoln Memorial University’s policies and procedures governing research with human participants (specifically, those as described in Lincoln Memorial University’s Institutional Review Board Policy). I shall comply with the letter and spirit of those policies and will not undertake the research without IRB approval. Furthermore, I am aware that certain departments may have their own standards for conducting research, and it is up to me to familiarize myself with them. I further acknowledge my obligation to: (1) obtain written approval of significant deviations from the originally approved protocol BEFORE making those deviations; and (2) report immediately all adverse effects of the study on the participants to the Chairperson of the Institutional Review Board and the Chairperson or Supervisor of my Department.

Carolyn Daugherty  
Principal Investigator signature  
2/13/10

Electronically submitted

Chair/Supervisor/Director signature  
Date

Co-Investigators:

a. Name: __________________________  
Signature: __________________________  
Affiliation: __________________________

b. Name: __________________________  
Signature: __________________________  
Affiliation: __________________________

14. Submission Information

Send one original and one copy of the application and all supporting materials to:
ORGSP
Lincoln Memorial University, Duke 304
6965 Cumberland Gap Parkway
Harrogate, TN 37752

The submission of incomplete packets may significantly delay the review process. Forms and policy guidelines are available at: http://www.lmunet.edu/curstudents/ORGSP/IRB.htm

For questions, comments, or assistance in completing the form, contact the IRB Coordinator at 423-869-6214 or 869-6291 or pauline.lipscomb@lmunet.edu.
Appendix C. County Permission To Conduct Research

REQUEST FOR PERMISSION TO CONDUCT DATA COLLECTION ACTIVITIES WITHIN THE SYSTEM

Name: Carolyn Daughtry

CCSD Employee: Yes ☑ No ☐ If NO, list employer:

College/University Supervising Activities: LMU

Degree in Progress (Level/Area): Ed.D

Locations for Data Collection: [Redacted]

Date of Request: 3/19/10 Requested Date(s) for Data Collection: April 2010 - May 2010

Professor's Name: Susanic Phone/Email: Susanic@windsor.edu

Include with this request:

☑ A letter from your supervising professor on college or university letterhead indicating support for your research and his/her confirmation of data collection validity.

☑ A brief summary of the issues being researched and the type of data collection you are requesting to conduct. (Page 2 of this form).

☑ Method of data collection assessment (Page 2 of this form); Number of respondents, etc.

☑ Copy of interview questions, surveys, etc. that will be used. If student data is used, a notarized "Release of Educational Records for Research Purposes Confidentiality Statement" will be required.

I, Carolyn Daughtry, do hereby submit to not hold the Cherokee County School System liable for any findings, or commentary involved in this research. I understand that without the express written permission of the Cherokee County Board of Education, I am not authorized to conduct any data collection involving system employees or students and/or any other information that is protected by Federal or State Law. Furthermore, a copy of all findings and data collection instruments will be made available to the Cherokee County Board of Education. All research is to be sent to the Office of Assessment upon completion of the project.

Signature: Carolyn Daughtry Date: 3/19/10

Signature of Principal (if applicable): [Redacted] Date: [Redacted]

Send this form to Dr. Susan Padgett-Harrison, Director, Office of Assessment, Educational Services Annex

Staff Use Only

Office of Assessment: ☑ Permission given ☐ Permission denied

Conditions of Permission: Denied due to: [Redacted]

Revised 01/2009 Additional signatures on file for: [Redacted]
Appendix D. Copy Of Cover Letter For Survey

I would appreciate your assistance with this research project on the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program. The project is being conducted by Carolyn Daugherty from Lincoln Memorial Ed.D program as fulfillment for a dissertation. The research will help me understand the benefits of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program.

All you need to do is complete this short questionnaire, which should take approximately three minutes. Your participation is completely voluntary, so you have the option to skip questions or to stop participating at any time. If you do not wish to participate, simply discard the questionnaire.

Responses will be completely anonymous; your name will not appear anywhere on the survey.

By completing and returning the questionnaire you are acknowledging that you are 18 years of age or older and are consenting to participate in this study.

Keep this letter for your records. If you have any questions regarding the research, contact Carolyn Daugherty at csdaugherty@gmail.com or my advisor Dr. Fran Swantic at swantic@windstream.net. If you have any questions regarding your rights as a research subject, please contact the Lincoln Memorial University Institutional Review Board c/o Pauline Lipscomb, Director of the Office of Research Grants and Sponsored Programs.

Thank you again for your help.

Carolyn Daugherty, TSA as Administrator

Elementary
Appendix E. Permission To Use Online Survey To Advise New Survey

Carolyn Daugherty

From: Jim Jordan [info@reportbullying.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2009 1:45 PM
To: Carolyn Daugherty
Subject: RE: Permission

Carolyn, You have the authority and rights to use any survey or information on our reportbullying.com website.

Jim Jordan

Motivational Speaker - Author
Voted best entertainer 12 yrs in a row
(readers choice awards GTA)
905 333 4553
1866 333 4553 (toll free)
Anti Bullying-Leadership-Career Development

From: Carolyn Daugherty [mailto:Carolyn.Daugherty@]
Sent: Tuesday, September 08, 2009 11:11 AM
To: info@reportbullying.com
Subject: Permission

To whom it may concern,

I am an administrator at an elementary school in Waleska, Georgia. I am writing my dissertation on bully prevention. How would I go about gaining permission to use your Staff Survey? .

Thanks so much,

Carolyn Daugherty, M.S.Ed., Ed.D
Teacher on Special Assignment
Administrator
Elementary

When I stand before God at the end of my life, I would hope that I would not have a single bit of talent left, and could say, "I used everything you gave me".
Erma Bombeck
Appendix F. Principal And Teacher Survey

1. What is your position?

_____ Teacher
_____ Administrator

2. How long have you been at your school?

_____ Under 12 months  ___ 1-5 years  ___ 6-10 years  ___ 10-15 years  ___ 16 or more

3. What grades do you work with?

_____ K-3  ____ 4-6  ____ all grades

Please indicate the extent to which you perceive the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program to be working.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>No Opinion</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School personnel use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students use more effective strategies to stop bullying.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is greater understanding about the nature of the bullying problem at our school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More stakeholders (staff, administrators, community members) are involved in solving the bullying problem at our school.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The number of bullying incidents has been decreased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The severity of reported bullying incidents has decreased.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The atmosphere at the school has been more peaceful.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G. Structured Interview Questions For Principals

Possible Interview Questions for 3 principals in a North Georgia School District

1. What grade levels does your school hold?
2. How many children do you serve?
3. How long have you been with this school?
4. Do you perceive that bullying has increased or decreased since implementation of Olweus?
5. Approximately 35% of teachers had no opinion on question 4, why do you think that is so?
6. Did you implement it, or was it already in place?
7. How much training was done with your staff?
8. How do you train new staff?
9. Are there components that you disagree with? If so, which ones?
10. Are there components that you feel strongly about in a positive way?
11. Do you feel the time expended has benefited your school?
12. What has been the overall effectiveness of the OBPP?
13. What have been some unintended consequences?
Appendix H. Consent To Conduct Audio Interview

Dear Principal,

You have already agreed to participate in a research study entitled: Principal and Teacher Perceptions of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program conducted by Carolyn Daugherty. I am asking for your permission to allow me to audiotape as part of that research study. You do not have to agree to be recorded in order to participate in the main part of the study.

The recording(s) will be used to assist in writing field notes, reflections, and add to the qualitative portion of my dissertation.

The recording(s) will include your title as Principal only. Names and school names will not be used.

The recording(s) will be stored in a locked file cabinet and destroyed within a year from the interview.

Your signature on this form grants the investigator named above permission to record you as described above during participation in the above-referenced study. The investigator will not use the recording(s) for any other reason than that/those stated in the consent form without your written permission.

_____________________________
Participant

__________
Date
Appendix I. Signed Interview Consent Form, School One

You have already agreed to participate in a research study entitled: Principal and Teacher Perceptions of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program conducted by Carolyn Daugherty. I am asking for your permission to allow me to audiotape as part of that research study. You do not have to agree to be recorded in order to participate in the main part of the study.

The recording(s) will be used to assist in writing field notes, reflections, and add to the qualitative portion of my dissertation. The recording(s) will include your title as Principal only. Names and school names will not be used.

The recording(s) will be stored in a locked file cabinet and destroyed within a year from the interview.

