

A CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE:

THE EFFECTS OF BULLYING AND AGGRESSION AND THE MOST EFFECTIVE
PRACTICES FOR REDUCING AND/OR ELIMINATING THE PROBLEM

By

Katy Michelle Bryan

A Project Submitted to the Faculty of

The Evergreen State College

In Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements

for the degree

Master in Teaching

2009

This Project for the Master in Teaching Degree

by

Katy Michelle Bryan

has been approved for

The Evergreen State College

By

Masao Sugiyama, Member of the Faculty

June 2009

Abstract

Bullying and aggression in school children has a long history in school systems. This paper presents a rationale for exploring the most effective practices for eliminating bullying and aggression from the lives of children. Using the history of the subject as well as an extensive review of the body of literature on bullying, this paper presents practical classroom implications for address bullying. Also included in this paper is an evaluation of the research articles as well a section on suggestions for further research. This paper identifies the problem of bullying and suggests that teachers increase their presence during students' play as well as assist students in developing the socialization tools needed to reduce conflict among peers.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Abstract	iii
Preface	v
CHAPTER ONE: RATIONALE	1
Introduction	1
Definition of Terms	1
Rationale.....	2
CHAPTER TWO: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND	7
Introduction	7
CHAPTER THREE: CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	12
Introduction	12
Identifying the Characteristics of Affected Student Groups.....	12
Bully/Victim Cycles and Socialization	22
Family Influence on Aggressive Behavior	39
Teacher/School/Peer Influence on the Bullying Cycle	45
Evaluation of Implemented Intervention Programs	65
CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION	76
Introduction	76
Summary of Findings.....	76
Classroom Implications	83
Suggestions for Further Research	86
Conclusion	88
REFERENCES	90

Preface

The words “thank you” are not sufficient to express my gratitude to all of the family and friends who have helped me on my journey to becoming a teacher. First, I would like to thank my best friend Brianne Winkelman, for helping me brave my undergraduate degree. Without her I surely would have lost my mind and many credits. Second, thank you to Ashley Lind for being my partner in crime for the last two years. The journey of MIT would have been significantly harder and in fact nearly impossible without your laughter, support, and company on many long, endless nights of homework and freaking out. Third, thank you to Ashley Spencer for being the best buddy a girl could ever ask for. Her humor and love for all things shopping kept reminding me that there is life after MIT.

Fourth, a huge and endless thank you to my entire family for supporting me for the last twenty-eight years to achieve all my dreams. Thank you to Sarah Bryan (and Emma), and the entire Gubser family (Dennis, Shannon, Taylor, and Camden) for all the sweet things you did to keep me going and for meeting me at Starbucks (my second home) while I did my homework so we could still keep in touch. My Mom and Dad have more than earned a special thank you. Their words of encouragement and dinners kept me going through many long nights of homework and exhaustion. My Mom exemplifies love with her constant support and work as an elementary teacher. She has taught me by example that it is possible to have it all if you put in the work and give it time. You are truly my hero Mom, I love you.

Finally, to my wonderful husband Matt and our many pets: Shnikes, Stewart, Kitten, Sydney (devil dog) and Scout (baby devil dog). Thank you for sitting by my side

day and night reminding me the importance of my work. For filling my water glass, feeding the boys, yelling at the puppies, and keeping our house going when I was too busy to do so. Matt, I love and appreciate you more than you will ever know. I can't wait to continue to build our life together.

CHAPTER ONE: RATIONALE

Introduction

In 1999, Columbine High School in Colorado shot to the news forefront when two teenagers shot and killed thirteen fellow students then turned the guns on themselves (Sheras, 2002). In a 2000 report, in two-thirds of the school shooting in the last ten years, the attacker reported that prior to the attack they experienced feelings of being “bullied, attacked, threatened, or persecuted” (Glew, Fan, Katon, and Rivera., 2006). Since that time, school violence and bullying has become a much more topic familiar in many schools districts throughout the country. Although there is evidence of some bullying leading to school violence on a larger scale, the majority of bullying occurs within a smaller scope and often involves psychological and physical intimidation which may lead to a decrease in self esteem, emotional issues, as well as a decrease in academic growth (Sheras, 2002).

Definition of Terms

This paper will define the term bullying as currently understood in schools and research today. Many consider Olweus (1978) to be the first modern researcher of bullying and its effects as well as the creator of one of the most popular anti-bullying programs. Olweus began his research in the late 1960's and early 1970's and continues on today. In 1978, Olweus defined bullying as a student “being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly, and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students” (p. 9). Olweus also defined bullying to include another key element that made the distinction between bullying and fighting clear. Bullying differs from fighting due to shift in power in the relationship of the students. In fighting, two or

more students are combating against each other. This differs from bullying due to the imbalance of power that must exist. Within the context of bullying, the power becomes asymmetrical as one or more students hold more power and strength than the other student (Olweus, 1993). This strength is not to be confused merely as physical strength. Though this may be the case in some instances, it more often refers to an imbalance in perceived emotional strength among the students.

The research community has expanded the definition of bullying to include many types of harassment that were previously unnamed. Bullying now includes physical and verbal bullying, sexual harassment, racial bullying and any other behavior that targets the victim for the purpose of being hurtful and intimidating (Suckling & Temple, 2002). Prior to the 1970's, bullying did not include intimidation and other psychological forms of bullying (Koo, 2007). These are all crucial elements to the understanding of the current definition of bullying.

Rationale

As the definition of bullying has evolved, so has the understanding of the implications and effects of bullying on the victim. Formerly considered a rite of passage or a normal part of childhood, chapter two will further describe this phenomenon. As a further understanding of the effects of bullying has developed, there is greater focus on the subject as well as a view that bullying is a very serious issue that needs addressed. The issue of bullying has come to the forefront due to the findings that bullying causes symptoms such as emotional, physical, or behavioral difficulties, depression, feelings of helplessness, anger, hostility, fear, anxiety, sleeplessness, loss of appetite, and nausea (Koo, 2007). Olweus (1993) found that 60% of boys considered

bullies in grades 6-9 had at least one criminal conviction by the time they were twenty-four. This study demonstrated that bullying has implications that reach further than just the bully and victim involved.

Bullying has the potential to impact the lives of the society in which the bully is likely to grow up and commit crimes. When facing a list such as that, educators find it difficult not to acknowledge bullying as a problem. Olweus (1978) identified the seriousness of the problem and the need for adults to step in and be interrupters in the cycle of bullying. The bullying cycle includes the actual bullying incident involving direct participants as well as the outside participants such as those witnessing the event. The cycle also refers to the shifting positions of victims and bullies as they often move between the two categories. Olweus acknowledged that often adults may feel that intervening is often too controlling and meddling but went on to say that “to fail to stop these activities implies a tacit confirmation- an attitude that seems very inhumane” (Olweus, 1978). The issue of bullying is relevant to the current school systems and also has a historical presence.

Bullying is a pervasive issue that has been present in school systems for a significant period of history (Koo, 2007). Though the ways in which bullying is identified and defined has changed, its existence and influence on the lives of students is a constant. The effects of bullying have implications for both students as well as the adults in their lives including both parents and teachers. A myth exists that bullying only affects the bully and the victim. As mentioned before, the effects on the victim includes both psychological and physical aspects. Studies now show that there are also effects on the bully and that many bullies are often victims themselves. Cullingford and Morrison’s

(1995) interviews with incarcerated youth reported that nearly all subjects experienced victimization from bullies as well as demonstrating bullying behavior themselves. Many books and studies now show that bullying has dismal consequences for many members of society (Sheras, 2002).

This paper will show that bullying that occurs within the school can have negative consequences outside of the school in society. The negative behavior of bullies (if gone unaddressed) translates into higher instances of additional destructive behavior later in life such as drug and alcohol abuse and involvement in crime (Sheras, 2002). Because the impact of bullying can have such a negative impact for society and schools, it deserves an in depth look by parents, teachers, and students alike. Parents and teachers are vital in ending the cycle of bullying. Active intervention from adults against bullying translates to bullying being less likely to occur over time (Olweus, 1978). Olweus also called for a stronger relationship between parents and teachers in order to fully protect children against bullying. These findings highlight the importance of helping teachers, parents, other adults, and students understand bullying and the ways in which to address and prevent it. Additionally, bullying awareness and education is an important step in the reduction of bullying in schools.

Bullying is a problem in schools on multiple levels. Intimidation and bullying occurs on the playground, in the classroom, and all over schools. Because the problem occurs on multiple levels, there is a need for a multiple level to finding solutions to bullying. Research has found that for anti-bullying plans to be effective they must include a whole school approach (Sullivan, 2000). To simply give a single teacher the tools to addressing bullying is not enough. Rather, entire schools should create and

follow anti-bullying plans that empower students, teachers, and administrators to be the interrupters of the cycle of bullying. Education should extend to parents so that they can work in conjunction with the school address issues of bullying.

Studies on the parental relationships of bullies and victims have found that bullies often have strained relationships with parental figures and often feel less liked by the parent. Conversely, victims often have identified having a closer contact with parental figures (Olweus, p. 117). Though parent and child relationships will differ, it is clear that parents have an important and vital role to help end the cycle of bullying. Speaking with their children about what happens at school can make a major difference in identifying and stopping bullying. To be able to identify and address both subtle and overt forms of bullying, adults need to have a trained eye. Additionally, students need to be educated on how to identify bullying and learn and practice the tools to address bullying and express their own feelings.

In the United States, approximately one in seven school children have been either a bully or a victim. This number translates to nearly five million children (Entenman, Murnen, & Hendricks, 2005). These numbers indicate that bullying is an issue that negatively affects most, if not all schools and many students. Schools as a whole need a plan to address effectively the issue of bullying. Teachers and students need to be educated on how to identify and prevent bullying. Educating on bullying and formulating whole-school plans to address bullying is an imperative step in ending bullying. Therefore, the purpose of this paper is to attempt to answer the question: “What are the effects of bullying on elementary students and what practices are effective in reducing and/or eliminating instances of bullying.”

Chapter one defined bullying as being “exposed, repeatedly, and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students” (Olweus, 1978, p. 9). This chapter also looked at the importance of the subject in relation to current education. Chapter two will look at the historical development of the subject of bullying and of how public education is attempting to deal with the issue.

CHAPTER TWO: HISTORICAL BACKGROUND

Introduction

Chapter one presented a rationale for further exploration on the phenomenon of bullying and aggression in children. Chapter one also presented reasons why it is important to discover the most effective practices for reducing and eliminating bullying from the lives of all children. Chapter two will present the historical background on the subject of bullying and aggression to present a better understanding of the current state of the subject.

Records of bullying exist in historical accounts from as early as the 18th century. These records defined bullying as “physical harassment that usually related to a death, strong isolation, or extortion in school children” (Koo, 2007). Early accounts of bullying, as shown in this definition focused primarily on the physical instances of harassment. Olweus (1978) identified that “the fact that some school children are frequently and systematically harassed and attacked by other children has been described in literary works and many adults have personal knowledge of its existence from their own school days” (p. xi). Many adults can recall personal memories of bullying in their childhood. It is important to review the historical record of bullying to understand how the shift in understanding as well as the urgency to address bullying has developed.

Research on bullying is a rather new phenomenon but the act of bullying is not. Records of bullying are somewhat scarce due to a view that bullying was a rite of passage. To find the records of bullying, it must be remembered that bullying prior to the 1970’s was often considered only physical violence and generally harmless. Identification of bullying has occurred in historical books and old newspapers from the

18th and 19th centuries in places such as Japan, the U.K., and Korea (Koo, 2007). An early example of this type of violence is in a document called *The Complete Newgate Calendar* (The Complete Newgate Calendar, 1926). This book is an account of gruesome crimes committed in the early eighteenth century and often kept in homes as a source of moral guidance. One crime mentioned in this document took place in 1825 between two seventeen year old boys and one fifteen year old boy. The two older boys fought to the death with the younger boy after they exchanged words on the playground.

Another example of bullying came from the 19th century out of a book entitled *Tom Brown's Schooldays*. First published in 1857, the book described an attack of one boy by many other boys (Koo, 2007). Bullying as mentioned in written documents such as the *Newgate Calendar* or *Tom Brown's Schooldays* often focused the outer appearance of its victim. The harassment and bullying often revolved around the mocking of external characteristics or dialect used by the victim. These examples illustrated the attack on personal character which can prove so damaging to students. Koo also cited the common view from the 19th century that many considered violence between two individuals to be a private matter. The view accompanied a larger societal feeling that violence was an accepted part of everyday life. Koo also cited that the phenomenon of hazing contributed greatly to the acceptance of bullying and aggression as a part of everyday life.

Historical examples of bullying exist in other countries such as Korea and Japan. The bullying in these countries is somewhat different than the bullying found in other European countries. Bullying in these countries correspond with cultural traditions and parenting styles. In Korea, the term *myunsinrae* defines bullying. Examples of this type

of harassment occurred most between officers of higher and lower rankings and was more often psychological rather than physical. The use of bullying attempted to make the victim feel shameful which many considered equivalent to death (Koo, 2007).

This type of bullying was similar to the early bullying found in Japan. The term for bullying in Japan was *ijime*. This type of bullying often occurred between students of the same age or within the same classroom. This differs from accounts of bullying in European countries where bullying often occurred with older children bullying younger students. Like the early examples from Korea, Japan's early examples involved feelings of shame. A commonly used parental punishment was isolation, separation, or the threat of abandonment. This tradition moved into classrooms and schools where students isolated victims if they did not conform to group standards. This has evolved to the bullying practices seen today (Koo, 2007).

The definition of bullying has continued to change and evolve as society has changed and evolved its view of the issue of personal violence and attacks. A major shift in the public's view of violence occurred with World War II (WWII). After the war, many people experienced a shift in the view of human rights and the treatment of humans with dignity (Koo, 2007). This became visible by the 1948 and 1949 United Nations declaration that all people deserve the right of equality, the right to life, liberty, and security. This shift signaled a change in what many considered acceptable behavior and treatment of others (Koo, 2007). The transformation of thinking partnered with society slowly beginning to draw associations with bullying and later incidents of violence and crime.

Until the 1970's, the term aggressive behavior was often used as a substitute to the word bullying. The definition along with the terminology has shifted several times since the 1970's. In the 1950's, aggressive behavior would have been considered to involve mainly robbery and stealing. By the 1960's, this definition of aggressive behavior had moved to include persistent inattention, carelessness, underhandedness, and smoking (Koo, 2007). As bullying and aggressive behavior became a concern for parents and teachers, the work of one man led the way for studies on bullying.

With the research done by Olweus (1978), the 1970's definition changed to the term bullying and included both physical and emotional harassment. The research community on bullying considers Olweus to be one of the first researchers on the issue of bullying. His work began in the 1970's and pushed for societies to move from considering bullying to be a harmless rite of passage to a major social issue. In 2003, Olweus worked with the United States Department of Health and Human Services to create a document to help adults better identify and prevent bullying. His work has changed the definition of bullying as well as how schools currently address bullying.

Olweus (1978) defined bullying as being "exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other persons" (p.9). Olweus went on to further modify the definition as "any kind of ongoing physical or verbal mistreatment where there is an imbalance of power or a desire to intimidate and dominate" (Entenman et al. 2005). This definition was a major turning point in the history of bullying because it defined bullying to include not just physical violence but also verbal violence and intimidation. Including these often more subtle forms of intimidation was important to formulating ways in which to address the issue of bullying. Olweus' work has greatly

contributed to the current view that bullying has the potential for long term harm and the issue need immediate attention.