Your signature on this form grants the investigator named above permission to record you as described above during participation in the above-referenced study. The investigator will not use the recording(s) for any other reason than that/those stated in the consent form without your written permission.

[Signature]
Participant

6-3-10
Date
Appendix J. Signed Interview Consent Form, School Two

You have already agreed to participate in a research study entitled: Principal and Teacher Perceptions of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program conducted by Carolyn Daugherty. I am asking for your permission to allow me to audiotape as part of that research study. You do not have to agree to be recorded in order to participate in the main part of the study.

The recording(s) will be used to assist in writing field notes, reflections, and add to the qualitative portion of my dissertation. The recording(s) will include your title as Principal only. Names and school names will not be used.

The recording(s) will be stored in a locked file cabinet and destroyed within a year from the interview.

Your signature on this form grants the investigator named above permission to record you as described above during participation in the above-referenced study. The investigator will not use the recording(s) for any other reason than that stated in the consent form without your written permission.

Participant

5/25/10
Date
Appendix K. Signed Interview Consent Form, School Three

You have already agreed to participate in a research study entitled: Principal and Teacher Perceptions of the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program conducted by Carolyn Daugherty. I am asking for your permission to allow me to audiotape as part of that research study. You do not have to agree to be recorded in order to participate in the main part of the study.

The recording(s) will be used to assist in writing field notes, reflections, and add to the qualitative portion of my dissertation. The recording(s) will include your title as Principal only. Names and school names will not be used.

The recording(s) will be stored in a locked file cabinet and destroyed within a year from the interview.

Your signature on this form grants the investigator named above permission to record you as described above during participation in the above-referenced study. The investigator will not use the recording(s) for any other reason than that/those stated in the consent form without your written permission.

Participant

[Signature]

Date
Appendix L: Transcripts of Interviews

Transcription from Interview One

Interviewer:  Ok, we are recording and I hope it picks up.  We will just start with some basic questions.  What grade levels does your school hold?

Participant: We have K-4.

Interviewer: How many children do you serve here on campus?

Participant- Currently around 855, we fluctuate, but that is a good estimate.

Interviewer- How long have you been here as the principal?

Participant: This is my fifth year.

Interviewer: Do you perceive that bullying has increased or decreased since the implementation of Olweus?

Participant: I wouldn’t say it has increased, if anything I would say it has decreased. We haven’t really done a follow up survey to see formally. But I do think that because we are much more open about discussing bullying behaviors I’d like to think there is more awareness and how those behaviors can lead to bullying, full fledged bullying.

Interviewer: I just wanted you to know that teachers had no opinion on that, do you have any thoughts on that. Approximately 35% had no opinion on whether Olweus had led to an increase or decrease in bullying.

Participant: Hum, that is interesting, so one third basically. You know maybe they haven’t seen a decrease in their classroom environment. And again maybe if there was some more hard data. What we find is it’s hard, particularly with these aged children it is hard to get reliable data because we have the Olweus survey that we initially gave to our students and the counselor here has been involved in administering it. We thought if the teachers
gave the survey a teacher may define a term differently or something, so for consistency we tried to have the same people do that. But again, kids I don’t know they almost contradict themselves sometimes. It’s one of those they give you positive and negative to try to weed that out but one minute they are saying they’ve been bullied four times and the next minute they say they have never been bullied or that it happens every week. Again, trying to get them a clear definition of what’s bullying verses bullying behaviors is sometimes difficult. To get them to remember Olweus’ definition which is repeated and power based, so “someone called me a name today” is not bullying but it could be bullying behavior.

Interviewer: Did you implement at this school or was it already in place?

Participant: We actually started the inaugural implementation. When the district offered those courses we were one of the first in the first year. We have had several groups to go but we were one of the initial to go to training.

Interviewer: So that was four years ago?

Participant: Yes, I believe so. There were ten of us and we had…well we started out with more representation from third and fourth and we made sure to pull from our specials or connections teachers, some call them because they come in contact with all of the students. So we had counselors, our computer lab teacher, a PE teacher, a couple of homeroom teachers from third and fourth, administrators, all to initially go. Then we sent another team and then we’ve done a lot of in house redelivery.

Interviewer: That leads into my next question, how much training was done with your staff.

Participant: Well that was a two or three day, I believe it was three days initially and then like I said a second team went and then since then we re-delivered to the staff and we’ve
done refreshers with them since- every year we’ve done some type of refresher and then as new staff have come on we tried to make sure they have an opportunity to be trained as well. So the county has done a good job of offering at least once a year some type of one day training. I think it was post planning three years ago we did a whole staff training. We’ve had a pretty active Olweus Committee, also our counselor has been instrumental within the county to go share ideas. She’s always represented us well. It was great to share and see what other schools have done.

Interviewer: You said there is a new staff county training for Olweus, is that beginning, middle, or end of the year?

Participant: Probably October “ish”, in the fall. We do a big kick off in October and then there is a bully prevention week. We have a school wide assembly with all students present. We’ve had different speakers talk about parts of bully prevention, what the bully circle looks like, and go over the definition. We have a no bully pledge we do here. High school kids come over and do skits, one skit for K-2 and another for 3-4 grade. They lined up the terminology perfectly. One year Cobb EMC brought Miss Teen Georgia came to talk about it. We show “Don’t Laugh at Me”. We play the music at the assembly and there is a video that goes with that. PE uses it some, we use it to seat kids at the assembly. One year we purchased the book for each homeroom. So the kids are familiar with that. We also do annual t-shirts. We get sponsors and everyone in the building gets a shirt. This year it was a black t-shirt with a red peace sign and it said “Peace, Love, and Bear Paws”. The sponsors are great because there is no cost, it also levels the playing field, socioeconomic, etc. We all wear them the first Monday of each month. Some of the kids wear them about once a week.

Interviewer: Are there any components that you disagree with?
Participant: Of the total program? Probably just the survey. It is difficult, it is long. So we gave the survey initially and one other time, but chose not to this year. We just aren’t confident in the reliability/validity.

One thing I forgot to mention we did have Mike Carpenter come. He was contracted to work with the district one of the things was to do something with parents, so we had third grade perform one night some different songs like “Don’t Laugh at Me”. Unfortunately, we didn’t hold their kids hostage and many left before listening to him speak. We ended up with about fifty parents who stayed.

Interviewer: Are there any components you feel strongly about with Olweus?

Participant: I think it does cause us to talk about the specifics with behavior that’s what I like about it. I’m not sure how familiar you are with the history of this area, but there was an incident here in this county. But that incident was in this very community. So people who have been around a long time that is still obviously a very emotional issue. So they assume that one small thing is going to lead to something dramatic like that. People get really worked up about that. We hear it in the media to and parents can be quick to say, “he’s bullying my child”. People sometimes have their own definition that is an inch deep and a mile wide.

Something else that is powerful that we don’t do enough of – some teachers do a better job than others and it’s not something we require but we encourage it is the class meetings. It’s a time component as well too. Class meetings can bring a sense of unity and family. That’s an area I would say that we want to grow in. One thing we need to understand is we aren’t out to change the bully or the victim, we are trying to sway the bystanders to react to what’s happening. Bystander involvement.
Interviewer: Do you feel the time and money expended on the program has benefited your school?

Participant: I would say so, I don’t know the exact dollar amount. I’m sure it was quite sizeable for a contract with him. I know that since then the county chose to invest training in one of our current employees. That will be a challenge next year since she is back in the classroom, but I think this day and time you have to have something in place to try to make the world better for kids and make school better for kids but also I just think that legally you have to have something in place. The key to it is- whether you call it Olweus or not if you can create a school where all kids belong- and I know that’s their theme, that’s what it’s all about, if you can teach respect for other people. We have to teach kids to respect each other’s differences- we model that a lot.

The terminology has been beneficial to adults, for kids it could be more primary.

Interviewer: What do you see as the overall effectiveness which goes back to my previous question, and then with that have you seen any unintended consequences?

Participant: As far as effectiveness I think it’s been great to heighten the awareness of the adults in the building. Sometimes it’s just being mindful of the types of behaviors to look for – some things stand out, we’ve always thought of it as being physical or rough, but there are so many other things besides the physical. The whole exclusion part is (especially in 3-4 grade) and the name-calling. One thing we’ve seen is cyberbullying and how to prevent that- internet safety. Parents will show up for meetings on that. Our full time computer teachers have done a lot with that.
Unintended consequences…I’d say the positives outweigh any negatives. Reporting has increased, but there is the confusion of the complete definition again. Just like after we do “Good Touch, Bad Touch” there is an increase in reports. That’s not a negative thing either. When they report it just takes retraining to explain what it means. For example, “yeah that wasn’t a nice thing to do, but was it bullying according to this definition?”.