Chapter one presented the rationale for the exploration of the issue of aggression and bullying among students. Chapter two presented the historical background of aggression. This included the evolution of societal views on aggression and bullying. Chapter three will present a review of the research literature on bullying and aggression and attempt to demonstrate the impact of bullying and aggression on students in relation to socialization as well as academic achievement. Also included in chapter three will be a review of current intervention programs in an attempt to identify the best practices for reducing and/or eliminating bullying.

CHAPTER THREE: CRITICAL REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Introduction

Chapter one covered the rationale behind the exploration of the question of what is the effect of bullying on students' academic achievement and social development as well as uncovering what the most effective practices of reducing and/or eliminating bullying in elementary schools. The rationale included current definitions of bullying and student statistics of experiences of bullying. Additionally, the rationale integrated known effects of long-term bullying such as a decrease in self esteem, emotional issues, as well as a decrease in academic growth (Sheras, 2002). Chapter two provided the history of the issue of bullying and aggression in schools. The history of bullying extended back to the 18th century and has often included behavior that various cultures identified as a rite of passage and a common part of childhood. Chapter three organizes the research literature into the following five sections: identifying the characteristics of affected student groups, bullying/victim cycles and the effect on socialization, family influence on aggressive behavior, teacher/school/peer influence on the bullying cycle, and evaluation of implemented intervention programs. Chapter three explores not only the results of the literature but also the implications on future research.

Identifying the Characteristics of Affected Student Groups

The five studies in this section identify the common characteristics of students affected by the bullying/aggression cycle. Peterson and Ray (2006) examined the role gifted students play in the bullying cycle. Coie, Dodge, Terry, and Wright (2006) examined the influence of the sociometric characteristic of students by focusing their study on the qualitative differences in aggressive behavior of rejected and non-rejected

boys. French (1991) instead examined a group of female students to determine the characteristics of girls who experience difficulties on peer relationships. Hand and Sanchez (2000) explored an older student population to determine the gender differences in the behavioral, emotional, and educational consequences of sexual harassment. Finally, Abecassis, Hartup, Haselager, Scholte and Van Lieshout (2002) sought to determine the difference in gender, age, and frequency in mutual antipathies of school-age children and its possible influence of social adjustment.

Peterson and Ray (2006) examined the role (if any) of gifted students in the bullying cycle. Researchers selected 432 gifted eighth graders throughout 11 U.S. states (California, Arizona, Wyoming, Georgia, Texas, Maryland, Indiana, Iowa, Michigan, Illinois, and Nebraska) for this study. The gifted students attended a summer camp for gifted students and at the end of the session had the opportunity to volunteer for participation in the survey pending parental permission. The researchers asked students to complete a survey requesting both quantifiable and narrative information of their experience with bullying from kindergarten through eighth grade. The survey included questions about height, weight, self-reports of experienced of being bullied (physical and nonphysical) and when, and worries for the students. A contact at each site administered the surveys to the students after receiving parental permission. Upon completion, using a statistical analysis each survey had 549 potential data points used for evaluation.

Peterson and Ray (2006) found that bullying appears to be a significant problem for gifted children and early adolescents. The percent of students that reported experiences with bullying at some point during all nine years registered at an average of 67% of the 432 participants (73% of males, 63% of females). More participants were

victims of repeated bullying in grade six than in any other grades. In general, a higher percentage of gifted males than gifted females reported experiences with bullying. Name calling was the most prevalent kind of bullying, followed by teasing about appearance, teasing about intelligence/grades, pushing/shoving, beating up, knocking books, and finally hitting/punching. The researchers further broke down name calling into five thematic categories: appearance, intellectual capability, expletives, sexual, and personality. Grade five was the peak year in terms of emotional impact (as indicated by students ranking). Of the participants, 28% (33% of males, 22% of females) bullied someone at some time during the first nine years of school. The percentage of participants that reported being bullies increased steadily from kindergarten through grade eight (3% to 16% respectively). The most common form of bullying by gifted students was name-calling.

Peterson and Ray's (2006) study was a unique attempt to look at bullying from a distinct groups perspective. Enhancing the study was students' ability to write in their own answers to questions rather than reporting on a scale alone. This article also cited many theorists work as support to the article including Erikson and Piaget. A clear weakness of the paper was lack of introductory information which excluded the definition that researchers used to determine who qualified as gifted. Researchers also noted that completion of the survey took place in the time after 9/11. This drew concern of compromise of the questions on fear and violence from students' newfound worries about security. The study also did not compare the students' answers with students outside of the gifted classes. Further research should compare the gifted students' statistics to non-gifted students statistics. This work provided useful information in regards to teasing

about appearance and intelligence in upper elementary grades. Teachers and counselors should be particularly alert to this kind of bullying that often falls outside the school-accepted definition of bullying. Particular focus should be on prevention of bullying with an emphasis on building a positive, safe school culture. This includes educational discussion groups and classroom meetings.

Coie et al. (1991) conducted a study to explore the differences in the behavior of rejected and non-rejected boys considered aggressive by peers. The study cited that aggression is the strongest single correlated behavior to peer rejection. From this, the researchers wanted to distinguish specific behaviors that may correlate to the rejection and subsequent non-rejection of other boys. The researchers looked at specific characteristics and items such as isolating the gender by only looking at boys. Additionally, the researchers looked at the event that initiated the aggressive act. The researchers sought to distinguish if the act of aggression was the initial act or the response to another aggressive act and identify how or if this correlated to the peer rejection of boys.

The Coie et al. (1991) study, conducted in Durham, North Carolina, incorporated 25 first grade and 28 third grade classrooms in ten different elementary schools. This school system at this time was serving a population that was 90% African American. The majority of the student population ranged from lower- to lower-middle class socio-economic status. First, students reviewed a roster of all students in their grade level. From this roster, the students submitted the names of the students they liked the most and three students that were liked the least. Students received the following descriptions and then asked to name three students that best fit each description: cooperative, starts fights,

leader, disruptive, sense of humor, and unhappy. The researchers instructed students not to talk about their answers with other students as well as emphasized the confidentiality of their answers.

From the peer nominated of students, the majority of students nominated were African American which is reflective of the student population. Coie et al. (1991) selected to only use African American male students in the project. Each group contained six boys that were in the same age-grade bracket. The six boys were comprised of students' selected based on sociometric status as determined by the previous mentioned peer nomination. The six categories included two average-status boys, two rejected boys, one neglected boy, and one popular boy. The boys in each group selected had no previous association with one another and were all from different schools. The total number of participants totaled 131. Students participated in five recorded meetings each lasting 90 minutes. Half of the session was structured and half was unstructured. During each half of the session, the adult leading the activity left for ten minutes.

After analyzing the results, Coie et al. (1991) found that among the nine-year-old group, boys considered rejected, initiated more aggressive episodes than non-rejected boys. This differed from the younger age group in which there was no significant difference in the sociometric status of the boy initiating the aggressive act. In both age groups, researchers saw a positive correlation between boys considered by peers to be aggressive and rejected and higher instances of initiating instrumental aggression as well as escalating instrumental aggressive acts. Reactive episodes showed a higher correlation to non-singular acts. Additionally, when the target in reactive episodes

reacted aggressively, the aggressor was more likely to escalate and continue the act. Boys considered aggressive had a lower rate of being victim of aggressive acts against them.

A clear weakness of the Coie et al. (1991) study was the simulated play groups. The boys met in experimentally designed playgroups that met during the summer. Prior to the play group the boys had not met each other. The design of each group was based on coded videotapes of the boys however when and how the videotapes were recorded was absent from the study. Another weakness of the article was the homogenous nature of the group of boys selected for the study. The study included only black males of a lower to lower-middle class socio-economic status from Durham, North Carolina. The homogenous nature of the article may make it relevant and replicable in this school system in which 90% of the student population is black, however its reliability in other school systems with a more diverse population would need evidenced in further studies.

The Coie et al. (1991) study did have an important strength in the further exploration of more sub-categories of aggression. This study broke the proactive behavior into sub-categories of instrumental and bullying episodes. This proved significant by demonstrating a difference in both the participants of instrumental acts as well as the reaction of those involved. Though the population used was not large or diverse, a further study could corroborate similar findings specifically in early instrumental aggression and be translated into a preventative program aimed at younger students social development.

In French's (1990) study of peer-rejected girls, the researcher sought to distinguish if there were specific characteristics that differentiated peer-rejected girls

from non-peer rejected girls. In a rural middle-class Midwestern community, 511 girls in grades three to five with parental permission participated in the study. Using sociometric interviews of peers and teachers, researchers categorized subjects into peer-rejected, popular, or other. Peer-rejected was defined as falling in the bottom 20% of the peer rating and popular was defined as being in the top 20% of the peer rating. Using random selection, researchers selected 46 rejected girls and 20 popular girls for further work in the study. The girls ranged from age eight to ten. The girls in the study completed an assessment identical to a previous assessment done by French with only boys. French aimed to compare the results of this study with the previous results of the study using boys.

French's (1990) assessment identified similar characteristics of the two selected populations. Within the peer-rejected population, researchers separated the girls into two additional categories. In the first category, identified girls had a low rate of self-control, a high rate of peer-rated aggression, and social withdrawal. This first category comprised a larger number of girls than the second category of girls. The second category exhibited similar but more extreme characteristics as group one. French characterized the second group as having greater withdrawal (than group one), anxiety, hostile isolation, academic disability, and low academic task orientation.

French (1990) noted that in comparison to the previous study using boys, the girls broke into the same characteristic categories as the boys. Specifically, the peer-rejected girls (and boys) broke into two groups the same as mentioned previously. Girls and boys did contrast in the area of aggression. In the second category of peer-rejected boys, the researcher characterized the smaller more devious group from other boys by a higher rate

of aggression. This was not the case for the two categories of peer-rejected girls. Teachers rated peer-rejected girls and popular girls to have the same amount of aggression.

The findings of French's (1990) study are significant to understanding the identifying characteristics of rejected students. After further research with larger groups of students, if similar results are established, they may be important in developing intervention programs. Specifically, training for interventions and teachers may need to include different identifying practices as well as treatment for boys and girls.

Hand and Sanchez (2000) focused on the gender differences of high school students in their perceptions of sexual harassment. Researchers sought to determine if sexual harassment affects girls differently than boys. Citing previous research that shows the rates of sexual harassment in the workplace, researchers proposed that schools are mimicking a cycle of sexual harassment that if unstopped will continue on to the adult workplace. The researchers conducted individual socio-metric interviews with eighth through eleventh graders. In all, 1,607 boys and girls completed the same interview questions. Questions included if students had ever been sexually harassed while at school and the severity and frequency of the harassment. The researchers asked for further explanation of the affect of the harassment on the students. The researchers presented students with behavioral, emotional, and educational choices. Students were also asked to rate the harmfulness of various sexual harassment acts. Finally, the researchers asked students to identify if they had ever sexually harassed anyone while at school.

In comparing boys and girls ranking of the severity of various forms of harassment, in all types of harassment, Hand and Sanchez (2000) found that girls rated all

acts as more serious than boys. Boys and girls ranked similar items in the low end of the seriousness scale. Girls reported a higher rate of experiencing sexual harassment than boys and the majority of the reports were physically based rather than verbally or emotionally based. Boys and girls committed similar acts of sexual harassment however boys committed significantly more acts than girls. In both boys and girls, the higher the rate of being sexually harassed, the higher the correlation to sexually harassing others.

Hand and Sanchez' (2000) study used primarily socio-metric interviews with students. It would be useful to incorporate the views of teacher to understand how they view the cycle of sexual harassment. Replication of the study with junior high students (grades six and seven) would give a better understanding of when sexual harassment begins to occur in school. For future research, it would also be useful to do a longitudinal study to find out if there is any correlation of bullying in elementary school to sexual harassment in school. The implementation of this research may be significant for building intervention programs that address the different needs of the genders in combating sexual harassment in the school setting.

Abecassis et al. (2002) explored the significance of mutual antipathies and their significance in middle childhood and adolescence. The researchers defined mutual antipathy as two children who mutually disliked each other. The researchers studied 2,348 school-age children (1,251 boys, 1,097 girls) and 2,768 adolescents (1,522 boys, 1,246 girls) to determine age and gender differences, incidence rate for mutual antipathies as well as the possible implications for social adjustment. School-age children answered three different questionnaires. The first questionnaire was a sociometric set of nominations in which peers nominated other students for roles such as classmates they

liked and classmates they did not like. The other questionnaires that students completed were the Olweus Bully-Victim Questionnaire and Depression Inventory. Adolescents completed a similar set of questionnaires. The first was a sociometric set of nominations in which they could select no more than five students. Adolescents also completed a demographic survey, the Olweus Bully-Victim Questionnaire, an adjustment survey, and a Relational Support Inventory.

Abecassis et al. (2002) used the sociometric nominations to determine the mutual antipathies. Categorization of mutual antipathy applied to students who both identified that they did not like each other during the sociometric nomination. Researchers additionally grouped students based on which were social accepted and socially rejected. Using survey answers, students were then assigned scores for antisocial behavior (fights, bullies, and disturbs), prosocial behavior (cooperates, helps), and social withdrawal/ineffectiveness (shy, seeks help, is bullied).

Using all of the above information, Abecassis et al. (2002) categorized mutual antipathies by age and gender. In school-age students, mutual antipathies reported at a rate of 8.3% of girls and 24.5% of boys. In adolescents, 14.2% of girls and 18.9% of boys were engaged in mutual antipathies. The researchers determined that having two or more mutual antipathies had a positive correlation to nomination by peers as being significantly more aggressive and socially ineffective. The same students involved in the mutual antipathies self reported that they were involved in bullying. Students who were involved in mutual antipathies also self reported being victims more than students who were not involved in mutual antipathies. There were nearly equal numbers of same-sex antipathies and mixed-sex antipathies.

Abecassis et al. (2002) required students to nominate students for categories such as not liked at all. Due to the fact that students lacked the option to not give a name, the validity of their nominations draws question. The researchers could remedy this issue by instructing students that they have the option not to name students if they don't feel it applies. A strength of this study was that the researchers improved upon previous sociometric questions by creating much more clear questions thus increasing the accuracy of the subjects' answers. The study drew a correlation between mutual antipathies and positive social behaviors. This could be important to proving the importance and need of intervention programs to decrease mutual antipathies of students of all age.

Bully/Victim Cycles and Socialization

The nine studies that comprise this section examine how the bully/victim cycle impacts students' socialization. The studies in this section examine various aspects of early socialization including how different social behaviors affect peer acceptance and later adult behavior. The section begins with Shantz' (1986) examination of the rate of aggression compared with peer status. The study conducted by Boulton (1999) aimed to identify the links between students' playground behaviors/peer contacts and three sociometric measures of peer relationships. Mostow, Izard, Fine, and Trentacosta (2002) studied a similar set of sociometric measures when they examined in what ways emotional, cognitive, and behavioral problems are predictors of peer acceptance. Ladd and Burgess (1999) shifted from peer acceptance to determining if aggressive, withdrawn, and aggressive/withdrawn students are at a higher risk for relationship maladjustment. Kochenderfer-Ladd and Wardrop (2001) investigated the possibility of predicting children's loneliness and social satisfaction growth curves from changes in

their peer victimization status. Kochenderfer and Ladd (1996) also studied peer victimization to determine if it was a cause or consequence of school maladjustment. Ambert (1994) focused on the interrelated facets of peer abuse and its subsequent effects on later development. Holt, Finkelhor, and Kaufman-Kantor (2007) sought to examine if bullies, victims, and bully/victims are at an increased risk for victimization in four other domains (conventional crime, child maltreatment, sexual victimization, and witnessing/indirect victimization). Finally, Cullingford and Morrison (1995) conducted a study to determine if there is a correlation between bullying in school and later adult criminality.