Interviewer: Is there anything else you’d like to add?

Participant: Well I’d just like to say that I think we’ve done a really good job with it, we’ve been fairly consistent, and didn’t just go into it the first year and then let it go we’ve tried to keep the fire under it. We do a lot of community outreach too. Parents bring to the school the feelings they had going through school, so if they were bullied they bring that with them.

Interviewer: Thank you so much for your time I really appreciate it.
Transcription from Interview 2

Interviewer: Ok, so what grade levels does your school hold?
Participant: K-6

Interviewer: And how many children are here?
Participant: 1250

Interviewer: And how long have you been here?
Participant: 12 years

Interviewer: Do you perceive that bullying has increased or decreased since the implementation of Olweus?
Participant: I think we are pretty much the same. There has been some improvement but we have 1250 kids and the odds are not in our favor.

Interviewer: The survey I sent out showed that the teachers had no opinion about that, do you have a comment on that?
Participant: On the bullying increasing or decreasing?
Interviewer: yes…

Participant: I think most of our teachers handle things in house in their classroom and they aren’t really aware of what’s going on in the building. I think it’s a perception thing.

Interviewer: Did you implement Olweus or was it already in place?
Participant: We implemented it.

Interviewer: Ok, do you want to talk about the implementation process?
Participant: We had a committee that went to the initial training, a two day training. We represented each grade level, our specials, and our counselors. After the two day training we came back and redelivered to our staff. Then we had Dr. Mike Carpenter come in and
give a half-day training on a staff development day for the entire staff. So we began implementing this past fall with the classroom meetings and rewarding positive behavior.

We did not do the kick off which they really want you to do. It was a timing thing.

Interviewer: Well that answers my question about training staff, but is there a procedure for training new staff coming in?

Participant: Not now, but I'm sure in pre-planning we will get with the new staff and all. Actually, (county trained person) is now a part of our staff, so I would think she would be in charge of training the new staff.

Interviewer: Are there any components that you disagree with?

Participant: Not totally.

Interviewer: Are there any components you feel strongly about in a positive way?

Participant: I like the class meetings. I think it not only gives the kids a change to vent and all but gives the teachers an opportunity to really get to know their kids. With increased standards and accountability you are losing the ability to get to know your kids. I think this is a small opportunity to do that.

Interviewer: Do you think the time and money expended on the program has benefited your school?

Participant: Yes, I mean any time you get any resources it benefits and all. With budget cuts I don’t perceive any additional money. We started the program and we intend to follow it through and all with the resources that we have on hand.

Interviewer: And what has the overall effectiveness of Olweus been?
Participant: I think it’s improved the morale with the kids that we are here to support them and they have somewhere to go. Sometimes kids say they are being bullied and it may not really be bullying so we try to distinguish that and still feel we are supporting the kids.

Interviewer: Last question, and what have been the unintended consequences of Olweus?

Participant: We have had more parent calls about their child being bullied. It’s almost like we put the word out there, so now that’s the word that is coming back to us.

Interviewer: Do you have any other things to say about Olweus?

Participant: No, I mean it’s a good program. I think the concepts are good, but again with implementation, especially with a large school. I think the end justifies the means.

Interviewer: Well, thank you for your time.
Transcription from Interview 3

Interviewer: Ok, first question, very simple… what grade levels does your school hold?

Participant: K-4

Interviewer: And how many children do you serve here?

Participant: This year we have 1135.

Interviewer: And how long have you been here?

Participant: This is my third year, so I’ve just completed three years.

Interviewer: Do you perceive that bullying has increased or decreased since the implementation of Olweus?

Participant: Well I’ve only been here for three years and we started Olweus before that, but I really don’t see bullying as a big problem here. The one thing I do see is the awareness has increased. And the bullying we have is more “mean girl” and exclusion. I don’t think it’s bullying that has increased I think awareness has increased so people are more inclined to report it.

Interviewer: The survey I sent out showed that the teachers had no opinion about that, do you have an opinion as to why?

Participant: Well I think it’s probably the same thing bullying hasn’t increased but children are aware and teachers are aware. Some of the things before that we just called tattling could actually escalate to the level of being bullying.

Interviewer: Did you implement Olweus or was it already in place?

Participant: It was already in place. It was about 7 years ago, they were one of the first schools.
Interviewer: Are you familiar with how much training was done with the staff here?

Participant: There was a good bit of training done, I believe Mike Carpenter with Olweus came and trained most of the staff and he was involved with their original kick off which was at least six years ago maybe seven. It’s a great program. The program here is very strong. It was great buy in for the teachers. We have a bullying committee that meets as needed. But the plan is once a month or two months to plan activities for the school and what the focus is going to be. There are several good activities that take place for awareness.

Interviewer: Is there procedures for training any new staff coming in?

Participant: We have tried to train, so whenever the county has offered training we have particularly made sure that our committee was trained and then our committee is responsible- there is a committee member for each grade level on the committee, so they are responsible for making sure their entire team is aware of the procedures, our discipline plan and our plan for preventing bullying. In addition to grade levels it’s specials people, kind of like our leadership team.

Interviewer: Are there any components that you disagree with? If so, which ones?

Participant: No, the only thing that I think is sometimes in the elementary school, especially here – if you do it on the way it is supposed to be done, there is too much emphasis on things that are more sexual that are beyond what our fourth graders really are aware of – when we do the survey there are several questions we take out. It’s really not appropriate for third and fourth graders.

Interviewer: Someone mentioned how long the survey is…

Participant: It’s long, but we haven’t had as much problem with that this year we did it almost as a CRCT test in the fact that the teachers read the questions and the children
answered it. We also had them to remind them of what the definition of bullying is, so I think the data on our survey this year is going to be a little bit better. In the past, third and fourth graders- if anyone calls them a name, they might use the word bully. We wanted to make sure they really knew what that meant.

Interviewer: Are there any components you feel strongly about in a positive way?

Participant: Well, I do think the whole thing, we had a new student come to school this year and was walking around the school and saw the signs, the no bullying signs, and he asked our counselor, do you have bullies at this school? And she answered, you know we work really hard to make sure that we don’t, it’s a big focus to make sure we don’t. He said, “Oh, I’m so glad cause I’m coming from a school where I was bullied”. So I think just that awareness is really important and I do think the fact that we explain to children not only what a bully is, but what to do as a victim. That’s one of the components I think I really like is the part that as a victim there is something you can do and as a bystander there is something you can do. It’s not all about the bully. It’s about the other people and what they can do.

Interviewer: Do you think the time and money expended on the program has benefited your school?

Participant: Absolutely, even though ours is a different kind of bullying. I do think it’s very beneficial.

Interviewer: And what has the overall effectiveness of Olweus been?

Participant: Awareness. That mean girl stuff and exclusion is really hard to overcome. And I have to say one of the most beneficial things we’ve done this year is we showed that American Girl movie, Karissa. It’s an amazing story about exclusion. We showed it to our third and fourth graders at the end of the year. It’s a great story about a little
girl in a school and she is excluded. It’s really neat about how she handles herself, what she does. It’s so sweet. I’m sorry I got off on a tangent, overall effectiveness? I do think it’s effective. This school does not have very much bullying.

Interviewer: Last question, and what have been the unintended consequences of the program?

Participant: Well, I think the big thing is that since they are aware we have a lot of things reported that aren’t necessarily bullying. And that goes for the parents. It has become a catch-word. So, anytime a kid is picked on or someone says something unkind to a kid it’s, “my child is being bullied”, or “I am being bullied”. So that is the hardest thing to overcome is what is truly bullying and what is just someone not being nice to your child. So that is the unintended consequence, I think.

Interviewer: So you think you have an over-reporting almost?

Participant: Of things that aren’t bullying… yeah. But that’s OK we deal with it. We have mild consequences to start you know the counselor referrals and talking to the children and it’s worked for us. We had an incident this year and it was really neat – a student in third grade, which is a tough grade because that is where that exclusion starts. The mom sent me this ranting email about how her child was being bullied and it was terrible, terrible, terrible. And I told her we would take care of it and I wrote back something about have you talked to her about what she can do as a victim? She was so mad at me for saying that it was her fault. So I said to her that I am in no way saying it is her fault, but I told her the program we use for bully prevention is that there are things the victim can do to empower them. Not that she has done anything wrong but that she can be empowered, not that she did anything wrong, but wanted to know if she’d talked with her. So we pulled the girls in and it
turned out beautiful, it was like oh my gosh this is so sweet. They wound up talking about it and getting past it. I won’t say they were best friends but they were friendly after that.

Interviewer: Do you guys do the big kick off, or class meetings?

Participant: We do the class meetings, I don’t require them, I encourage them. I would say 70% of our teachers do them. Class meetings are worth the fifteen minutes they take because it saves you so much time in the long run. We also do quarterly or monthly things we do something called the “rainbow of respect”. When students are caught doing something exceptionally kind they get to put a hand print on the wall and each grade level has a color so it makes a rainbow. At Thanksgiving last year we did turkeys. So when teachers found students being appropriate bystanders and helping people then they got to put a feather on the turkey. Another thing they do here is they have the mascot paw print there is one on each playground so if you are outside and you don’t have anyone to play with you go and stand on the paw print. If someone sees you standing on the paw print they are supposed to come and ask you to play. Now you can’t say, “I don’t want to play with you, I want to pay with her”, but you’ve got to go with that person that comes. And of course if two people are standing on the paw print they play together. It’s a really neat thing for elementary school. It starts in Kindergarten they teach them about the paw prints.

Participant: In a given week I bet we don’t see maybe two kids in the office. We are really able to focus on what is really important. The kids here are good. The parents are supportive.

Interviewer: Well, do you have anything more to add about Olweus?
Participant: Well, I would say I am surprised at how important I do think it is. When I first heard we were doing bullying in the elementary schools, I thought, “We don’t need that.” But I’m really surprised to have found out it is very beneficial and it has made a difference, if for no other reason than people are aware of what bullying is. A school has to have something in place. Parents see it in the news.

Interviewer: Well, thank you so much for your time.
### Appendix M: Master list of Coded Themes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interview #</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Question 1</td>
<td>K-4</td>
<td>K-6</td>
<td>K-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What grade levels does your school hold?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 2</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many children do you serve?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 3</td>
<td>5 years</td>
<td>12 years</td>
<td>3 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How long have you been with this school?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 4</td>
<td>It has not increased. It has decreased. There is more openness in discussion about bullying and <strong>more awareness</strong>.</td>
<td>We are the same. Maybe some improvement.</td>
<td><strong>Awareness has increased.</strong> Awareness has increased so more people are inclined to report it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do you perceive that bullying has increased or decreased since implementation of Olweus?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 5</td>
<td>Maybe they haven’t seen a change within their classroom. Data is hard to get. Our counselors give it to all students for consistency, but the kids contradict themselves. Getting a clear definition communicated to the kids is a challenge.</td>
<td>Teachers handle things in their own classroom and aren’t aware of what is going on in the building. It’s a perception thing.</td>
<td>They probably perceive it hasn’t increased or decreased there is just more awareness. Teachers all read the survey to them and they are reminded of the definition.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approximately 35% of teachers had no opinion on Question 4, why do you think that is so?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 6</td>
<td>We were a part of the inaugural implementation four</td>
<td>We implemented.</td>
<td>It was already in place. This was one of the first schools 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 7</td>
<td>How much training was done with your staff?</td>
<td>A team received a 3-day training. Redelivered to staff and gives refreshers. Kick-off each year.</td>
<td>A team went to training and Dr. Carpenter came to redeliver. No kick-off.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 8</td>
<td>How do you train new staff?</td>
<td>Around October</td>
<td>Will be trained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 9</td>
<td>Are there components you disagree with, which ones?</td>
<td>Just the survey. It is difficult and long.</td>
<td>Not totally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 10</td>
<td>Are there components you feel strongly about in a positive way?</td>
<td>Causes discussion. Class meetings are important. Encourages Bystander involvement also.</td>
<td>Class meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 11</td>
<td>Do you feel the time expended has benefited your school?</td>
<td>I would say so.</td>
<td>Yes, anytime you have more resources it’s a good thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 12</td>
<td>What has been the overall effectiveness?</td>
<td>Heightens awareness of adults in the building.</td>
<td>Improved morale with the kids. Sometimes kids say they are being bullied and it may not really be but they feel supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question 13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What have been some unintended consequences?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Reporting has increased. |
| Confusion with the definition |
| More parent calls reporting bullying. |
| Things are reported that aren’t necessarily bullying. |
### Appendix N: Iteration of Qualitative Responses

#### Survey One Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration of Questions</th>
<th>Qualitative Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
<td>Some teachers noted increased awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Staff were more aware of the need for support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>Awareness of the program increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All teachers felt more aware of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Survey Two Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration of Questions</th>
<th>Qualitative Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
<td>Students felt more comfortable and engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>Improved communication between teachers and students.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7, 8</td>
<td>Awareness of the program increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Improved understanding of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Survey One Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration of Questions</th>
<th>Qualitative Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4, 5, 6</td>
<td>Staff noted increased awareness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>Understanding of the program improved.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2, 3</td>
<td>Students felt more engaged.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>All teachers noted increased engagement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Survey Two Teachers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Iteration of Questions</th>
<th>Qualitative Feedback</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8, 9, 10</td>
<td>Improved understanding of the program.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7, 8, 9</td>
<td>Increased confidence in teaching.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6, 7, 8</td>
<td>Awareness of the program increased.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5, 6, 7</td>
<td>Improved understanding of the program.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

#### Notes

- KA: 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
- 1A: 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
- 2A: 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
- 3A: 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4
- 4A: 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4

- KB: 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
- 1B: 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
- 2B: 3, 3, 3, 3, 3, 3
- 3B: 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4
- 4B: 4, 4, 4, 4, 4, 4

- 5: SD
- 4: P
- 3: A
- 2: NA
- 1: NO
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Appendix P: Annotated Bibliography

Rationale for Inclusion

The purpose of this resource was to provide educators with a beneficial compilation of annotated sources addressing components of the issues related to school bullying. There were certain criteria required for inclusion. Literature referencing research from 1993 to 2009 was included. A majority of the research was contemporary; however, information surrounding the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program dated back to the early 1990s. Research addressing an introduction and background on bullying, types of bulling, bullying roles, perceptions of bullying, approaches to deal with bullying, anti-bullying programs, consequences of bullying, and miscellaneous additional resources were included. This resource was intended to serve as a reference tool for the practitioner needing an inclusive and readily accessible source on bullying.
Introduction and Background to Bullying Problems and Programs


Researchers surveyed opinions of 1,229 students in the age bracket of 9 to 13. Suggestions for anti-bullying curriculum were made. This research concluded with similar results from what other research was showing, that one third of students reported being bullied at some time. Contradicting other research this study showed that a majority of the bullying was happening in middle school. It was noted that bystanders played the most important role and can be the answer to stop bullying.


The author explained each of the three roles in great detail, the bully, the bullied, and the bystander. The next section gave indicators to determine if a child may be a bully or a victim of bullying (provided steps to take if one’s child is the bully, and strategies to be used if one’s child is the victim), or even a witness to such. The author concluded with school involvement (how to evaluate a school’s anti-bullying procedure), community involvement, and the influence of technology on the problem.


This was a three-year study of an evaluation of a school based violence intervention program. It was modeled after Dan Olweus’ work. The school was located in a rural
midwestern county and involved 32 teachers and by year three included 752 students. Surveys were taken, and adult awareness, conferences, class meetings, talking with bully and victim, and talks with parents were some key components. Anti-bullying class rules were utilized as well. The training expanded each year as did the scope of the program. Attitudes improved and the self-reporting of students who felt victimized increased, leading to more reports of bullying. However, this did not impact feelings of safety.


This author reviewed Dan Olweus' definition of bullying, which states that bullying has occurred when a student has been the recipient of repeated negative actions from one or more other students. He also differentiated between direct bullying (kicking, shoving, hitting) and indirect bullying (rejection, name-calling, gossip, or threats). It was suggested that administrators and staff members should be trained to be sensitive to bullying acts, and surveys should be used to follow up. There should be a plan in place to cope with this issue.