Shantz (1986) observed students free play to determine if there was relation between a child's rate of participating in conflicts and their aggression level and the correlation to this to the child's like or dislike by their peers. After obtaining parental permission of 233 first and second grade students, researchers randomly selected 96 students for participation in the study. The students came from two different schools. The researchers divided forty-eight students from each school into same-sex play groups each consisting of six first graders and six second graders. Students met once a week for one hour each session. During each free play sessions, the researchers presented students with many age appropriate toys. Graduate students supervised students at all times. The groups met for ten consecutive weeks with all sessions being video and audio recorded.

Two observers viewed all video tapes and agreed on conflict episodes. Observers identified 1,646 conflict observers from 72 hours of video tape. Shantz (1986) coded each conflict to identify all participants and the sequence of actions. An alternate observer randomly checked conflicts to check their agreement with the other observers.

From this, the researcher found that all observers were in agreement on physical aggression episodes with a mean of 96.87%. The agreement on verbal aggression was slightly lower but still significant at 90% ($p < 0.05$). Prior and then after the ten week play sessions, all students completed a sociometric interview. During each interview, students identified three students that they liked and three students that they disliked.

Students who had frequent participation in conflict episodes had a higher rate of physical aggression during the conflict episodes. Shantz (1986) found that students rated as disliked by their peers had a higher rate of participating in conflict during the sessions. Additionally, the more conflicts a student participated, the greater their dislike score at the end of the sessions. There was a difference in the correlation between dislike score and conflict for boys and girls. Girls with higher dislike scores had a higher correlation to verbal aggression whereas boys with higher dislike score had a higher correlation to physical aggression. The study generated different results for boys and girls while in same sex play groups. A strength of the study was its use of random selection of the subjects. However, researchers conducted the play in arranged openly observed play groups. Observations conducted in natural play settings such as recess would strengthen the study. It would also be useful to extend the study to by replicating it with mixed-sex play groups to determine of the correlation results would change.

Boulton's (1999) study examined the possible link between how students behave during free play on the playground and peer relationships by assessing three sociometric measures (social preference, bully, victim). In this study, three trained observers recorded the play of 89 eight and nine year olds while on the playground of their schools. The study encompassed 45 girls and 44 boys. The schools involved in the study were

located in a large city in the United Kingdom. To habituate the students to the observers, training of the observers occurred in the presence of the students. Upon introduction to the observers, the researcher instructed students' that the observers could not speak to anyone on the playground. Training of the observers included how to use a coding scheme and prior to the study. Preparation also included additional testing to ensure accuracy by comparing coded observations of several students.

Observers recorded students and their contact (or lack thereof) with others. In addition, the observers watched the participants in a random order. Each observation was for a 60 second period in which the observer recorded who the participant was with, what activity they were engaged in, in what ways the student was interacting (verbally, physically, or otherwise), and how many children were still with the participant at the end of the 60 seconds. Observers conducted these scans between the months of December and March with the mean number of scans for each student being 56.8.

Additionally, the observers conducted individual sociometric interviews with students. The interviews were conducted at two different time periods, once during February and then again at the end of the school year in July. The observers informed the participants that all interviews were confidential and not shown to students and teachers. During the interview, observers instructed participants to identify which three students they liked the most and which they liked the least. The observers also provided head shots to students to ensure accuracy in the naming process and include all students in the naming process. The observers then processed the data into a Social Preference score.

Finally, observers presented participant with Olweus' definition of bullying:

“A child is being bullied, or picked on, when another child or group of children, say nasty or unpleasant things to him or her. It is also bullying when a child is hit, kicked, threatened, locked inside a room, sent nasty notes, when people won’t talk to them, and things like that. These things may happen a lot and it is difficult for the child being bullied to defend himself or herself. It is also bullying when a child is teased a lot in a nasty way. It is not bullying when two children of about the same strength have the odd quarrel or fight.” (p. 945)

From this definition, observers asked students to name who were bullies and who were victims at their school. From these numbers, researchers computed the scores into a Bully Score and a Victim Score. The scores reflected the number of classmates that had nominated the child as a bully and the number that had nominated them as a victim.

The observers sought to determine if there was a difference in gender in how they reported bullies and victims in the sociometric interviews. To verify if there was a difference in gender, observers separated the sociometric interview results into the following four nomination categories: bully from boys, bully from girls, victims from boys, and victims from girls. After further calculation, statistics showed that the two genders showed similar reported numbers in all categories.

Boulton (1999) found that group size showed significant and positive correlation with Social Preference Score. The time spent alone on the playground also significantly and positively correlated with Victim Score ($r = 0.34$ $F(1,97) = 12.70$, $p < 0.05$). Among the boys, there was a significant and positive correlation between Group Size and Victim Score. Specifically, the more time spent in small groups correlated to a higher reported victim score. Conversely, among girls, Group Size and Bully Score showed a positive

correlation ($r = 0.42$, $F(1,9) = 20.47$, $p < 0.05$). Girls interacting in primarily small groups received higher Bully Scores. Additionally, boys showed a positive correlation between the Bully Score and Group Size. The researcher cited the need for further research to determine whether this statistic was due to a forced interaction between bullies and their peers or if there is another explanation.

The Boulton (1999) article was very clear about its methods and focus on conducting the study in the natural setting of the students so that the results would be as accurate as possible. The observers were diligent about not interfering with the natural play of students in order to preserve the accuracy of their observations. The findings indicate that boys and girls are often moving in similar patterns in bullying. This is useful knowledge for the planning of programs to address bullying in mixed sex settings. A weakness of the study is the often used phrase gender norm without a definition or explanation. Specifically, the article on page 950 attempts to rationalize their results by stating that an explanation resides in the gender norms. Without further data or explanation of what encompasses the term gender norm, the article shows weakness by the usage of the term.

Mostow et al. (2002) conducted a study to determine if there are emotional, cognitive, and behavioral predictors of peer acceptance. The researchers used a sample of 201 first and second grade students (53% boys, 47% girls). The researcher conducted interviews in both the fall and spring for the study and evaluated students' verbal ability, emotional skill, and sociometric status. Test for verbal ability measured students' level of expressive vocabulary. The questionnaire on emotional skill evaluated students' ability for emotional perception of peer's feelings. Finally, the researchers evaluated

sociometric status in an interview in which students reported on their peers in regards to like and dislike. From this information, students same-sex social preference and opposite-social preference was calculated. Teachers of the students also completed the Social Skills Rating System. This information evaluated students' social skills, problem behaviors, and academic competence.

Mostow et al. (2002) found that verbal ability showed a positive correlation ($r = 0.27$, $p < 0.001$) to emotional knowledge, social skills, and peer acceptance (both same and opposite-sex). The researchers found that emotional knowledge predicted social skills however the opposite proved to have no significance. Social skills did not predict emotional knowledge. The researchers also found that verbal ability predicted emotional knowledge as well as that emotional knowledge and social skills predicted higher rates of social skills in the spring. The researchers also cited that age was a predictor of emotional knowledge and that sex was a predictor of social skills.

The findings of Mostow et al. (2002) identified the correlation ($r = 0.22$, $p < 0.01$) between students' emotional and social skills to peer acceptance. These findings may be useful to citing the need for the development of programs that attend to the improvement of young elementary students' verbal and emotional skills. Further evidence to confirm the results that sex predicts social skills. Verification of these results may lead to a change in intervention program design to differently address the skills needed for each sex.

Ladd and Burgess (1999) explored the idea that specific behavioral characteristics put students at risk for relationship maladjustment. For this study, the researchers conducted a comparison between aggressive, withdrawn, and aggressive/withdrawn

children and normative and matched control groups. Subjects ($n = 250$) were selected in kindergarten while part of another study. At the completion of second grade, 242 subjects remained in the study. In kindergarten teachers rated students on the Aggressive with Peers and Asocial with Peers of the Child Behavior Scale. From this information the researchers determined that students were in one of the following behavior groups: withdrawn, aggressive, aggressive/withdrawn, or non-aggressive/non-withdrawn. Additionally, observers and observational data from teachers placing students on the Child Behavior Scale supplied additional information on students' relationships to peers.

Ladd and Burgess (1999) found that subjects receiving scores of aggressive stabilized over time more than subjects categorized as withdrawn. Peer acceptance and friendship correlated positively to each other however they both correlated negatively with peer victimization. Children's reported loneliness and perceived satisfaction correlated negatively ($r = -0.60, p < 0.001$) with peer relationships. Conflict with teachers correlated negatively with closeness but positively correlated to dependency. Aggressive students received lower sociometric peer ratings than students from the withdrawn and normative groups. The peer ratings of aggressive students remained stable of the period of the study. The study produced results that show that aggressive students remain not only in the category of aggressive but also remain having low sociometric peer ratings. This illustrates the need to address aggression in students early rather than waiting for it to self correct. If unaddressed, students will likely remain in the aggressive behavior group. A strength of this study was the multiple forms of data from observations by persons outside of the school system as well as observations by teachers

that worked closely with the students. Additionally, the study further dissected the differentiated trajectories of the original behavioral students' characteristics.

Kochenderfer-Ladd and Wardrop's (2001) studied the use of peer victimization status as a predictor to children's loneliness and social satisfaction. The researchers interviewed 388 children (193 boys, 195 girls) at five points between the entrance of kindergarten and the end of third grade. The researchers were attempting to tie shifts (or lack thereof) in peer victimization status to correlated changes in student reported loneliness and social satisfaction. The study focused on lower elementary students to further explore the early workings of the victimization and socialization rather than on the later effects on older students. A lack of research exists in this area due to what many researchers consider the instability of lower elementary bullying. The statistics showing that 20.5% of kindergarten students were identified as victims, 8.5% of the students could still be classified as victims 3 to 4 months later illustrates the instability of lower elementary bullying statistics. Despite this shift, researchers wanted to explore the victimization shifts and how or if it shifts loneliness and social satisfaction.

In a mid-western public school, Kochenderfer-Ladd and Wardrop (2001) sought the permission of parents of kindergarteners of a two year span. In the two cohorts, researchers obtained full data over the four year span for 388 students. Using individual interviews, researchers interviewed students twice in kindergarten and once in each subsequent year through third grade. Students were administered two self-report tasks. The first test was used to measure the students victimization score by using the rate in which the student self identified as being a victim. The base created in kindergarten served as the original grouping. The second test was the Loneliness and Social

Satisfaction Questionnaire. Using these two tests, researchers tracked the change in victimization status with students reported feeling of loneliness and social satisfaction.

Kochenderfer-Ladd and Wardrop's (2001) study revealed that 60% of the students reported victimization at some point during the four year study, most students did not report victimization the entire time therefore the status of being a victim was not chronic for the majority of students. Despite this statistic, 4% of the students emerged as stable victims as defined as being identified as a victim at four or more of the meetings. If the definition increased to include identification of victimization at three or more points, the statistic increased to 14%. These findings indicate that bullying happens to everyone at some point, for the previously mentioned population, the bullying is a chronic condition.

A clear strength of Kochenderfer-Ladd and Wardrop's (2001) study was its focus on both verbal and physical bullying. The study cited known differences in the bullying styles of boys and girls and from this, researchers include both types in their work with students. This inclusion of both traits of bullying makes the article more applicable to additional populations of mixed gender. The study also attempted to challenge the idea that bullying is a rite of passage that happens to all at some point by citing that for a percentage of students the problem is chronic. The idea of following victimization and bullying in younger grades is a challenging idea to explore but it may still hold additional information on how victimization affects younger students.

Kochenderfer and Ladd (1996) focused on the cycle of peer victimization of school maladjustment. Specifically, researchers sought to determine if peer victimization is the cause or consequence of school maladjustment. The researchers conducted the study with 200 five and six year old students (105 boys, 95 girls) in the fall and spring of

their kindergarten year. The researchers used an established questionnaire with the subjects entitled The Perceptions of Peer Support Scale. This questionnaire measured children's perceptions of their peers as well as provided as space for students to self-report on aggression they had personally experienced. The researchers sought to establish if student victimization occurred on rare occasions or on a consistent basis. This was determined through victimization scores created from the questionnaire. Students also completed the School Liking and Avoidance Questionnaire. This questionnaire aimed to identify students' attitudes towards school. Students completed two other tests to determine students' loneliness and academic achievement level. Finally, in addition to all the questionnaires students participated in individual interviews in both the fall and spring. The researchers administered all other questionnaires in both the fall and spring with the exception of the test for academic achievement level.

Kochenderfer and Ladd (1996) found a positive correlation ($r = 0.78$) between victimization and loneliness. Victimization also had a negative correlation to peer acceptance. The researchers examined two sets of mathematical models which suggested the extent to which changes in school adjustment could be predicted by early peer victimization and also if changes in peer victimization status could be predicted from early school adjustment. Researchers found that peer victimization was determined to be significant predictor ($p < 0.05$) of changes in school avoidance and loneliness. Students considered to be victims showed a positive correlation with higher rates of loneliness. Of the sample, 20.5% qualified as victims of aggression at one time or more. Despite the high rate of the previous statistics, the number of students consistently and frequently targeted was lower at 9%. There was no reported correlation to students' school

adjustments determining changes in peer status. Research also showed that school adjustment problems were at their highest when students were still being victimized however if a shift in victimization status occurred, students reported a decrease in loneliness.

Kochenderfer and Ladd (2001) briefly alluded to observations accompanying the study but there was no information on what this consisted of. For a more thorough report, the type of observation done would be an important piece to add to the study. The researchers also hypothesized that at younger ages (less than eight years old) the bullying patterns are less stable as reflected in the shifting numbers of reported victims from fall to spring. This may translate into focusing intervention programs at the younger students (less than eight years old) while aggression patterns are less habituated than at older ages. Completion of further research may be able to confirm if this approach would make significant difference in bully rates of lower elementary school students.

Ambert (1994) sought to explore the rate of peer abuse among students as well as the implications of peer abuse on later development. The researcher randomly selected subjects from a larger sample of 1,432 students. The 180 respondents participated in the study which focused mainly on participants' responses to two questions. The first question had an interchangeable time frame. The researcher asked students to identify what they liked best to remember about (interchangeable time frame). The following question asked students to identify what they liked least to remember about (interchangeable time frame). The time frames considered were 0-5 years old, 6-10, and 11-14. Half the respondents also responded to the time frame of 15-18 years old. The

researcher collected answers in the form of autobiographies and coded for themes. The researcher then placed the themes into larger categories and statistics.

Ambert (1994) found that peers accounted for at least 30% of the recollections (both happy and unhappy) of the subjects in three of the interchangeable time frames. This accounted for more than parents. An average of 21.6% of students reported negative treatment by peers that had an effect for several years. A similar report on the negative treatment of peers only reported that 11.5% had negative parental experiences that last several years. Following students' accounts of peer abuse, the researcher also identified parents as secondary victims of abuse. The researcher attempted to connect peer abuse as altering the mood of youth who then go home and have conflict with parents due to the stress of peer abuse. The researcher provided no statistical evidence of this.