This study involved utilization of a program called Youth Matters in 28 fourth grade classrooms and comparison of results to a no-treatment control group. They worked from the premise that skills for social and emotional conditions could be taught. The program was interactive. The results were promising with a decrease in victimization; however, bully and victim roles overlapped at times. The growth modeling of binary outcomes may not have been the best choice. The researchers did acknowledge that there were not many accepted programs in the U.S. that have been studied sufficiently.

This study began by indicating the various definitions on bullying. Koo then delves into the history of bullying from the 18th to 20th centuries from Korea, Japan, and the UK. The author attempted to correlate newspaper stories from the UK in the 1800s to the definitions of bullying and historical documents from Japan and Korea to the definitions of bullying. However, one could have perceived those correlations as a stretch; they seem more associated with hazing than bullying. He discussed military incidents and male rituals and labels them as bullying. He investigated parental discipline techniques, which seemed more associated with time-out, than isolation and bullying. Koo summarized that the definition of bullying has changed and will continue to morph due to modern technologies allowing for bullying through email and the Internet.


This book gave practical advice on how to involve the entire school to combat bullying. It gave clear criteria on how to determine a child's role in the bullying phenomena. Olweus proposed that 15% of students in primary and secondary schools are involved in bullying either as the perpetrator or as the victim. Olweus suggested that his strategies have reduced bullying issues by 50% and resulted in a decline in truancy, vandalism, and other anti-social behavior associated with the bully/victim scenario. He also boasted that classroom environments have improved giving more students a positive outlook on schooling.
Types of Bullying


This article investigated the role peers play as bystanders of bullying. The research examined perceptions after students were given vignettes displaying verbal attacks on a student. The vignettes were of a weight insult, a clothing insult, and a social rejection. Self-reporting was used with the Weinberger Adjustment Inventory-Short Form and The Children's Coping Scale-Short Form. Nine schools in Australia participated, with 379 students ages 10-13. Several factors played into the participation of bystanders to watch, join in, support the bully, or support the victim. The factors included whether the person was a friend of the bully or a friend of the victim, whether the person had low or high self-esteem, and their levels of self-restraint. Bystanders may not become involved for fear of being the next victim, lack of self-esteem, or lack of acceptable strategies. It was clear that anti-bullying interventions were important, as well as addressing it earlier in school rather than later.


This article focused on cyber bullying. It was a qualitative ethnographic case study. The study involved 5th and 6th grade students and followed them for a year. Students were given class projects that involved using the Internet. The different projects included a class website, a chat room format, guest book, and an email service. The students’ grades would not be affected if they did not access these things from home, though they were given that
option. The researcher chronicled events weekly and found bullying to be an issue, but not the serious issue that the media spins it to be. Differences between boys and girls were obvious. Boys bullied more online than girls. Boys used more serious language and tone. Girls tended to pretend to be someone else to hurt feelings. Flooding was used by the boys and involved blocking others from communicating by pressing the submit button and holding it down. There was also flaming, harassment, cyber stalking, and exclusion. Researchers found that those who were likely to be bullied at school were bullied via technology as well. Since schools have boundaries as to what can be enforced in and out of school it would take considerable cooperation between school and home to manage cyber bullying.
Bullying Roles


The authors began by answering questions of what bullying was, who were the bullies, who were the victims, and who were the bystanders. By surveying teachers and librarians and referencing the Amazon web site, the researchers were able to gather a list of books that explored the bullying issue. It was narrowed to books published between 1995 and 2003. Jalongo's (1983) guidelines were used to select the 25 books to be used. Criteria were identified such as characters, the bullying behavior portrayed, the setting, the gender of the bully, role of bystanders, adult involvement, and resolution. As other literature had supported the gender of the bully tended to be male, the characters were mostly animals, the setting was typically school or home, 88% of the stories involved bystanders, over half displayed adult involvement, and the most often used problem resolution was the bystander or adult intervening to stop the bullying. The researchers expressed that by the teacher reading a book the children could relate to, they showed compassion and knowledge of the happenings in the classroom. This could give rise to more children bringing issues to the teacher.


This study followed children for a six year time period and examined the roles of bully and victim through primary and secondary education. Children were very different
from early ages to near adolescence. In primary schools the role of victim was ever changing, while the role of bully tended to remain more constant. The bully role was found to be more likely to continue into secondary school. It was determined that secondary school hierarchy was higher than primary school. Secondary school often marked more rejection and less acceptance of the victim as compared to the bully.


This research suggested that victims of bullying as well as the bullies themselves were more likely to be involved in more violent behavior than those who have not been exposed to bullying behavior. This study examined bully/victim characteristics, risk factors, and the role of parents and gender in bullying. Olweus' most significant findings are summarized, and the author provides a look at peer pressure and sexual harassment. The author took a very personal view of this subject. It was more of a review of literature with reflective portions throughout.


This study utilized a tracking survey called TRAILS (Tracking Adolescents Individual Lives Survey). This study followed Dutch preadolescents until they were 25 years old and explored the developmental mental health and social growth into adulthood. Using peer nomination, children were divided into four categories: bully, bully/victim, victim, and
uninvolved. In the univariate analysis it was indicated that boys are more likely to be bully and bully/victims and girls are more likely to fall into the uninvolved category. The multivariate analysis predicted aggressiveness, isolation, dislikability, and gender as related to family and parenting. A limitation to the study was the peer nomination. It was found that characteristics such as aggression, isolation, dislikability, and gender were more related to bullying than parenting relations in bullying and victimization. For the next wave of the study the children would be into their secondary education.
Perceptions of Bullying


This study analyzed the drawings of children as they depicted bullies and bullying situations. The authors polled 30 nine year olds, 18 nine-ten year olds, and 34 students who were twelve years old. They were asked to draw someone being bullied and then interviews were conducted to ask open-ended questions to get a brief story of their drawing. They were asked questions such as:

- How do you think the bully feels?
- What is the bully thinking?
- Why would he/she want to bully?
- How do you think the one being picked on...feels?
- What is she/he thinking?
- Why is he/she being picked on?
- What could he/she do so that he/she is not picked on?

Responses were coded and a descriptive and qualitative analysis was performed. To measure frequencies, a chi-square was used. Children's responses overall correlated with the current research. Approximately 70% of the children said the bully was trying to make the other child feel sad. Half of the children felt as if the bully had positive emotions from inflicting harm. Of the children asked, 98% felt the victim was having negative emotions. When asked about reacting to the bully, 40% said to tell a teacher, 27% suggested making friends with the bully, 23% stated to walk away, 17% suggested ignoring the bully, and only
12% said to confront. Though the sample was small, homogenous in race and socioeconomic standing, the qualitative procedure asking children open-ended questions provided much insight.


Potentially differing views on bullying between students and school staff are explored through this research. In May of 2006, 15,185 students and 1,547 staff members were surveyed. Some questions were "yes" or "no", while others were on a 1 to 4 scale. Staff perceived that bullying occurred more infrequently than the students. Another interesting development was that students overall perceived adult intervention to make the situation worse, whereas staff did not believe their intervention had negative consequences. Possible deviations in wording of the questions, as well as the location the surveys were conducted, could have impacted the results.


This research probes children's opinions on the most effective intervention in bullying scenarios. The researchers identified the children's status as victim, bully, or bystander. One bully/victim was found but was not included in the analysis. After children were identified they were asked structured questions using the three perspectives of bully, victim, and bystander. The different points of view gave way to different opinions on how each situation should be handled in the most effective manner. The findings indicated that interventions
should be tailored to the different roles the children play among their peers. For example, the bullies saw retaliation as the only effective discourager of bullying because they saw weakness in assertiveness or nonchalance.


Researchers examined principals' perceptions of bullying as it related to students with disabilities. Ninety percent of participants responded that disabled students were sometimes bullies and other times they are bullied. A random sampling was taken from 75 of 650 elementary schools in the state of Alabama. A 65% response rate was the final count. Overall, principals did not seem to perceive that their schools had a bullying problem, although 90% felt that students with disabilities were either bully, victim, or both.


Hunter and Boyle analyzed the perceptions of boys and girls within short term bullying, long term bullying, and the amount of control they felt in those situations. They hypothesized that knowing the amount of control students feel in different contexts could benefit researchers in their quest for appropriate interventions. It was also considered that the type of bullying taking place toward each gender would dictate the reaction of the victim. Almost 350 children were surveyed with a nearly even split between gender; the children were asked about the frequency of certain behaviors such as calling names, threats, damage, violence, extortion, spreading rumors, and relational exclusion. They were then questioned about the duration of those behaviors along with their perceived levels of control.
It was found that girls exhibit lower feelings of control more than boys when the bullying was more frequent. Thus, earlier intervention would be beneficial. Overall, it was found that boys have more control over bullying than girls. Children being victimized by older children did not necessarily have lower feelings of control, which brings into question the imbalance of power school of thought within some definitions of bullying. A substantial limitation to this study was that children reporting a lower threshold of control had those feelings from the beginning; they were not necessarily developed over time.


The authors attempted to deduce whether children's repeated attacks are similar to being bullied and whether peer victimization and bullying are also similar. Psychological adjustment, coping strategies, and cognitive appraisals were used. It was hypothesized that not all students would report both a power imbalance and malicious intent between them and the aggressor. It was, however, expected that those bullied would perceive to be in less control, see a higher threat level, use more coping strategies, and have higher levels of the symptoms of depression. The study looked at 1,429 students between the ages of eight and 13. Very specific questions were asked of the students to determine their experiences with bullying or aggressive behaviors, their methods of coping, and their symptoms of depression. Students who reported peer-victimization did not always indicate that it was bullying. Bullied students used the same amount of problem solving but used more coping strategies. Symptoms of depression were higher for those who were bullied. It was found that bullying was quite different from and more harmful than peer-victimization.

Researchers explored a correlation between levels of respect and bullying. Surveys were given to 3,147 students and interviews were conducted among 315 students. Respect levels were examined among peer to peer and peer to teacher relationships. Conclusions were that levels of respect were moderate overall. The relationship was a significant one. One drawback to this study would be how each participant defines the word respect. The adults in the school were given the task of setting the level of respect within the school.


Through this research study, practicing teachers (those with a teacher job) and training teachers (those in school to become teachers) were given a vignette that described an altercation. In one vignette, a scenario of two boys fighting and the description of the teacher intervening using words, followed by the teacher being assaulted by one of the boys, was provided. The other vignette was the same except the teacher intervened physically. Again, the teacher was assaulted. Three hypotheses were made: the teacher using non-physical strategies would be seen in a more positive light, practicing teachers would provide better evaluations than the training teachers on those, and the classroom environment would play a part as the disorganized classroom can lead to more blame for the teacher. All of these were significant in positive findings. Specifically, practicing teachers sided more often with their own. Also, a disorganized classroom reflected poorly on the teacher in the mock situation.
Twelve teachers per experiment were used in this relatively small study. However, this study could provide insight to predict future behavior.


Surveys were given to students whose parents agreed and gave consent and teachers were surveyed at the same time. Parent surveys went home to be completed. A total of 739 students in 4 through 6 grades were surveyed, along with 367 parents and 37 teachers. When parents completed the parent survey, they did not follow directions to indicate their own child's name; therefore, certain deductions could not be made. The results demonstrated that while parents and teachers understood the various forms of bullying better than the students, the students indicated being bullied more often than parents and teachers acknowledged.
Approaches to Deal with Bullying


Cowie investigated bystanders and their role to eliminate bullying. Nine schools in the United Kingdom participated for one year in a peer support system using Befriending programs, conflict resolution programs, and peer counseling. Peers would take those who were victimized under their wings to support and listen to them. Data was collected through interviews with peer helper benefits and victim benefits in mind. Some problems mentioned were lack of a private place for counseling, lack of adult support, and lack of training for the peer helpers. Time and resources were also mentioned as limitations. Some benefits noted were self esteem, responsibility, and teamwork improved within the peer helper group. According to those involved, the overall atmosphere in the school improved.


A school-wide approach has been shown to be most effective when combating bullying. All parties must be aware of the situation and be involved in the intervention. This book explored different vignettes and proposed solutions to the vignette and activities the teacher could use to present this material. This book provided support and encouraged teachers to develop their own scenarios to practice problem solving with the children.

By using Solving Problems Together (SPT), a counselor met with a small group to encourage discussion and problem solving strategies to deal with bullies and other life situations. With SPT, students took control of their own problems and learned to gain the confidence and skills to deal with them. A school-wide survey identified five students to participate. The counselor had a framework to set a purpose, identify goals, set objectives, and select the curriculum. The researcher used a pre/post test design to evaluate the students’ progress and the program's effectiveness. While this study showed promise, it was mentioned that comparing SPT with traditional counseling programs might be beneficial in future research.


The article began by acknowledging the seriousness of bullying and the possible consequences of physical harm, mental harm, and attendance problems. Bullies themselves could be at risk for physical harm as well and suffer from guilt. The research insinuated that teachers overlook bullying because they do not know how to address it. The authors explored types of aggression that can come from a history of bullying. One was reactive and was hot-blooded and automatic. The reactive aggression tended to be purposeful and premeditated. The study explores intervention needs and the role the counselor plays. Seven recommendations are made to assist the counselor in intervention.

The authors began with two hypotheses: having any intervention for anti-bullying would decrease the self reports of bullying, and the group with the addition of multimedia would further increase the drop in bullying episodes. Three groups were studied, one group had a teacher/counselor intervention, the second had the addition of videos, and the third group had all the other interventions plus a DVD that students watched. Pre and post treatment data was collected. Results were concurrent with the hypotheses. By adding more interventions levels of bullying decreased.


Newman focused on students’ help seeking skills when being harassed by peers. He addressed the fact that dealing with conflict is a daily issue for most, and children need to learn to resolve conflict on their own, but in what situation is help warranted and at what social cost? He focused on two theoretical perspectives of adapted help seeking: coping and self-regulation. Newman pointed out that age and gender greatly influence decisions and methods used in adaptive and non-adaptive help seeking. He theorized that coping strategies were a more ideal and effective help seeking method. Furthermore, he acknowledged that additional research should be conducted in the area of adaptive help seeking, specifically as it relates to bullying.

It is a legal requirement in England to have anti-bullying policies within each school. This study investigated 115 primary schools and 27 secondary schools with a 31 item scoring analysis. Areas within a policy were definitions of bullying, including forms like verbal, physical, and exclusionary forms. At least 40% of the items were found in school policies. The 31-item analysis explored definitions, reporting and responding to bullying situations, keeping data on bullying, and strategies used to prevent bullying. Two areas that lacked attention were cyber bullying, which is relatively new, and homophobic bullying. A limitation to this study was that the school response rate was only 50%. Also, more current issues were not involved in the analysis, such as cyber bullying after school and attacks based on religion and disability. Most policies gave adequate definitions and examples and involved parent notification. This study highlighted that many areas need to be addressed more sufficiently, such as more recent definitions of bullying, data collection, and more preventative measures.


The authors began by communicating a story, which was composed of several experiences of two different teachers. It described a boy named Billy who was a constant distraction in class. The dynamic between the boy and the teacher was analyzed as well as the relationships between mother and boy, principal and boy, and classmates and the boy. Everyone, whether knowingly or not, contributed in some way to Billy's behavior. His mother yelled at him in the morning, she wished he were never born, and the mother constantly threatened to go to the school board on the principal who only baby sat the boy in
the office when he got into trouble. The teacher became the victim and the boy continued to bully, as he was not fearful because his mom promised she would take care of the situation. This cycle was perpetual because of each of the participants’ beliefs about the situation. Their mentalization propagated the problem. In the Peaceful Schools Experiment, a philosophy was adopted, not a program. The philosophy began with positive climate campaigns led by the counselor to modify the beliefs of all people involved with the school. A form of classroom management was adopted to identify the cause of the problem and not just administer consequences. Peer and adult mentorship was used to advance the classroom management techniques over into the entire system of adults. A physical education program combined role play with martial arts defensive moves along with relaxation techniques. Reflection time was implemented daily to give the teachers and students time to analyze the events of the day. These interventions were measured by self-reports of bullying, bystanding, empathy towards victims, aggression appropriateness, and observations of disruptive behavior. The predominant conclusion was that this intervention was successful in reducing aggressive behaviors and disruption and increasing bystander willingness to intervene.
Anti-Bullying Programs


According to Farrington (1993), bullying is defined as any act of physical, psychological, or verbal harm committed by a more dominant personality against someone who is less dominant. Farrington and Baldry evaluated sixteen programs attempted all over the world to alleviate bullying. They identified criteria to establish which programs would warrant study. They evaluated the ones that used quasi or experimental design, pre/post measures, or age-based cohorts; programs that gave definitions and a program to be used in schools; ones that had bullying measured by self-report questionnaires, teacher ratings, peer rankings, or observations; at least 200 students used; published in English only; and percentages used to quantify increases/decreases in behavior. A table dissected program components, participant information, methods of evaluation, and design of research. Summaries of the programs and their results indicated that eight had positive results, two had mixed results, four had small results, and two had negative results. Overall research shows anti-bullying programs to be positive, with Olweus showing the most positive results. Future research would need to assess the programs number of components related to success rate.