Ambert's (1994) study focused on a very narrow set of question as well as solely on short self-reports. In order for the survey to be more thorough, there should be an expansion of the questions to provide more in depth. A strong trait of the study is the length of time that the questions examined. Another possible way to strengthen the results may be to administer the questions during the actual age bracket rather than retrospectively as a young adult. Though the researcher did not provide evidence connecting the stress of peer abuse to parental conflict, the issue warrants further exploration in a study that isolates the topic.

Holt et al. (2007) sought to examine if bullies, victims, and bully/victims are at an increased risk for victimization in four other domains (conventional crime, child maltreatment, sexual victimization, and witnessing/indirect victimization). All fifth grade students in the selected school district received letters of consent that needed parents'

signature. Of the 884 students in the district, 53 students (6%) did not participate due to a lack or decline of consent. In the study, students completed several questionnaires and self-reports including a demographic questionnaire, an interview and questions on the bully scale, victimization scale, anxious/depressed and withdrawn/depressed. The researchers also gave a final written group survey.

Holt et al. (2007) had each participant complete a demographic survey that included questions about his or her sex, age, grade, and race, or ethnicity. Students also completed the nine-item University of Illinois Bully Scale to assess bullying behavior. Students completed the four-item University of Illinois Victimization Scale and the 33-item screening Juvenile Victimization Questionnaire. The Juvenile Victimization Scale measured victimization in five categories including: conventional crime, child maltreatment, peer and sibling victimization, sexual victimization, and witnessing and indirect victimization. This questionnaire did not ask the location that these crimes took place. The researchers asked students the particular types of crimes they encountered and if they had happened within the past year. Students also completed a twenty-one item questionnaire using the Anxious/Depressed and Withdrawn/Depressed scale from the Youth Self-Report. This measured how students were feeling (e.g. "I feel lonely" – true or untrue, etc).

Holt et al. (2007) found that bullies, victims, and bully-victims reported higher levels of incidence in the four domains (as mentioned in the question) than the students not involved in bullying. The researchers first categorized students as bullies, victims, bully-victims, or no status. Creating groups allowed the researchers to examine each category separately. The results revealed that 99 (14.4%) subjects classified as bullies,

83 (12.0%) as victims, 54 (7.8%) as bully-victims, 451 (65.7%) as no status. Bully-victims reported significantly more instances of conventional crime victimization and sexual victimization than bullies and victims. Bully-victims and victims reported more child maltreatment and peer and sibling victimization than bullies. Of the no status students, 3.1% reported sexual victimization in the last year in contrast with bully-victims who reported 32.1% being sexual victims. Also, bully-victims and bullies reported higher rates of witnessing and indirect victimization than victims. Youth involved in bullying in any capacity, whether as bullies, victims, or bully-victims, reported more victimization in the domains than no status youth. The researchers found the highest levels of reports in the status bully-victim.

The Holt et al. (2007) study examined not only bullies but also victims in relation to their risk in multiple domains. Including victims as well as bullies in the study created a much more thorough and complete study. Additionally, this highlights the need for more attention to all youth involved in bullying cycle including witnesses. The researchers also included ways in which implementing the surveys could work as part of bullying prevention programs. Partnering this with the essential need to include assessment of what kinds of victimization students may be exposed to is a suggestion for implementation on a school level. The researchers reported a high number of students being victims of conventional crime but the survey was clear to conclude that this may be due to the high crime rate in the community and not indicative of a connection to bullying. Further research should be able to clarify this statistic. The study also recommended that the victimization side of bullying needs further addressing in bully prevention programs since the level of seriousness of victimization in other areas was

high. The study completed in only one school district would benefit from replication in other areas with more students to make it more credible. Also, it relied entirely on students' reports (no observations teacher /administrative observations) which may limit the accuracy.

Cullingford and Morrison (1995) conducted a qualitative survey to determine the relationship between the experience of the subjects in school (with specific attention to bullying/victimization) and later adult criminality. The researchers interviewed 25 youth offenders between the ages of 16 and 21. The researchers conducted semi-structured, private interviews in a male and female youth offender institution. As reflective of the prison population, significantly more males than females participated in the interviews. The researchers informed youth participating in the study of the confidentiality and anonymity of the survey however researchers omitted that the focus of the study incorporated bullying. In order to explore a variety of portions of the subjects lives, interview items included students overall experiences in school, their feelings and attitudes toward curriculum, bullying, friends, teachers, outside life and familial relationships.

Cullingford and Morrison (1995) reported no difference in the results for either gender. Subjects reported that the school environment was often one aggression and bullying. Subjects' definition of aggression included both physical forms of aggression as well as psychological forms such as teasing, taunting, and name calling. Subjects generally reported an understanding that bullying and fighting were a part of the school experience. Several subjects identified taunting other children as a normal social behavior. This included subjects who identified as aggressors as well as victims.

Subjects identified physical aggression as more damaging than verbal aggression. Subjects cited a lack of intention as the reason that bullying was not a serious offense. Many subjects also cited a difficulty in academic achievement and reported feeling rejected by teachers as well as peers. Those interviewed also reported being both victims as well as aggressors. Subjects also self-reported that they felt they were more likely than their peers to react aggressively as victims than other students.

The qualitative nature and small number of subjects in Cullingford and Morrison's (1995) study makes it difficult to compare the results. The consistency of the statements of each of the subjects certainly warrants further research to determine the extent to which these results are consistent across ages and location. From the results of this study, some portion of the student population has received the message that aggression and bullying is a normal social behavior and part of the school experience. Further research completed on a larger scale may confirm this. Confirmation of research may lead to programs designed to unravel this view from the thoughts of students. If students do not identify bullying as a problem, it may be difficult to effectively administer other bullying intervention programs. Additionally, most subjects did not identify verbal aggression as harmful. This would also be useful to include in the development of intervention programs. Also, the addition of further education on how intention does not change the effect of bullying would be a useful piece of intervention programs. The study lacks the corroboration of other studies that examine the long term effects of bullying on adults. Additional research on this area would be invaluable in determining the long term effects of bullying.

Family Influence on Aggressive Behavior

The three articles included in this section examine the influence of family on the aggressive behavior of children. The first article describes a study by Schwartz, Dodge, Pettit, and Bates (1997) in which the researchers examine the early socialization and family interactions of children who later emerge as aggressive and bullied. Domina (2005) sought to determine how different types of parental involvement effect elementary students' achievement tests scores and the students rating on the Behavioral Problems Index. In the final study, Bolger and Patterson (2001) compared maltreated and non-maltreated children in relation to peer rejection, aggressive behavior, and social withdrawal.

Schwartz et al. (1997) conducted research to determine the early socialization patterns of boys that later emerged as aggressive victims of bullying. The researchers interviewed the mothers of 198 five-year-olds to assess the nature of the boys' home environments. Approximately four-to five years later, the researchers evaluated the same students in their classroom environments to determine their level of aggressive behavior and peer victimization level. Students were broken into several categories and then compared. The categories were: aggressive victims (n = 16), non-aggressive (passive) victims (n = 21), non-victimized aggressors (n = 33), normative (n = 128). Researcher selected students during registration for kindergarten in the April prior.

Schwartz et al.'s (1997) original interview consisted of a 150 minute interview with the mother in the home of the child. The interview included a combination of open-ended and structured questions aimed at establishing the child's developmental history, socialization, and family background. The answers were broken into three time periods

of the subject's lives: Period one: 0-12 months in age; Period two: Age 12 months to one year prior to the interview; and Period three: one year prior to the interview. From this information, the interviewer gave a five point summary rating to each period of the subject's lives. Additional questions for the mother included discipline strategies, frequency of discipline, and severity of punishment. The researchers placed answers into the previously mentioned time periods and assigned five point summary ratings. Four additional subject areas included: exposure to violence (both within and outside the home), martial conflict child was exposed to, physical abuse experienced by the child, and socioeconomic status.

To identify victim/aggression status, Schwartz et al. (1997) had the subjects' classmates participate in a sociometric interview that instructed students to identify no more than three students that fit three victimization descriptors. The researchers asked students to repeat the procedure with three aggressive descriptors. From this information, the researchers calculated student's victimization score and aggressive score. Additionally, the researchers assigned students a social preference score. The researchers found a negative correlation between peer group victimization and social preference ($r = -0.57$). There was also a positive correlation between peer group victimization and aggression ($r = 0.32$). There was an additional negative correlation between aggression and social preference ($r = -0.45$).

Using the previously mentioned identifying procedures, Schwartz et al. (1997) compared students using the categories of aggressive victims ($n = 16$), non-aggressive (passive) victims ($n = 21$), non-victimized aggressors ($n = 33$), normative ($n = 128$). In comparison to the three other categories, aggressive victims experienced higher exposure

to parental aggressive strategies, maternal hostility, and dyadic marital violence. Additionally, aggressive victims experienced higher exposure to martial conflict and slightly higher levels of restrictive discipline than their passive and normative counterparts. Non-victimized aggressors also had higher rates of exposure to violent role models. The researchers also reported that subjects who reported physical abuse had a higher correlation to becoming later aggressive victims. Of boys harmed by physical violence, 29% were aggressive victims. The researchers reported a similar rate for harmed boys and the status of non-victimized aggressors. The researchers placed another 29% of harmed boys into the category of non-victimized aggressors.

Schwartz et al.'s (1997) study focused on the early socialization of aggressive male victims of bullying. Conducting future research on a female population would determine if the results are the same for both sexes. Additionally, the only parent interviewed was the mothers of the subjects. In order for the study to be more thorough, fathers, siblings, and other extended family members should participate in interviews. A strength of the study was the dedication to continuing the study across a significant period of time. In addition, the researchers were able to continue the study with a large number of subjects across the entire length of the study. The results of this study may be helpful in identifying students who may be at risk of developing aggressive/victim status due to early socialization however it would be difficult to employ this tactic in everyday classroom use. Further research should be done to identify practices that could produce the same results (of identify at-risk students) in a method that could be employed by school employees.

Domina (2005) sought to determine if parental involvement with elementary school students had an effect on achievement test scores and students rating on the Behavioral Problems Index. The researcher examined 1,445 subjects enrolled in fourth grade and under. The students were from one school district in a suburban setting. Using random selection, students received consent forms. Students that completed the consent forms continued on. Remaining students completed the Peabody Individual Achievement Test (PIAT) and the Behavioral Problems Index (BPI). The PIAT is a standardized test that measures skills in mathematics, reading recognition, and reading comprehension. The BPI uses mother's answers from 28 questions to determine the frequency, range, and type of behavioral problems. The researcher cross referenced this information on the student to six parental school-involvement activities: attending a PTA meeting, one-on-one meeting with a teacher or school official, volunteering in the classroom, volunteering in an activity outside of the classroom, helping student with homework, checking student's homework. The research also gathered information on the students' socioeconomic background.

Domina's (2005) research showed a high correlation ($r = 0.68$, $p < 0.01$) between five parental activities and high academic achievement. The five parental activities that correlated were attending parent-teacher conferences, attending PTA meetings, volunteering in the classroom, volunteering outside of the class, and checking students' homework. When parents of students participated in these five activities, students scored an average of 15.35 percentage point higher on the PIAT exam. There was a negative association with parental help and academic achievement. Further research showed that parents had adjusted involvement based on the individual needs of the child and in fact

the influence of parental involvement on academic achievement lacked statistical validity. The researcher also examined parental involvement on BPI and found that parental involvement in four of the activities (volunteering inside the class, volunteering outside of the class, attending PTA meetings, checking homework) showed a positive correlation ($r=0.37$, $p<0.01$) to the improvement of students' behavior problems. This translated into students' scoring 17 percentage point lower on the BPI.

Domina (2005) only interviewed the mothers of students (rather than the father or custodial adult) for the BPI questionnaire. The research community should question this practice due to its exclusion of students that may have other adults as primary caregivers. The study however did include fathers, husbands, or partners in the rating of an adult who volunteered or participated in school activities. It would be useful incorporate other adults into the BPI questionnaire in the same technique. Though the relation between parental involvement and increased academic achievement lacked proof, the relation between parental involvement and improved behavior is significant. This could have implications in creating school-based programs to involve the parents of students who are demonstrating behavioral difficulties.

Bolger and Patterson (2001) examined maltreated and non-maltreated children in relation to peer rejection, aggressive behavior, and social withdrawal. The researchers used a sample of 107 maltreated children and 107 non-maltreated children for the study. Data for the study came from three sources; data from a previous longitudinal study that revealed students peer relationships and behavior, information on maltreated students acquired from a statewide registry, and details of the maltreatments from the local Department of Social Services. The researchers chose the 214 participants from a

previous longitudinal study that included the collection of the information on peer relationships and behavior. The two sets (maltreated and non-maltreated) were matched based on gender, ethnicity, age, socioeconomic status, and school attended. The researchers categorized the type of maltreatment of the subjects (physical, emotional, failure to be provided for, lack of supervision and sexual) then scaled the abuse using a five-point scale (mild to severe). The researchers checked the reliability by using a reliability coder. The reliability rate was 77%.

Bolger and Patterson (2001) found that physical abuse showed significant correlation ($r_{105} = 0.33$) to emotional maltreatment. A similar correlation was shown between failure to provide and a lack of supervision ($r_{105} = 0.35$). The researchers later categorized abuse into three larger categories of harsh/abusive parenting, neglectful parenting, and sexual abuse. The age of abuse onset correlated negatively with the length the abuse lasted ($r_{105} = -0.075$). For the peer rejection rating, the researchers used peer nominations to establish if the subject was rejected or non-rejected for grades two through seven. Using this same data, students were also assigned social preference scores. Over the length of the data provided (five years) including all subjects, 64% were never classified as rejected, 28% were rejected during at least one, but not all time periods, and 8% were rejected during every year of the time period. Of students not maltreated, 73% reported never experiencing rejection. Of students who had experienced up to five year of maltreatment, 64% reported never experiencing rejection. Of students who had experienced five or more years of maltreatment, 50% reported never experiencing rejection. Of the students who had experienced five or more years of

maltreatment, 17% reported rejection during two or more years. Of the non-maltreated students, 8% experienced rejection during two or more years.

The results of Bolger and Patterson's (2001) study showed a clear correlation between peer rejection and maltreatment. Students maltreated during any period of time have an increased rate of rejection. The rate is even higher in students maltreated for five or more years. Intervention program and teacher training should include possible additional interventions to provide these students with additional aid to prevent rejection. Further research would provide opportunity to categorize the exact nature of the rejection and to isolate possible methods to reduce rejection.

Teacher/School/Peer Influence on the Bullying Cycle

This section includes nine studies that explore the influence of teachers, schools (environment), and peers on the bullying cycle. The first study, conducted by Haselager, Hartup, Lieshout, and Riksen-Walraven (1998), determined the common attitudes and behaviors of friends and non-friends in elementary school. Pellegrini, Kato, Blatchford, and Baines (2002) studied the playground games of children during their first year of school with relation to social competence. Smith, Cowie, Olafsson, and Liefoghe (2002) attempted to determine how 14 countries differ in definitions of bullying as well as the importance of establishing a universal understanding of aggression. Mishna, Scarcello, Pepler, and Wiener (2005) shifted their attention to teachers by interviewing them to determine their understanding and definition of bullying. Rossem and Vermande (2004) explored the possibility of integrating children into a classroom by using informal social classroom roles. Pellegrini and Bartini (2000) examined the transition from primary to middle school to determine what effect change in environment, peer

transactions, and changes in development have on the amount of bullying reported. Zin's (2001) study expanded the scope to include a method to determine to what extent bullies are also victims. Astor, Meyer, and Pitner (2001) researched how students of different ages perceive the risk of violence in schools with particular attention to various locations in the building. Finally, Welsh (2000) investigated how school climate and individual student characteristics affect school disorder (victimization, avoidance, perceptions of safety, misconduct, and offending).

Haselager et al. (1998) explored the similarities between friends and non-friends. The researchers chose subjects from 102 elementary school classes located in the Netherlands that were already participating in an additional study. The researchers assessed 2,509 students using sociometric interviews and peer nominations and from that the researchers selected target children. The researchers randomly chose one boy and one girl from each class to be the target subjects. The only condition to selection as the target for study is that each child must have identified in the assessment at least one same-sex friend and one same-sex non friend. The researchers selected a total of 576 children for the study. This included 97 boys and 95 girls as target subjects as well as 192 same-sex friends and 192 same-sex non friends. The mean age of the participants was 11 years and 1 month.

Haselager et al. (1998) asked students to identify three friends in their class. Students were considered friends if they mutually nominated each other. The researchers considered students non-friends if neither student nominated the other as friends. As a whole class, students were given a list of nine terms describing particular behaviors (i.e. cooperates, starts fights, is shy, etc). Researcher then instructed students to assign no

more than three peers to each behavior. While in a whole class setting, the researchers instructed students to write the names of the three students they liked the most and the three they liked the least. The researchers again assigned peer preference scores to the students based on the collected data. The final portion of the testing included a test to determine the level of depression of the students. Using a questionnaire, the researchers scored students' answers and placed them on a scale.

Haselager et al. (1998) found that pairs of students identified as friends and non-friends reported a higher rate of similarities in nominations by peers. Additionally, both friends and non-friends reported having similar social behavior. The similar social behaviors included both pro-social behaviors (cooperates, offers help, has friends) as well as anti-social behaviors (starts fights, disrupts, bullies classmates). There was a higher correlation ($r = 0.77$, $p < 0.05$) to friends demonstrating similar anti-social behaviors than to friends who demonstrated similar pro-social behavior. Self reports and peer nominations both illustrated these similarities.

Haselager et al. (1998) incorporated a large randomly selected subject group as well as a variety of ages thus strengthening the chance of duplicating the results. Additionally, research may incorporate the similarities between friends and non-friends across gender lines to identify if those students possess similarities as well. This could be a challenge due to the results in this study that most students nominated same sex peers however exploration is worth consideration. This research may be useful in creating intervention programs in which peers with different social behaviors work together in pairs. Results showed that students often replicate the behavior of peers, including anti-

social behavior, therefore pairing students with peers that demonstrate different behavior may work as an intervention in anti-social behavior such as bullying.

Pellegrini et al. (2002) conducted a longitudinal study of the playground games of children to determine the implications of the play for social competence and adjustment to school. The researchers focused on the play of students in their first year of full day school. The researchers conducted the study in a large Midwestern city in the United States. Students participating in the study were in the first grade and originated in two urban primary schools. The researchers selected 77 students (30 boys, 47 girls) for the study and had a mean age of 6.4 years. Four graduate students conducted the study. Due to the high number of students that spoke Spanish as their first language, one of the researchers spoke Spanish and conducted the interviews with Spanish speaking students in Spanish. The researchers conducted direct behavioral observations, peer nominations, self-reports, and teacher and research associate ratings of children. To deter bias, research associates did not observe the students with whom they conducted interviews.

In addition to observations conducted during recess, Pellegrini et al. (2002) interviewed students twice during the year: once in late fall and again in late spring. During the interview, the researchers asked students for peer nominations of students from their class. Students nominated peers they liked the most, who were friends, and who was good at sports/games. Additional questions were asked but not for the purpose of this study. Students were also asked to rate their enjoyment of school. Finally, the students' teachers and the researchers rated the level in which the students were adjusted to school and their participating in games with peers.

Using the information they gathered, Pellegrini et al. (2002) first sought to identify the frequency, variety, and complexity of boys' and girls' games during the first year of school. Second, the researchers wanted to examine if games and play for student related to the social competence and level of adjustment to school. Boys engaged in more games and a greater diversity of games throughout the year. Girls tended to engage in more verbal games. The games boys engaged in tended to be more competitive though the researchers cited that the competitive nature of girls' games may have been too minute to detect due to the methods of observation. To determine the social competence of students, the researchers defined having social competence as the majority of peers express like for the subject as well as participating in reciprocal friendships. For boys, facilitating games had a high correlation ($r = 0.82, p < 0.01$) to social competence.

Pellegrini et al. (2002) reported that with the exception of reporting that girls were more likely to engage in verbal games, this article lacked results pertaining to female students, play, and social competence. The researchers cited difficulty in accurately observing the play of all students due to a lack of observers and efficient methods. For future research, the methods of observation require a revision to measure in more depth the play of female students. Despite the lack in information on female students, the results of game leadership for social competence may be useful in facilitating games in which a variety of students are in charge of leading the games. Measuring work of this nature may determine if rotating leadership may in fact increase the social competence of students that normally do not take a leadership role in play.

Smith et al.'s (2002) study attempted to clarify the difference in the definitions of bullying across fourteen countries. The researchers compiled a set of 25 stick-figure

cartoons that depicted a variety of social situations. The cartoons depicted different forms of bullying as defined in different cultures. The majority of cartoons depicted negative acts however some showed accidental negative acts whereas others showed aggressive acts more reflective of bullying. Cartoons did not include color or clothing but did include a caption in the native language of the subject. Captions described the event but did not include the term bullying. Using focus groups of the same subjects, the researchers collected terms familiar to the students that they used to describe bullying.

Smith et al. (2002) showed the cartoons to 1,245 students (604 at 8 years old, 641 at 14 years old) from fourteen different countries. The researchers showed students the cartoons on an individual basis then given a term from the focus group. Using the cartoons and captions, students included or excluded the cartoon based on if it demonstrated the term from the focus group. Researcher presented subjects with five to ten terms dependant on how many terms the focus group selected. For the eight year old subjects, the researchers read the caption accompanying the picture. For the fourteen year old subjects, the researchers showed the subjects the cartoons but read the subjects captions themselves.

Smith et al.'s (2002) results showed that younger students are able to differentiate between aggressive and non-aggressive acts but have a difficult time distinguishing between different forms of aggression. Older students were able to differentiate in more detail the verbal types of aggression than younger students. Younger students considered a wider variety of physical altercations in their definitions of bullying. These findings were consistent across all countries included in the study. The researchers speculated that the higher rate of reported victimization in younger students may be correlated to the

wider definition expressed by younger students. This concept warrants further exploration by the research community to confirm that higher victimization rates in younger students are due to their definition of bullying. Additionally, pending further research, invention programs may benefit from patterning to fit the need of younger student to gain the skills to better differentiate bullying behavior and skills for intervention.

Mishna et al. (2005) examined how a group of teachers understood bullying in respect to their own definition and ideas for intervention. The researchers selected four public, urban schools that differed in income, family composition, and percent of recent immigrants. The researchers then administered a questionnaire to fourth and fifth grade students in an effort to identify student who were victims of bullying. Using the questionnaires, researchers selected nine boys and nine girls from each grade (fourth and fifth) identified as bullied. The researchers also interviewed the teachers of the bullied students. Trained graduate students interviewed thirteen teachers. The length of the interview depended on how many of the bullied students were in the teacher's class. The researchers requested teachers to share their response to hearing that their students had self-identified as a victim of bullying. Further questions explored the teacher's understanding of the definition of bullying, whether the child had identified as being bullied to the teacher previously, as well as how (or if) the teacher had responded to the bullying of the student.

Smith et al. (2002) found that teachers reported that they were unaware of 10 of the 18 students who experienced bullying. Of the seven that the researchers previously identified as experiencing bullying, all seven had reported at least one bullying incident

to their teacher. Of the seven known victims, five of the students had been working with the teachers in a variety of ways to stop the bullying. All teachers included two aspects in their definitions of bullying; an imbalance of power and an intentional act. Teachers reported a varied understanding of bullying in regards to including physical and non-physical forms of bullying. The variety came not only from the considering of different forms of bullying but also how serious the teachers considered the bullying. The majority of teachers did not include repetition in their definition of bullying. Upon completion of the study, the researchers consulted with teachers to verify the results and developing themes.

The qualitative aspect of the Smith et al.'s (2002) study created room for the teachers to explain their specific, individual experience and understanding of bullying in relation to their student. Though the researchers put significant effort in the selection of diverse schools, the inclusion of only thirteen teachers and eighteen students created an issue of needing further research. Replication of the study on a larger scale and in a wide variety of areas would help create understanding on how location may change results. By identifying the varied understanding of teachers in regards to the definition of bullying the research indicates that it would be useful to create a school or district wide definition that all teachers, staff, and students are familiar with. Additionally, teachers reported confusion on not only how to identify and incident as bullying but also uncertainty on the steps to follow to intervene. This finding illustrates the need to have a school or district wide set of procedures to intervene on bullying in addition to a unified definition.

Van Rossem and Vermande (2004) examined the effectiveness of using informal classroom roles to increase a student's integration into the classroom setting. The

researchers analyzed the social relationships and classroom roles of 1,241 first grade students from 71 classrooms in the Netherlands. The researchers interviewed students and asked to name classmates that demonstrated certain behaviors. Behaviors included categories such as: shows leadership, bosses others around, says mean things to others, ect. The majority of questions revolved around social experiences with peers. Questions exclusively focused on identify aggressors rather than victims. Using the number of positive nominations and negative nominations children received scores to identify their roles in the classroom. The researchers also sought to identify characteristics that may be consistent with all students identified in each role. Correlation between sociometric status and classroom roles was calculated. There was additional exploration of the correlation between classroom roles and school adjustment calculators.

Van Rossem and Vermande (2004) defined sociometric status to include the categories: popular, rejected, neglected, controversial, and average. The researchers cross referenced the results with classroom roles which included: average, gentle, tough, isolate, nice, follower, leader, bully, and firm. The researchers found an association between classroom roles and sociometric status. Students considered gentle were more popular at a rate of fifteen times higher than students considered gentle and rejected as reported by peers. High correlation was also found between tough/rejected, isolate/rejected, nice/popular, follower/average, and bully/rejected. Conversely, the researchers reported low correlation between rejected/gentle, tough/popular, isolate/popular, nice/rejected, follower/rejected, leader/rejected, bully/popular, and bully/neglected. Children in the rejected category split across several categories. Rejected children were located primarily in the tough and bully role with 17% of rejected

children remaining in the average classroom role. A few number of students considered tough were categorized as popular (3%).

Van Rossem and Vermande (2004) cross referenced these roles with school adjustment categories of attention problems, aggressive behavior, fear/uncertainty, restlessness, and loneliness. Students in the bully and tough category had a high correlation to attention problems, aggression, and restlessness. Students considered in the roles nice and gentle had the lowest association with attention problems, aggression, and restlessness. Isolated students correlated most with the fear/uncertainty category. Students in the isolate and bullying category had the highest self report as lonely.

Van Rossem and Vermande (2004) explored multiple aspects of classroom roles and school adjustment. The researchers did not separate gender therefore students were able to nominate peers from both sexes. This differentiates this study from other previous studies. This study relied primarily on self reports therefore for future study it would be useful to partner the self reports with observational research during free play (possibly during recess) to confirm the accuracy of student self reports. The findings of this study may also be useful in determining how teachers could encourage students to expand their behavior past their current peer assigned roles. Specifically, for students who demonstrate aggressive or other negative behavior, it would be useful to partner them with students who demonstrate positive behaviors to encourage positive role mobilization.

Pellegrini and Bartini (2000) examined the transition from primary to middle school to determine what effect the change in environment, peer transactions, changes in development has on bullying rates. During year one of the study, the researchers selected

154 fifth graders for participation. During year two, the researchers selected 138 (of the same) fifth graders. During year one, the researchers collected student reported data and peer nominations. Students were given the Olweus' Senior Bully Victim Questionnaire and peer nominations of popularity, friendship, social networks, and isolates. The researchers read items aloud to a classroom of students by a member of the research team. The researchers informed students that the information was confidential. Students' names were included on reports. For the peer nominations, researcher presented students with a roster of their classmates. They were asked to nominate three peers they liked most, three that played alone/seemed lonely. The researchers also asked students to identify who hung out together. The researchers also asked students to identify their own friends. Additionally, the researchers asked teachers to complete a temperament measure and the Dodge and Coie's Teacher Check List for the selected students. The temperament scale measured the emotional intensity of students (i.e. child overreacts in stressful situation, ect).

Pellegrini and Bartini (2000) predicted year two bullying based on the fifth grade victimization status and affiliative network from the first part of sixth grade. In year two, the researchers utilized direct and indirect observational measures, peer nominations, self report measures, student ratings of environment, and teacher rating of student behavior. Researchers observed focal participants directly at least once per week for the whole school year. Observations took place throughout the school day and in various locations. Research associates also attended training sessions. The researchers used photos of the children to make sure associates identified the correct focal children. Associates rotated

students every 10 weeks to minimize over familiarization. At end of year, all associates had observed all students.

Pellegrini and Bartini (2000) also asked students to keep a diary once a month for the whole school year. Once a month an associate gathered all students and asked them to recall the last 24 hours and answer a series of questions about who did they spend their time with as well as if they had been an aggressor in any way. The researchers requested students to identify the targets and what specific aggression they experienced. Teachers again completed the Dodge and Coie's Teacher Check List and Martin's temperament instrument as in year one. The researchers used the results from peer and self-report measures administered to the year two group in the fall and spring by a trained research assistant. With peer nominations, students were given a roster (as in year one). The researchers asked the same questions as in year one. Additionally, researchers gave students were given a list of the members of their homerooms and asked to assign a descriptive statement to each student related to bullying (e.g. she/he is mean, kids make fun of her). Finally, students completed a survey on the transition in regards to 9 items measuring their view of school environment and self-concept. Students also (as in year one) received the Olweus' Senior Bully Victim Questionnaire.

Pellegrini and Bartini (2000) found that bullying increased from fifth to sixth grade possibly to establish dominance when changing to larger school environments. Boys had higher scores of instances of bullying than girls. Girls held more negative views of bullying than boys. Self-reported victimization decreased from the end of fifth grade to the start of sixth grade. Girls identified more friends than boys. The nomination of isolates and reported isolation increased from the end of the fifth grade to the start of

sixth grade and then declined again at the end of the sixth grade. In the second year more students admitted to bullying but less students reported bullying. There were distinct changes in peer affiliation between fifth and sixth grade which created more instances of bullying. The teachers that completed the rating of students' emotions were different than in year one since students had switched to middle school. Peer nominations resulted in boys rating as more emotional as well as aggressive than girls. Boys' proactive aggression remained stable from fifth to sixth grade and girls' declined significantly. Research found that aggression is stable from primary to middle school.