This study examined identification of vital components of an adventure-based anti-bullying program. The mission was to reduce bullying behavior while making for a safer school atmosphere in an elementary school in New Mexico. An Anti-Bullying Initiative
survey was used along with role-play school sessions. Limitations of "ceiling effect, abnormal data distributions, and low correlation coefficients" were acknowledged. It was documented that students became more responsible and helped with peer relations.


Two hundred and twenty-one teachers from urban and suburban school districts in a mid-western area participated in focus groups to discuss bullying and student aggression. A qualitative survey was used at the end of each 45 minute focus group. The survey addressed beliefs about student behavior and aggression. Following the focus groups, 778 fourth through sixth graders from the same schools were given self-reports to gauge aggressive behavior. Discipline data was also utilized. As expected, the urban school setting reported more aggressive behaviors than did the suburban setting. Using this information the authors worked collaboratively with the teachers to set up a workable program to meet the individual needs of the schools. A school that reported the most aggression, for example, may have benefited more from a whole school approach with classroom-based programs. A school with less aggression may have desired to only implement some behavior supports and teacher consultation.


Many schools have bully prevention programs in place. This article explored taking a school intervention and applying it to a less structured schema, like a summer camp.
Numbers of bullying incidents, discipline referrals, and counselor perceptions were all analyzed. The Bully Busters Program was used in this instance. A one-group pre/post-test design was used. The Bully Buster Program was implemented over 10 weeks. The camp counselors had varying degrees of education and it was a possible limitation to the implementation of the program. A small sample size was also a limitation. Results were unclear.


There were 44 studies analyzed for this research. Originally, 622 reports were identified as being related to bully prevention, but to allow for effect size calculation the field was narrowed. Four types of design were used, including randomized experiments, experimental control comparing before and after, other experimental control comparisons, and quasi-experimental designs and age cohort designs. To be included, bullying and victimization had to be the measured outcome of the study. The researchers successfully showed that bully prevention programs showed a 20 to 23% decrease in bullying and a 17 to 20% decrease in victimization. Programs involving peer work created an increase in victimization. The authors suggested an accreditation process for bully prevention programs. They also recommended that design of programs as well as implementation be studied.

**Frey, K., Hirschstein, M., Snell, J., Mackenzie, E., Broderick, C., & Edstrom, L. (2005).**

*Reducing playground bullying and supporting beliefs: An experimental trial of the steps to respect program. Developmental Psychology, 41(3), 479-491.*

Retrieved from ERIC database.
Bullying was identified as a problem that effects learning, social connections, and the overall classroom atmosphere. A school based intervention program was suggested as a good start to decrease bullying at school. The Steps to Respect program was a multi-faceted program involving a change in the school environment. It encompassed a set curriculum and training among staff, classrooms, and a parent outreach component. It also addressed the bystander issue. Two years worth of playground observations were done to determine the effectiveness of the program. Teacher ratings and student surveys were also collected over a two-week period in the fall and spring of each observation year. Overall, bullying decreased for the intervention group. Results were more substantial for the teachers who were vigilant with their coaching. Adult responsiveness did not increase. Following the control group for the same two years that the intervention group was followed would have given better results.


This book introduced the Olweus Program. It investigated the different aspects of bullying. The book goes over the importance of a school-wide implementation, how to get started, how to set rules in a positive way, how to hold class meetings, how to use role-play, how to confront the bully, how to get parents involved, and how to extend the program.


Researchers from the University of Georgia accessed a large Clarke County elementary school to distribute student surveys to obtain a clear picture of the bullying environment. After results were analyzed a plan was put into place to change the entire school’s atmosphere. A "BEE" theme permeated the school. The Five BEEs were: Be
Respectful, Be Responsible, Be Honest, Be Ready To Learn, and Be Your Personal Best.

Surveys were conducted as a pre-assessment in 1998 and a post-assessment in 1999 and determined success with this strategy. A 59% reduction in both self-reported aggression and in self-reported victimization were shown. This collaborative approach between teacher, university, and student propelled a positive change in this school.


This article addressed the creation, implementation, and evaluation of a joint project between a public elementary school and a university. They worked within a collaborative model beginning with a consultant meeting with stakeholders, identifying concerns, the creation by the teachers of an intervention program, implementation and then evaluation of the program. An aggression scale was used for third through fifth grade students; Kindergarten through second grades used a shorter version of the same scale. The program started with creating a positive atmosphere for all involved, followed by educating the students, and then training the teachers. In grades K through 2 a significant reduction in self-reported aggression, but in 3-5 there were no significant changes noted. With the self-reported victimization there was a significant reduction in all grades K through 5. More schools would need to participate in this precise model to get an accurate result.


This article investigated each participant of the bullying dynamic. Bully and family characteristics, long-term effects for the bully, as well as for bully-victims, and victims were
explored with substantial research behind each. Specific interventions were explained, such as, Olweus, The Bully Project, and Bullybusters. More generic interventions, such as behavioral contracts, and counseling, were also mentioned. Five suggestions were included to make school a positive experience: victim support, clear rules and consequences, playground/lunchroom/hallway supervision, open discussion in class, and parental involvement.
Consequences of Bullying


This article quoted percentages of bullying occurrences around the world. The emphasis was on prevention and whole school approaches to prevention and involved training, conferences, teacher meetings, class rules, and so on. The authors then explored the effects of bullying on a child. Consequences were identified to be physical to both the bully and the victim. The bully could suffer from depression, eating disorders, suicidal thoughts, and substance abuse. The victim could suffer from depression, low self-esteem, suicidal thoughts, anxiety, and eating disorders as well. Academics could also be affected.


The authors emphasized that loneliness, anxiety, and peer difficulties were related to relational aggression. It has already been researched that physical and verbal harm can affect the development and academic success of students; however, other forms of aggression were just as damaging, such as rejection and exclusion. This study explored three elements: whether aggression gave students a feeling of lack of safety within their school, if exposure to relational aggression increased the odds of students bringing a weapon to school, and whether there was a gender difference. Surveys were used and given to over 2,000 students in grades seven through 12. There was a 67.2% response rate. It was determined through the analysis that relational aggression impacted the students' perceptions of school safety and their ideas about the school climate overall. As hypothesized, males were more likely to
bring a weapon when feelings of being unsafe surfaced. Females may have reacted in different ways. Some limitations were that students who interpreted more relational aggression were simply more aware of it as it occurred. The study only included African Americans and European American students. Including other races could change the findings.


The purpose of this study was to investigate the possibility that bullies, victims, and bully/victims would be at an increased risk for crime, child abuse, sexual abuse, and other victimization. Participants were 689 fifth grade students with varying backgrounds. Students answered a demographic questionnaire followed by two instruments, the University of Illinois Bully Scale and the University of Illinois Victimization Scale. Using the two measures, a two-analysis variance was used. Results indicated that those who felt they were bullies, victims, or both had higher reports of other victimization.


Three studies were conducted within this research. Self-concept was measured using Harter's (1982) Self-Perception Profile for Children. The Peer Victimization Scale and the Bullying Behaviour Scale (Austin & Joseph, 1996) were used. The first showed that those who bully and are victims have the lowest opinions of themselves followed by victims and then the bullies. The second study looked at the correlation of health problems among
bully/victims (the most affected). It also deduced that special education children were more likely to be involved in bullying when compared to a regular education student. The third study correlated post-traumatic stress disorder with those who were bullied in middle school settings. Behavior problems were observed in all three studies. It was concluded that a deviant child or the bully would follow the deviant pattern and end up with a type of substance abuse problem. Bully/victims were shown to have more psychosomatic difficulties.
Miscellaneous Additional Resources


During their education, children could become victim to various forms of abuse. Physical abuse would take forms of hitting and kicking, while verbal abuse would be name-calling, and relational abuse would be exclusion and gossip. The researchers for this study measured victimization using two tools: Arora’s Life in School Checklist, which is behaviorally oriented to measure physical forms of abuse, and Crick and Grotpeter’s measure to assess relational forms of victimization. These were modified into interview format. A peer reports tool was used as well as observations. The authors recommended several assessments to guide a decision to choosing an intervention for a school.


This article summarized the incidence of bullying in schools as well as the bullying definition. The strongest focus was a review of the insights gained over the last decade with the bullying phenomenon. The first insight shared was the researchers’ definition and assessment of bullying and its complexities. Self-reports, surveys, and observations were all mentioned as ways to identify bullying. The second insight explored the overlap of the definitions of bully and victim and the perception that a child could be both. Insight three
covered the thought that girls are more prone to relational bullying than boys. The researchers felt this idea not supported in some research literature. The fourth insight investigated social-ecological bully characteristics such as: race, age, anger, depression anxiety, and empathy. Being aware of these issues was vital for a school to implement effective interventions.


Using a narrative portrait, Lake told the story of Jeffrey, a fictional character comprised of former students or students Lake has worked with or been exposed to in the educational system. Lake utilized the story of Jeffrey to examine the progression of anti-social and violent behavior. She articulated four key developmental stages and suggested strategies and programs to introduce and help foster pro-social behaviors. Those four stages included birth, early years (to include pre-school and elementary school), middle school, and high school. One of the key programs and corrective interventions mentioned was parenting classes. These classes taught the parents how to deal with stress and conflict without modeling violent behavior. Another point Lake made was to point out that assertive discipline put a focus on those unwanted actions and never modeled the desired responses sought. It was also suggested that assertive discipline is a fear-based technique. Those were just a sampling of the strategies and programs she suggested.


McGuinness provided a case study of a high school senior girl being bullied. Categories of bullying were dissected as verbal, physical, relational, and cyber-bullying. The
case study was continued and a website was recommended for further help in diagnosing a child with the anxiety associated with bullying.


The Metropolitan Area Child Study Research Group (MACS) examined three types of interventions in 16 schools over a seven-year period. Schools received no treatment, curriculum plus teacher conferencing, or the latter plus small group training. The study examined a child's intent to use aggression, their aggression in fantasy, and their thoughts on appropriate aggression. The schools were either moderate resource schools or low resource schools. No interventions were successful in detouring proximal aggression. It was thought that results would become clearer further down the road. In the moderate resource schools, improvements were made when assessing fantasy, aggressive responses, and beliefs about aggression, but since actual aggression was not improved, the interventions were questionable. The setting for the intervention would also be an issue, in that, if the physical setting had more important issues to deal with, then the interventions may not have been addressed completely.


This research study investigated harassment in elementary school, specifically grades 4 through 6, and when it was determined that help was needed. Using a scale to gauge popularity, the researchers aimed to determine the result of a few hypotheses. They grouped
children as popular, average, and unpopular using a student roster and having the students number who had the most friends or who were liked the best, and then ranking the ones with fewest friends or liked the least. They gave out vignettes to have students and teachers deduce the need for help seeking; scenarios allowed respondents to determine whether teasing or physical aggression were able to be handled or needed to be reported. Open-ended questions were asked. Although the sample was small and could have produced errors due to the size, the researchers’ opinions were confirmed by the data. More popular children and teachers viewed teasing as much less critical than aggression. The unpopular children found teasing to be detrimental. Popular children as well as teachers also felt telling about the teasing could make the situation worse. The method of teaching a student to assess each situation for severity would be a beneficial intervention.


Even though bullying has been perceived as a symbol of childhood for a very long time, it only began to be researched in the 1970s by Dan Olweus. The indicators of bullying were that it negatively affected children by inflicting injury or discomfort. It was also characterized by an imbalance of power of one child over another. After a questionnaire was distributed to over 150,000 Scandinavian children, it was determined that 15% were involved in bullying in some way. When Trautman and her colleagues used the same questionnaire, it was haunting to discover that from 1983 the percentage had increased to nearly 50%. Empirical data has failed to prove that only the overweight, eye-glass wearers, or different race or ethnicity children were targeted. Olweus data has shown a dramatic decrease in those
bullying and those being bullied. In a 1999-2000 study, ten schools surveyed 2,300 students to find the percentage had been reduced by about 40%.
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Profile of Leadership Potential

I began leading at Carmel Elementary School as the Team Leader of EIP (Early Intervention Program) for the 2006-2007 school year. I was responsible for leading three other EIP teachers through creating schedules, often including working with up to twelve homeroom teachers each. I organized a testing schedule for progress monitoring, distributed and explained county and state paperwork and collected it for the school administrator, and sat in on conferences and meetings held to determine progress and future steps for up to 80 children. My peers recognized my leadership and voted me Employee of the Month in September 2006.

During this same school year, I wanted to be more involved and volunteered to be an auxiliary member of our Data Management Team. I met with other leaders on this committee and analyzed data in order to properly attack the weak test scores. We used this information for planning and ordering of materials to facilitate attainment of our goals.

I participated in Carmel’s “Sunshine Committee” from 1999-2008. This committee’s purpose was to plan special events for the faculty and staff. Plans were made in advance, decorations were bought, and assignments for tasks were created to uplift the morale of the staff to create a positive environment in which to thrive.

The next phase of my leadership experience came from the 2008-2009 school year. Carmel was assigned a new Principal, and certain things within the school changed. Instead of Grade Level Leaders, our new principal created the Building Leadership Team (BLT). Previously, Grade Level Leaders were a volunteer position. With the new principal’s first impressions of me and the input from the three assistant principals, I was chosen to be on the BLT. I was chosen by the administrative team to represent eleven other third grade teachers. I was assigned a student teacher from Kennesaw State University for the fall semester. Before the school year began, I had organized a teacher rotation for bus duty involving morning and afternoon duties for seventeen teachers. I had this schedule approved and ready for the first week of school.

My job responsibilities as third grade team leader centered on effective communication, linking teachers to the administrative team. I organized a meeting schedule, created a framework for meetings, and contributed to the format of the
meeting summary form. Different duties were divided among the grade level teachers so we would work efficiently. I co-wrote the School Improvement Plan, the School Impact Check, and the discipline code for all of third grade and sat on a committee to revamp the school’s positive reinforcement system. I was chosen for and graduated from Cherokee County’s Superintendent’s Leadership Academy. Focus Groups were utilized to educate the future leaders on all aspects of county operations from curriculum to transportation.

I have been told that I have the gift of being tactful, yet clear. I believe that my God given spiritual gift is encouragement. I grew up around teachers and have always loved teachers. I was blessed with mostly positive experiences during my education.

My favorite and most rewarding part of being team leader that year was helping other teachers. I felt confident in my knowledge of academics, behavior, state procedure for student interventions, and technology. Teachers came to me with various issues and I relished helping them understand or implement something new. I even had other members of the BLT come to me with questions and issues.

I interviewed for and was offered a job as a Teacher on Special Assignment as Administrator (TSA) for the 2009-2010 school year. I had an office and a list of job duties and responsibilities, which excited me. I was over programs such as Title I, EIP, ESOL, RtI, and ASP. This was an incredible experience; however, the TSA position was eliminated county-wide. While some in that role were sent back into classrooms, I was promoted to Assistant Principal. For the 2010-2011 school year my responsibilities included the School Improvement Plan, EIP, ESOL, RtI, and Partners in Education. I also reorganized the Sunshine Committee, provided positive support, and increased teacher morale.

A teacher is only as good as their administrator/leader inspires them to be. I believe in the trickle down scenario. If a leader is positive, smiles, encourages others, loves the job, loves the kids, provides support and encouragement, then a teacher will show her students the same qualities. You set a positive environment in which all people involved can thrive.

I don’t think leadership would have occurred to me had I not had a life altering experience in July of 2003. I was teaching third grade and I was content. After my husband was in a catastrophic car accident, my world changed. His accident left him a quadriplegic. In many ways it changed my perspective on my career. I realized that life is just too short. I began to wonder what mark I would leave on education. I began teaching in the EIP program, and I learned to be a better teacher through guided reading techniques and frequent assessments. I began to crave more to do. I wanted to do more, help more, and be more. My experience at LMU for my Doctorate has propelled me even further forward. I frequently search out and read books on leadership, and I anticipate a dynamic future in leadership.