A strength of Pellegrini and Bartini's (2000) study was the longitudinal aspect of the study. The study took place over a long period of time to show the change in students. The study also addressed the environmental and developmental factors that lead to bullying in addition to social issues in its analysis. A concern exists with the instructions given to students during the self-reports. The researchers instructed students to put their names on the self reports of being a victim of bullying. The article indicated that the researchers suspected students were afraid to admit any issues and/or complete the survey due to the presence of their name on survey. The subjects of the survey were a relatively small number in one isolated area and contained 95% Caucasians. This is not representative of the U.S. or the general population. Finally, different teachers (each year) evaluated the student's emotional state. The change in the evaluator may put into question the consistency of the evaluations.

Zin (2001) sought to explore to what extent are bullies also victims. Zin specifically aimed to conduct an examination of the bullying cycle in middle schools to identify student and school characteristics that contribute to the bullying cycle. The

researcher conducted the study in New Brunswick, Canada. The Atlantic Centre for Policy Research in Education and the New Brunswick Department of Education conducted a survey of all students in grade six and eight and their teachers. Subject included 6,883 sixth grade students and 6,868 eighth grade students.

As part of the study, teachers completed a teacher questionnaire evaluating students. Zin (2001) evaluated seven variables of students. Items studied were: student gender, SES, number of parents, number of siblings, students' academic status, affective (emotional) and physical conditions. The researcher registered physical and affective conditions on a single scale. The researcher calculated academic status from averaging tests in mathematics, science, reading, and writing. The researcher based students' writing scores on two pieces of writing assessed by teachers (in both grade six and grade eight). A panel of teachers graded all work on a six-point scale: unrateable, weak, marginal, acceptable, competent, and superior. Researchers averaged the scores from the two pieces or a final score. This final score had a mean of 0 and a standard deviation of 1.

Zin (2001) tested math and science in grade six only. The math portion of the test had 39 items that included numeration, geometry, data management, and measurement. The researcher tested students on their ability to understand concepts and then use them to solve problems. The science portion of the test had 33 items that tested both scientific concepts as well as scientific processes. The researcher measured the students' affective condition with a Self Description Questionnaire including 24 items. This measured students' self esteem and self concepts regarding non-academic and academics areas. Non-academic areas included were students' concepts of physical appearance, physical

ability, parent relations, and peer relations. Academics areas encompassed mathematics, reading, and school in general. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.87 in grade 6 and 0.88 in grade 8.

Zin (2001) measured the physical condition of students using a scale from the World Health Organization (WHO). The scale assesses the physical health of students including any health problems such as headache, stomachache, and backache. Students reported any additional health problems along with frequency. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.77 in grade six and 0.76 in grade eight. Within the study there were two dependant variables. The variable victim measured the extent to which a student reported verbal and/or physical victimization. The bully variable measured whether a student had participated in bullying activities against others. The Cronbach's alpha was 0.72 in grade six and 0.68 in grade eight.

At the large school level, Zin (2001) evaluated several major variables. Factors included school size, school location, and school mean SES. The researcher explored additional factors to reveal the school climate towards bullying. These factors included the disciplinary climate of the school, the expectations of peers as teachers (considered academic press), and the scope of parental involvement in the students' schooling. The Cronbach's alpha for the disciplinary climate reported at 0.77 for grade six and eight. Academic press reported a Cronbach's alpha of 0.61 in grade six and 0.65 in grade eight. Finally, parental involvement's Cronbach's alpha reported at 0.77 in grade six and 0.79 in grade eight.

Zin's (2001) study reported that bullying declines slightly between grades six and eight. From grade six to eight, the student characteristics were relatively unchanged

however the school characteristic shifted, particularly in size. Schools increased in size from grade six to eight. The mean class school size in grade eight was 38.97 whereas in grade eight was 51.97. Gender showed a higher correlation ($r = 0.52$, $p < 0.01$) bullies than victims. Bullies had an effect of -0.39 on bullies whereas victims showed an effect of -0.29. There are more male bullies than male victims however boys were to be more likely than girls to fall into the status of both bullied and victims.

Zin (2001) found that in regards to affective condition, students with a poor affective condition were more likely to become victims or bullies. Poor affective condition was defined primarily as a poor view of self as well as manifesting in other physical conditions such as insomnia, poor appetite, and depression. Between students with a poor affective condition who were either bullies or victims showed a standard deviation of 0.06. Researchers found that students with poor affective condition were more likely to be a bully than a victim (0.82 and 0.43 respectively). Physical condition of students had relation to student's likelihood of becoming either victims or bullies. Students with a poor physical condition were more to become bullies or victims but were significantly more likely to become victims (rather than bullies) when reporting a poor physical condition. This reported a standard deviation of 0.13. The SES and academic status did not show a significant association with either bullies or victims. Schools with poor parental involvement had higher numbers of bullies than schools where parental involvement reported at higher levels.

Zin (2001) found that gender, affective condition, and physical condition all contributed to the bullying cycle in both grades. These characteristics contribute to bullies and victims differently. Some characteristics make students more like to become

bullies whereas others are more likely to be present in victims. This study also showed that there were multiple instances in both grades in which bullies and victims reported as the same students. Bullies and victims being one in the same report more in grade six than in grade eight. This finding is significant because current counseling programs often treat students as either bullies or victims. This study concludes that programs may be more effective to treat all participants in the cycle of bullying with a more universal program that moves towards ending the cycle of bullying from all aspects.

Zin (2001) also found that because bullies in schools with a smaller student population have fewer victims to choose from, the problem may be overlooked because the victims may only include a small number of students. It is important not to overlook the problem because the extent to which the students may be bullied in small schools may be much more significant than first realized. Results also recognized the school discipline climate as a significant variable against bullying. When schools have shown that they are intolerant of bullying behavior, these schools were less likely to see bullying behavior occur. In addition to discipline climate, parental involvement played a significant role in deterring bullying in grade six. This implies that encouraging programs that increase parental involvement may contribute in a reduction of bullying. In grade eight, academic press had a similar result. Increasing the academic press among grade eight students in combination with a strengthened discipline climate may contribute to a reduction in bullying.

Astor et al. (2001) conducted a study to determine how students of different ages perceived the risk of violence in schools with particular attention to various locations in the building. The study encompassed 377 students in grades two, four, six, and eight

from an urban location in the Midwest. The researchers gave all students in the selected schools parental permission slips. The researchers selected students for the study by who received parental permission. The final number of students with permission was 85% of the student population. From this number, four additional students chose not to participate.

Astor et al. (2001) had participants review a map of the school and then asked them identify places they considered unsafe or dangerous. The researchers asked students further probing questions if they identified unsafe locations such as, why is it unsafe and who it is unsafe for. All results were compiled to identify which areas considered most unsafe by students. The researchers then identified the common themes present in student's remarks. Students revealed a common theme of considering an area unsafe when it lacked adult monitoring. The researchers also examined how (if at all) age played a role in the perceived level of danger.

Astor et al. (2001) found that most areas identified as violence prone were what students considered to be undefined space that lacked adult supervision and were overcrowded. Middle school students often cited overcrowding as the reason areas were unsafe. Middle school students cited hallways as most unsafe area in the school. Students cited the hallway 41 times as most unsafe with outside garnering the next highest ranking with 24 citations. Elementary students were more likely to identify the playground as unsafe. Elementary students cited the playground as most unsafe with 23 citations and general area deemed outside a close second with 20 citations. Middle school students were more likely than elementary students to feel unsafe in schools. Most students

identified at least one unsafe area in their school. Middle school teachers cited greater conflict in monitoring undefined areas.

Concern exists in two main areas. First, the Astor et al.'s (2001) study did not report if the researchers gave students the option to report that they considered all areas safe. According to the method section, the researchers asked students to identify unsafe locations in the school. To ensure accuracy, the researchers should express to students that they did not have to choose an area. The second area of concern regards the student population used and the application of the study to a larger population. The study involved a relatively small group of the area population (10% of the student population in the area) and included 67% boys. Though the higher percentage of males accurately represents this student population of the selected schools, it does not accurately represent all areas therefore additional research with other populations needs completion.

Astor et al.'s (2001) study attempted to tie in the idea (though not statistically proven in this particular study) that more adults can have an impact on how safe students feel at school, particularly in places considered unsafe. The study stated the majority of students cited the lack of adult supervision as the reason places considered unsafe as recorded during the sociometric interviews with students. This information may be useful to conduct further work exploring the correlation between an increase in supervision, bullying rates, and students reported sense of safety. If proven, an increase in adult supervision may become a part of future intervention programs in both elementary and middle schools.

Welsh (2000) investigated how school climate and individual student characteristics affects school disorders such as victimization, avoidance, perceptions of

safety, misconduct, and offending. The researcher used survey responses from middle school students in Philadelphia for the study. The researcher collected data from 11 middle schools during 1994-95. The researcher determined school climate and individual student characteristics by the Effective School Battery test. Items calculated for the school climate were students' perceptions of school safety, clarity of rules, fairness of rules, respect for students, student influence on school affairs, and planning and action (in which the school identifies and addresses issue). In regards to student characteristics items scaled included, school involvement, positive peer associations, belief in school rules, school effort, school rewards, age, race, and sex. Also considered were school disorder which included measuring how safe students feel at school in the building and how often they are afraid that they will be hurt or bothered at school. The researcher also measured student victimization by questionnaires that determined the frequency and severity of aggression. Finally, the researcher measured self-reported aggression/offended using the same questionnaire.

The 11 schools involved in Welsh's (2000) study differed greatly on the measures of school climate. School disorder also greatly differed among the 11 schools. Though the schools reported similar rates of serious offenses, general student misconduct differed greatly among all schools. There was also a large distinction between the levels of safety reported by students. Students calculated to have positive peer interactions reported less avoidance. Schools in which students reported fairness of rules and respect for students reported lower rates of offending. Students with greater involvement in school activities reported higher levels of offending. Students who believed in school rules also reported

higher school effort and association with non-deviant peers. Non-white males reported higher levels of misconduct than other student characteristics.

Welsh (2000) reported that students with greater involvement in school activities reported higher levels of offending. The researcher did not have an explanation for this statistic. To determine the cause or nature of this statistic, future research might supply data so schools could better address it in the future. Students who have greater involvement in school activities also reported higher levels of victimization. Researchers should address this in future research to determine the cause. The study showed that schools varied greatly on rules and rates of offending. To develop a better understanding of effective schools (effective in lowering rates of offending), studies should be done to determine the characteristics of the effective schools. This information would relate to replicating the effective measures in other schools.

Evaluation of Implemented Intervention Programs

The five articles in this section address the evaluation of implemented intervention programs in various parts of the world. Beran and Shapiro (2005) evaluated the anti-bullying program called Project Ploughshares Puppets for Peace. Slee and Mohyla (2007) conducted a similar study to examine the efficacy of the intervention program PEACE pack as implemented in Australia. Smith, Cousin, and Stewart (2005) broadened their study to include the evaluation of several anti-bullying programs implemented in Canada. McGuckin and Lewis (2008) investigated a baseline study to determine the level of management of bully/victim problems prior to anti-bullying legislation. Hirschstein, Van Schoiack-Edstrom, Frey, Snell, and MacKenzie (2007) conducted the final study in this section. The study determined how teacher

implementation of a comprehensive bullying prevention program affects student outcomes.

Beran and Shapiro (2005) evaluated the effectiveness of an implemented program in a large mid-western Canadian city. Developed in Ontario, Canada, the program entitled Project Ploughshares Puppets for Peace is for usage in elementary schools. The study focused on 129 students (69 boys, 60 girls) in grades three and four. The researchers had students from two elementary schools complete two surveys. All students completed the survey during the implementation of the program and then again three months later. The survey was designed evaluate students ability to accurately identify bullying behavior as well as their knowledge and experiences with bullying since the completion of the program. The surveys were identical with the exception of an additional question added to the final survey. The additional question asked students to identify how the program has changed the way they think about or deal with bullying.

Beran and Shapiro (2005) found that 50% of the students reported that their thoughts and behaviors had changed as a result of the program. Specifically, students cited that the program had taught them strategies to stop bullying and be safer. There was a group of students that did not feel they learned anything new from the program. This group consisted of 23% of the students questioned. The researchers took a deeper look at the way the program effected students who never reported victimization of bullying versus students who reported experiencing bullying in the past. Of the students who never reported as victims of bullying, 57% cited the program having a positive effect. More significantly, of the students who reported victimization of bullying, 44% reported that the program had a positive effect.

Beran and Shapiro (2005) questioned that the program had fulfilled its goal of increasing students' awareness of strategies to combat bullying due to the high number of students that reported no increase in knowledge since participating in the program. The researchers however did cite two important findings from the study. First, despite the lack of an increase in knowledge, the study showed that the students possessed a body of knowledge about bullying prior. Second, the researchers found it useful to use not only qualitative data but also open-ended questions in which students could supply knowledge and answers outside of the predetermined questions. Though this intervention program may not be ideal for all school systems, the type of evaluation used in this study may be useful for evaluating other intervention programs for comparative and effectiveness purposes.

Slee and Mohyla (2007) sought to evaluate the effectiveness of an intervention program named the PEACE pack in Australian primary schools. The researchers also wanted to explore the characteristics of a small group of students who reported no benefits from the program. The researchers developed a questionnaire to administer to students at each of the four schools selected for the study. The researchers administered the questionnaire in the first term of school. Data collected included demographic details, gender, age, subjects experiences with bullying, subjects knowledge of school initiatives to address bullying, subjects confidence to address bullying themselves, subjects rating on the rate of bullying since the implementation of the PEACE pack program. The questionnaire employed Likert-type scales for subjects' evaluation. Nine hundred and fifty-four students completed the questionnaire.

Slee and Mohyla (2007) separated junior primary students (mean age 6.2 years) from primary school students (mean age 9.3 years). Of junior primary students, 17% of boys and 19% of girls reported that after the intervention they had less encounters with bullying. Since the intervention, 12% of boys and 13% of girls reported an increase in bullying. The remainder of the students reported never experiencing bullying. Post-intervention, 18% of students reported they know how to stop bullying. Students also reported that post-intervention, 22% of students feel safe from bullying. Primary schools reported similar findings as junior primary schools. Post-intervention, 29% of boys and 20% of girls reported experiencing less bullying. Post-intervention, 12% of boys and girls reported more experienced with bullying. Students also reported feeling safer and having more resources post intervention. In schools that had a large increase in student population, the numbers of students reporting positive changes decreased. The researchers hypothesized that the new population of students lacked exposure to the intervention. Implementation of further research should confirm this hypothesis.

Because there was a part of the subject population that reported an increase in bullying post-intervention, further studies should determine the cause behind these statistics. Slee and Mohyla's (2007) study was useful for providing a clear picture of both pre-intervention and post-intervention statistics. Without the pre-intervention statistics, it would have been difficult to accurately measure the increase. The completeness of the statistics (with the inclusion of pre-interventions statistics) needs replication in other studies to evaluate intervention programs. As an increase in intervention programs continues, it may be useful to establish a protocol for evaluating programs for comparative purposes. Pre and post-intervention statistics would be an

integral part of a universal evaluation. Additionally, the positive results of the PEACE pack program should make it a consideration for implementation for schools in the United States. The study also cited that the PEACE pack program designed lends itself to adaption for individual schools. This factor makes the program much more universal and applicable to wide population.

Smith et al. (2005) focused their work on public schools in Canada. The researchers sought to understand how the implementation of anti-bullying interventions in public schools correlated to bullying rates. The researchers contacted the directors of all English-language public school boards for initial permission to conduct the survey. The researchers also contacted an additional 363 private schools for initial permission. From the schools that agreed to participate in the survey, the researchers placed all schools on a master list in alphabetical order and from that the researchers selected every second school to participate in the survey. All schools remained anonymous the researchers compiling the final results of the study.

Smith et al. (2005) sent each school principal a questionnaire packet which took approximately twenty to thirty minutes complete. The survey was nine pages long and was mainly scaled questions with room for the additional of other comments. Questions on the survey pertained to the characteristics of the school and students, the nature and severity of bullying at the school, the adequacy of resources to combat bullying, specifics and effectiveness of the anti-bullying programs implemented at their schools and finally any efforts the individual schools made to evaluate the program themselves.

Smith et al. (2005) received 395 completed surveys for evaluation. The return rate was 22.8% with 17.5% of responses coming from private school. The researchers

found that lower rates of bullying positively correlated with school principals reporting sufficient funds and higher amounts of school-wide anti-bullying programming available. It should be noted that all answers are self-reported by school officials rather than data collected by the researchers.

Smith et al. (2005) originally contacted 10.4% of public schools in the area however private school represented 17.5% of the completed surveys. In future research, private schools should be evaluated separate to ensure that the accurate results represent both public and private schools. The funds and resources available for intervention programs for private schools may differ from those in public schools therefore a need for separate calculations exists. Principals (or qualified school employees) were responsible for reporting all data. For a more in depth research, the specifics on the programs in each school as well as confirmed bullying statistics would better corroborate the principals' claims of the programs effect on bullying rates. Within the study, the researchers noted that principals reporting a decline in bullying rates using school wide programs, this contrasts previous research with the exception of the Olweus anti-bullying programs. This emphasizes the need for further research done by representatives outside the schools.

McGuckin and Lewis (2008) designed a study to explore the level of management of bully/victim issues in Northern Ireland prior to the implementation of anti-bullying legislation. The researchers contacted all 1,329 schools in Northern Ireland to have them complete a survey regarding the management of bully/victim issues. The researchers received back 285 of the surveys. Researcher constructed the survey in an audit style to determine what (if any) policies were in place on a school level prior to the

implementation of anti-bullying legislation. This questionnaire included information such as; the dissemination and implementation of existing government policies against bullying, components of any anti-bullying programs already in existence, communication of the policies to the school community, training of staff, management of victims claims of bullying, sanctions against bullies, and homophobic bullying rates. The majority of questions had a closed-response format and provided responders a space to write in qualitative responses.

McGuckin and Lewis (2008) reported that 64.2% of the respondents reported that they received instructions on existing government policies against bullying. Respondents reported at a rate 23.5% that they had not received any instruction. In response to the question of does the school have an anti-bullying policy in place, 97.5% responded in the affirmative. In qualitative responses, anti-bullying policies included components such as: policies and guidelines against bullying, whole-school programs, reporting procedures, observations of students during playtime, social skills training for students, and support for victims and resources for bullies to seek help. Of the respondents, 98.6% stated that their teaching staff receives training in how to handle bullying. In a further question, the researchers inquired if any non-teaching staff received training in how to handle bullying and 64.2% responded in the affirmative. When asked if the staff of the school had ever reported being the victims of bullying, 30.7% reported that staff had encountered bullying.

Due to the low response rate of 23.11% in McGuckin and Lewis' (2008) study, the statistics may not accurately represent all of Northern Ireland's schools. To establish complete statistics, the researchers would need complete further analysis with more

schools. The purpose of was to produce a baseline in which future statistics (post anti-bullying legislation) can be compared. This method will provide more accurate statistics on the influence of the anti-bullying legislation. On such a large level, it would be difficult to conduct, but the study would be stronger if it could include additional research methods other than school staff self-reports. Additional research may include student reports and outside observers. The work done around establishing a baseline prior to legislation may be a method that other countries may wish to employ to determine effectiveness of anti-bully legislation. Additional research around incidents of teachers and staff being the victims of bullying may warrant further exploration.

Hirschstein et al. (2007) explored how teacher implementation of a comprehensive bullying prevention program affects student outcomes. The researchers measured the implementation of the program in 36 third-sixth grade classrooms by observation and student report. The researchers measured the student outcomes by student surveys and teacher ratings of peer social skills and playground behaviors. The researchers paired six schools with matching demographics and socioeconomic variables. The researchers randomly assigned school to intervention and control conditions. The researchers observed randomly selected students (296) on the playground. The researchers randomly chose 36 third and sixth grade teachers (83% female) for training in the Steps to Respect program. The Steps to Respect program consists of increasing adult awareness and monitoring, enhancing support for pro-social behavior, and teaching social-emotional skills to support healthy peer relationship and counter bullying. This program includes staff and family training manuals, a program guide, and lesson-based curricula for third through sixth grade classrooms.

Hirschstein et al. (2007) reported that schools received 6 hours of on-site training from professional trainers using scripted material and videos from the Steps to Respect program. Training included staff role playing coaching students involved in bullying. Training also included orientation to lessons and instructional strategies including behavioral-skills training, cooperative learning and role plays. Schools then adopted a school-wide anti-bullying policy and reporting procedure. Principals sent letters home in the fall describing the program. Program consultants worked with the school during this time.

Teachers implemented lessons from December to May. Teachers taught the lessons over a 12-14 week period. Each skill unit is composed of ten 45-minute lessons followed by a 15-minute add-on taught within the same week. Hirschstein et al. (2007) completed pre- and post-test playground observations across ten weeks in the fall and ten weeks in the spring. Each child was observed for a five minute session about once per week. Children meeting the minimum of 40 minutes of playground observation at pre and post test (n = 296) were included in the analyses. Students also completed surveys in the fall and again in the spring. Teachers also rated the students' social skills.

Program consultants observed teacher lesson adherence and instructional quality. Consultants checked to what extent teachers covered lessons and how often. Hirschstein et al. (2007) evaluated teachers using the Social-Emotional Learning Checklist- Bullying Report. The survey evaluated using a four point scale to show the degree to which teacher's covered the material. Additionally, students responded to questions about their experiences and perceptions related to bullying on The Student Experience Survey: What School Is Like for Me. Teachers also rated the children on the Peer-Preferred Social

Behavior Subscale of the Walker-McConnell Scale of Social Competence and School Adjustment, elementary version. It rated students on 17 items.

Hirschstein et al. (2007) reported that teacher coaching of students involved in bullying was associated with less observed aggression. Adherence to the lessons was also associated with higher ratings of peer social skills. Lastly, students receiving high quality instruction had a greater reported victimization. The mean level of adherence to essential lesson components was 91%. The means rating for lesson quality was 2.24 (just above the scale midpoint). Support for students' bullying prevention and social-emotional skills averaged slightly more than once per week. Coaching of students occurred on average once per week. Adherence predicted greater teacher-rated interpersonal skills but not observed behavior or self-reported perceptions. Students whose teachers presented high-quality lessons indicated more perceived difficulty as compared to students whose teacher presented low quality lessons. Fifth and sixth graders whose teachers reported high levels of support (two to three times per week) aggressed less frequently after the intervention than the fifth and sixth graders of teachers reporting no or low support. Coaching was associated with students' perceptions of adult responsiveness to bullying. Coaching was also related to less observed encouragement of bullying among students who encouraged bullying at pretest. The number of lesson delivered was high across classrooms but adherence and quality varied.

The Hirschstein et al. (2007) study showed the importance of modeling appropriate behavior as well as the importance of helping students rehearse how to deal with bullying situations. It also showed the importance of helping students identify what bullying is. It also was clear to state the potential that teachers that had high quality

adherence may have been more likely to report improvement. The study had an interesting finding on how quality instruction led to greater reported victimization but it failed to investigate further the reasons why this was. This study also went across a wide range of ages and groups. It may be more effective to go into depth with each grade to find what is most effective with each age group. The study poses an interesting quandary that the high quality of lesson the more reported victimization. This certainly warrants further exploration and discussion.

Chapter three presented the research literature on the bullying cycle and its implication on youth. The following five section headings organized the articles in chapter three: identifying the characteristics of affected student groups, bullying/victim cycles and the effect on socialization, family influence on aggressive behavior, teacher/school/peer influence on the bullying cycle, and the evaluation of implemented intervention programs. Chapter four will conclude this paper by summarizing the finding of the articles in chapter, present the classrooms implication of the research, giving suggestions for further research.

CHAPTER FOUR: CONCLUSION

Introduction

Chapter one presented the rationale for completion of the an investigation to determine the effect of bullying on students' academic achievement and social development as well as searching for the most effective practices of reducing and/or eliminating bullying in elementary schools. Included in the rationale was a widely accepted definition of bullying. Also provided in the rationale were some of long-term effects of bullying such as a decrease in self esteem, and increase in emotional issue, and a decrease in academic growth (Sheras, 2002). Chapter two described the history of the topic of aggression of youth throughout history dating from the 18th century to current. Chapter three covered research literature that addressed relevant issues pertaining to aggression and the bullying cycle. The chapter three included the following five sections: identifying the characteristics of affected student groups, bullying/victim cycles and the effect on socialization, family influence on aggressive behavior, teacher/school/peer influence on the bullying cycle, and evaluation of implemented intervention programs. Chapter four will present a summary of finding from chapter three, implications for classroom practice, and suggestions for further research.

Summary of Findings

In the first section of chapter three, identifying the Characteristics of Affected Student Groups, the articles focused on identifying both similarities and differences in the characteristics of students affected by the bullying cycle. Four of the studies separated subjects and results by gender in an attempt to identify differences in both bullies and victims. Results showed that rejected girls demonstrate different characteristics than

rejected boys. Similar results produced by Hand and Sanchez (2000) showed that girls and boys also perceive and understand harassment differently. Peterson and Ray (2006) identified gifted students as another group of affected by bullying. This research is relevant to answer the question of what are the most effective practices for reducing and/or eliminating bullying. The research shows clear differences in the effects of bullying on each gender. With this difference in mind, whole school programs and individual approaches to counter bullying should incorporate this to better address the needs of all students.

The articles showed strength in identifying and acknowledging the differences in the characteristics of genders in terms their responses to bullying. The body of research incorporated large number of students ranging in location, age, and gender. This is significant to produce results applicable to multiple areas. The section held weakness in design at times due to lack in resources and subject choice. Studies conducted in replicated play groups in laboratories lack authenticity. Additionally, researchers cited a lack of resources constraining the level on thoroughness of observations. Coie et al. (2006) study exhibited a weakness in design when they examined only African-American boys due to a lack in response from other races. The results may not be able be applicable to all children to the homogenous nature of the subject group. In regards to answering what are the best practices, there is a need for further research to incorporate all relevant demographics in the body of research addressing the problem of bullying.

A trend in the studies was the usage of sociometric interviews and self-reports. Nearly every study employed these methods to determine students' status in multiple domains. Studies in this section examined elementary and junior high students. The

demographic in the study generally included both genders and multiple age groups. Four of the studies were quantitative with the only exception being Peterson and Ray's (2006) qualitative study on gifted students.

The section of chapter three, *Bully/Victim Cycles and Socialization*, researchers examined the patterns and trends in the socialization of students in relation to bullying. Research showed a positive correlation between conflict and aggression and a diminished peer status. Studies such as Kochenderfer and Ladd (1996) also explored the patterns and length of bullying episodes showing that the majority of bullying is not a stable condition. This section also investigated an important connection between peer abuse and development. Connected studies also examined the bullying cycle and the connection to risk for other abuses such as child maltreatment, sexual victimization, conventional crime, and witnessing/indirect victimization. These findings are significant to answer the question of what are the most effective practices to reducing and eliminating bullying. The research supports the conjecture that bullying has a substantial effect on students' relations to one another. Additionally, the finding that bullying is not a stable condition and often involves a changing population of students, suggests that programs addressing bullying should incorporate a school-wide prevention rather than simply addressing the students directly involved in incidents.

The greatest strength of the studies is their ability to decode socialization patterns for students in the cycle of bullying and victimization. Research produced significant results in regards to identifying the emotional and social behaviors correlated to both bullies and victims. This also included one of the only studies of adults that retrospectively examined the contribution of bullying to development and later

criminality. Weaknesses in the articles of the section include a lack of clarity in instructions. The majority of the studies included peer nominations that ask the students to nominate peers who fit various descriptors. Most of the articles lacked giving students the option to not nominate a peers if they felt no student fit. Decoding the socialization patterns in the cycle of bullying and victimization is useful in designing programs to address this cycle. Using this research, the educational community can build effective preventative programs that can use the early identification of bullying patterns to make significant reductions in the number incidents of bullying.

As previously mentioned, the majority of articles included a combination of peer nominations and self-reports. Additionally patterns included the usage of observations and teacher interviews. The majority of the articles were quantitative with only two qualitative. The demographic included a wide range of ages from interviews at age four with reference to early life (0 years through current) as well as a unique qualitative study that explored the early development of students who later exhibited criminal behavior.

The third section of chapter three, Family Influence on Aggressive Behavior, researchers examined the influence of family on students later considered aggressive. Schwartz et al. (2001) found that aggressive victim groups had experienced more punitive, hostile, and abusive family treatment than other groups. Bolger and Patterson (2001) took the research a step further to see how maltreatment related to the development of children. Research showed that chronically maltreated children are more likely to experience rejection by peers across multiple years. The final article in the section found that positive parental involvement affects in certain activities positively correlates to a reduction and prevention of behavior problems in elementary students.

This research is significant to answering the question of effective practices. The research shows that the role of parents in relation to the bullying cycle can be either negative or positive. This information can be used to shape programs for parents to better understand how they can positively aid their students in preventing bullying.

The strength of the section was in the ability of the study to identify early pre-school experiences that contribute to social development. The majority of other studies in this paper examined only school age experiences. The distinct weakness of these studies was in the design of the interviews. Two of the three studies relied on interviews with the mothers of students. The studies assumed mothers as primary caregivers and lacked subjects with any family structure other than as mother as the caregiver. The identification of the early experiences that contribute to social development can be used to better educate teachers and staff on how to facilitate positive anti-bullying interactions among students.

All studies in this section were qualitative and included interviews with the mothers of all subjects. Self-reports and peer nominations were also included in design. Additionally, Bolger and Patterson (2001) used control groups for comparison to test groups. All articles included both genders and focused on middle elementary students. The demographic included students who had experienced varied levels of maltreatment. The researchers were able to gain access to students' files through the Department of Social Services to examine the documentation of students' maltreatment.

The fourth section of chapter three, Teacher/School/Peer Influence on the Bullying Cycle, researchers examined various influences students encounter and the corresponding effect on the bullying cycle. Researchers such as Mishna et al. (2005)

discovered that many teachers were unaware of their students experiencing bullying due to a lack in a consistent definition and tools for intervention. Other important results included research that identified locations in school buildings that students perceive as violence prone. Researchers have examined school climate and found that school climate had a positive correlation to school disorder. Research has also shown a positive correlation between social roles and classroom integration of students. Studies on the role of peers on aggression and social preference showed that the games that students' play and the ways in which they play them contribute to social competence. The discovery of the lack of teachers' education on tools to combat bullying and inconsistencies in definitions regarding the subject, proves the need for further teacher education to fully answer how to reduce and eliminate bullying in schools.

Strengths of the research include the sheer volume of research that reports similar findings. The influence of peers and the play that students engage in has a significant correspondence to the social development of students. Additional strengths include the depth and number of subjects involved in the studies. The majority of the studies incorporated a large number of subjects and often included multiple observation styles, reports, and interviews. Weaknesses of the body of research from this section included similar issues as mentioned in the previous section. The researchers often cited a difficulty in observation practices. Due to the nature of play of some students, the researchers had difficulty recording the intricacies of students play.

The demographics of subjects were extremely diverse. Studies from multiple countries were included such as Smith et al. (2002) study that included 14 countries. There was a mixture of qualitative and quantitative studies that used self-reports, peer

nomination, teacher interviews, and observation. Ages included in this section had a wide range from lower elementary up to high school. There was representation of both genders in the majority of the studies.

The fifth and final section, Evaluation of Implemented Intervention Programs, presented the results of research that reviewed the efficacy of multiple anti-bullying programs. Evaluation of several programs produced mixed results. Most programs reported reductions in rates of bullying however for a small population of students; intervention programs produced a negative correlation to bullying rates in which students experienced more bullying post-intervention. Results also illustrated the importance of proper implementation of the programs by staff and particularly teachers. Research also illustrated various methods to measure efficacy of programs as well as how to establish a baseline. The need for proper implementation of preventative programs to render them effective is relevant to reducing and eliminating bullying. Simply installing the programs in school systems is not sufficient. A school and staff-wide commitment to addressing the issue of bullying is important to be effective in the reduction and elimination of bullying.

Strengths of the section include the presentation of multiple methods of evaluation procedures to implemented programs. The articles also incorporated different programs used in different countries which created opportunity for a larger comparison of programs. A weakness of the articles is that often the information used for evaluation came from a single staff member from a school. The articles relied primarily on the reports and questionnaires rather than statistics collected by the researchers or observations. The articles design included mixed-method and qualitative with only one

being quantitative. The demographic was extensive with research from in Canada, Northern Ireland, and Australia. The ages included lower elementary up to high school. Reporting used in the research generated primarily from school principals and occasionally from other school staff.

Classroom Implications

Articles such as Holt et al. (2007) suggested that bullies, victims, and bully-victims have a higher reported incidence in the domains of conventional crime, child maltreatment, sexual victimization, and witnessing/indirect victimization. The research cited in this paper shows a clear negative connection between the cycle of bullying and students development. The classroom implications begin with the actions of teachers and extend out to other members of the school community. Hirschstein et al. (2007) suggested that the teacher implementation of intervention programs has a significant correlation to the effectiveness of the program. The article suggests specifically that teacher coaching of students in defusing peer conflict. This action can happen outside of the intervention program. Even without implemented programs, individual teachers have an opportunity to assist student in developing mediation and communication skills. Additionally, teachers should establish relationships with students in which coaching is possible.

Mishna et al. (2005) produced findings that stated that teacher were often unaware of their students being bullied due to a lack in a consistent definition and tools for intervention. Teachers need to be educated on the definition of bullying as well as their specific school districts policy and tools for addressing bullying. If schools lack policies

for addressing bullying or efficient programs, teachers should work together to request the implementation of such.

Studies have shown varying numbers of students experience bullying. Low estimates conclude that at least one in seven school children have been involved in bullying of some form (Entenman et al. 2005). Many studies estimate this to be much higher such as 50% or more students being involved in studying. No matter what the number, the fact is that all teachers will encounter instances of student conflict and bullying in their classroom. It is not enough to hope that classroom management will address the social issue of bullying.

Teachers need expansive and flexible tools to address bullying. Often students are bullying because they themselves have been victims of bullying (Sheras, 2002). The cycle of bullying continues when students do not have the tools to properly express the pain and frustration they are feeling. Teachers must be prepared to address not only academic issues but also the social and emotional issues that are present in their classroom. Preparing teachers for this role should begin in their own higher education experience and continue on with training through their own school employer.

The work of teachers to prevent bullying must partner with a whole school approach to create an anti-bullying plan. Olweus' (1978, 1993) work showed that the most effective approach to preventing bullying is a plan that encompasses the entire school. The plans differ in specifics but additional studies concur with the findings that whole school approaches are most effective. Teachers should become prepared to address bullying by not only learning ways to address bullying in their own classroom but also how to help implement anti-bullying programs in their own schools.

Several articles demonstrated the confusion many students experience in identifying bullying. Smith et al. (2002) found that younger students are able to differentiate between aggressive and non-aggressive acts but have a difficult time distinguishing between different forms of aggression. Since the expansion of bullying to include both verbal and physical intimidation, it is important that students learn the tools to identify different forms of aggression. Established programs often include work around identification of aggression but teachers and schools can educate students without the use of the programs. Teachers should help students develop and practice the tools to identify aggression. This work should expand to intervention practices. Beran and Shapiro's (2005) study reported that after the implementation of programs to prepare students to address bullying, students feel more confident to manage bullying. This research suggests that students develop the skills for managing bullying.

Researchers have demonstrated the significance of peers on the bullying cycle as well as their influence on the behaviors of peers. Haselager et al. (1998) demonstrated the similarities of children and their friends as well as how this can influence behavior. This study identified that students considered antisocial had a greater likelihood to engage in antisocial acts with other students considered antisocial. Encouragement of student groups to engage in positive play with multiple groups of students will encourage students to engage in more positive behavior. The majority of play and conflict occurs on the playground and as Astor, Meyer, and Pitner (2001) pointed out, elementary students consider the playground one of the most violence prone areas. Teachers and schools need to work to encourage all students to make caring and safe choices during play. This includes adults being more of a presence for students during play. In the same study,

Astor, Meyer and Pitner showed that students cited a lack of adult supervision as a main contributor to the unsafe atmosphere.

Rossem and Vermande (2004) explored how students' integration into classrooms can be achieved using informal social roles. The study concluded that informal roles often constrain students' behavior. Teachers have an opportunity to influence the informal social roles of students. Teachers could attempt this by purposeful mixing of students into groups during classroom activities. As teachers challenge classroom roles, students will be more likely to challenge them as well.

Familial influence was determined to shape the later socialization of aggressive students as demonstrated in the study by Schwartz et al. (1997). Parents have great influence on the early development of students' socialization skills therefore it is also important to educate parents on ways to encourage children's development. The above mentioned study showed that students that later were identified as aggressive victims experienced punitive, hostile, and abusive family treatment. Providing parents with opportunities experience parenting classes or support groups to eliminate this type of parenting may ultimately create a decrease in the number of aggressive victims in the bullying cycle.

Suggestions for Further Research

The research articles provided vast amounts of information on the cycle of bullying, however there are many opportunities for further research. The majority of research is on middle to late middle school to the early part of high school. There is a need for further research in several areas. First, the pre-school development of students needs further research to determine what types of positive influences may reduce

children's likelihood to become a bully or victim. In the articles that explored families influence, the scope of interview was far too narrow. Researchers interviewed mothers but never included extended family or children with alternative care givers. Research should expand to incorporate the information held in this up-tapped resource. Second, many researchers cited difficulty in researching early elementary school students due to the instability of bully/victim status. Though the instability proved to be significant, research should still continue to determine what practices best combat the bullying cycles. The influential nature of students may create the best opportunity the school community has to combat the early development of bullying.

Third, there seems to be slightly more research on the influence of bullying on boys. Girls are often included in studies but rarely isolated completely in their own study. There is room to further develop the body of evidence of bullying in relation to females. Additionally, researchers often restrict their observation of relationships to same-sex friendships. Even in peer nominations, researchers often disregarded mixed-sex nominations. Further research should explore the dynamic of mixed-sex relationships in regards to bullying and aggression. Further gender research may also help determine if boys and girls would benefit from unique intervention programs to better address the different types of bullying that may occur.

Fourth, there are several opportunities for longitudinal research to further determine the long-term effects of bullying. Cullingford and Morrison (1995) conducted a qualitative study to determine if there is a correlation between bullying in school and later adult criminality. The incarcerated youth in the study often reported being both victims and bullies as well as having an overall sense of school-wide acceptance for

bullying. The qualitative nature of this study made it difficult to draw firm connections of criminality to bullying. Further research should explore whether this connection exists. Additional research should also include how to identify at-risk students in early elementary school so they can receive additional attention.

Finally, several articles acknowledged a lack of resources and methods to accurately observe students play. The researchers stated that the nature of play in younger students created difficulty due to their constant shifting and fluctuating. An increase in funds may help to correct this problem but it is more likely that an improvement on observation methods would be more effective in improving the observations of children's play. Holt et al. (2007) highlighted the need for additional research on all participants in the bullying cycle. The primarily overlooked participant of the bully cycle is witnesses. Witnesses can be integral in defusing bullying situations. Future research should study the best ways to prepare students to combat bullying. This could translate to larger whole school approaches as well as individual teacher methods.

Conclusion

In chapter one, the rationale explained the importance of exploring the effect of bullying on students' academic achievement and social development. The rationale created an argument in favor of searching for the most effective practices of reducing and/or eliminating bullying in elementary schools. The rationale also included the widely accepted definition of bullying as well as presented some of the long-term effects of bullying. Chapter two presented the history of bullying and aggression in children beginning with the 18th century. Chapter three organized the research literature that focused on aggression and bullying as well as evaluations of existing intervention

programs. Chapter three contained the following sections to organize the research: identifying the characteristics of affected student groups, bullying/victim cycles and the effect on socialization, family influence on aggressive behavior, teacher/school/peer influence on the bullying cycle, and evaluation of implemented intervention programs. Finally, chapter four presented a summary of the findings from chapter three, the implications for classroom practice, and suggestions for further research.

This paper presented the view that bullying is an embedded and serious issue that is plaguing the school system. The elements of this paper merge together to urge students, educators, parents, and all members of the community to work together to eliminate bullying from all schools. Bullying is a significant problem that needs addressing in a consistent and caring way. This paper suggested ways in which adults and students can work together to create safer schools. This paper also provides real solutions that for implementation on classroom levels as well as school levels. The research articles as well as other referenced literature make a strong case that bullying is a problem however there are multiple opportunities to put an end to aggression in schools. I hope this paper inspires every member of their community to create positive change to end aggression and bullying in all schools.

REFERENCES

- Abecassis, M., Hartup, W.W., Haselager, G.J.T., Scholte, R.H.J., & VanLieshout, C.F.M. (2002). Mutual Antipathies and Their Significance in Middle Childhood and Adolescence. *Child Development, 73*(5), 1543-1556.
- Ambert, A.M. (1994). A Qualitative Study of Peer Abuse and Its Effects: Theoretical and Empirical Implications. *Journal of Marriage and the Family, 56*(1), 119-130.
- Astor, R. A., Meyer, H.A., & Pitner, R.O. (2001). Elementary and middle school students' perceptions of violence prone school subcontexts. *The Elementary School Journal, 101*(5), 511-528.
- Beran, T. & Shapiro, B. (2005). Evaluation of an Anti-Bullying Program: Student Reports of Knowledge and Confidence to Manage Bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education, 28*(4), 700-717.
- Bolger, K.E. & Patterson, C.J. (2001). Developmental Pathways from Child Maltreatment to Peer Rejection. *Child Development, 72*(2), 549-568.
- Boulton, M. J. (1999). Concurrent and longitudinal relations between children's playground behavior and social preference, victimization, and bullying. *Child Development, 70*(4), 944-954.
- Coie, J.D., Dodge, K. A., Terry, R., & Wright, V. (1991), The role of aggression in peer relations: An analysis of aggression episodes in boys' play groups. *Child Development, 62*(4), 812-826.
- Cullingford, C. & Morrison, J. (1995). Bullying as a Formative Influence: The Relationship between the Experience of School and Criminality. *British Educational Research Journal, 21*(5), 547-560.

- Domina, T. (2005). Leveling the Home Advantage: Assessing the Effectiveness of Parental Involvement in Elementary School. *Sociology of Education*, 78(3), 233-249.
- Entenman, J., Murnen, T., & Hendricks, C. (2005). Victims, bullies, and bystander in K-3 literature. *The Reading Teacher*, 59(4), 352-364.
- French, D.C. (1990). Heterogeneity of Peer-Rejected Girls. *Child Development*, 61(6), 2028-2031.
- Glew, G., Fan, M., Katon, W., & Rivera, F. (2006). Bullying and School Safety. *The Journal of Pediatrics*, 152(1), 123-128.
- Hand, J.Z., & Sanchez, L. (2000). Badgering or Bantering?: Gender Differences in Experience of, and Reactions to, Sexual Harassment among U.S. High School Students. *Gender and Society*, 14(6), 718-746.
- Haselager, G.J.T., Hartup, W.W., VanLieshout, C.F.M., & Riksen-Walraven, J.M.A (1998). Similarities between Friends and Nonfriends in Middle Childhood. *Child Development*, 69(4), 1198-1208.
- Hirschstein, M. K., Van Schoiack-Edstrom, L., Frey, K., Snell, J.L., & MacKenzie, E.P. (2007). Walking the talk in bullying prevention: Teacher implementation variables related to initial impact of the steps to respect program. *Psychology Review*, 36(1), 3-22.
- Holt, M. K., Finkelhor, D., & Kaufman-Kantor, G. (2007). Hidden forms of victimization in elementary students involved in bullying. *School Psychology Review*, 36(3), 345-361.

- Kochenderfer, B.J. & Ladd, G.W. (1996). Peer Victimization: Cause or Consequence of School Maladjustment?. *Child Development*, 67(4), 1305-1317.
- Kochenderfer-Ladd, B. & Wardrop, J.L. (2001). Chronicity and Instability of Children's Peer Victimization Experiences as Predictors of Loneliness and Social Satisfaction Trajectories. *Child Development*, 72(1), 134-151.
- Koo, H. (2007). A Time Line of the Evolution of School Bullying in Differing Social Contexts. *Asia Pacific Education Review*. 8(1), 107-116.
- Ladd, G.W. & Burgess, K.B. (1999). Charting the Relationship Trajectories of Aggressive, Withdrawn, and Aggressive/Withdrawn Children during Early Grade School. *Child Development*, 70(4), 910-929.
- McGuckin, C. & Lewis, C.A. (2008). Management of bullying in Northern Ireland schools: a pre-legislative survey. *Educational Research*, 50(1), 9-23.
- Mishna, F., Scarcello, I., Pepler, D., & Wiener, J. (2005). Teachers Understanding of Bullying. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(4), 718-738.
- Mostow, A.J., Izard, C.E., Fine, S., & Trentacosta, C.J. (2002). Modeling Emotional, Cognitive, and Behavioral Predictors of Peer Acceptance. *Child Development*, 73(6), 1775-1787.
- Olweus, D. (1978). *Aggression in the schools: bullies and whipping boys*. Washington, D.C.: Hemisphere.
- Olweus, D. (1993). *Bullying at school: what we know and what we can do about it*. Oxford: Blackwell.

- Pellegrini, A.D., & Bartini, M. (2000). A longitudinal study of bullying, victimization, and peer affiliation during the transition from primary school to middle school. *American Educational Research Journal*, 37(3), 699-725.
- Pellegrini, A.D., Kato, K., Blatchford, P., & Baines, E. (2002). A Short-Term Longitudinal Study of Children's Playground Games across the First Year of School: Implications for Social Competence and Adjustment to School. *American Educational Research Journal*, 39(4), 991-1015.
- Peterson, J., & Ray, K. (2006). Bullying and the gifted: Victims, perpetrators, prevalence, and effects. *The Gifted Child Quarterly*, 50(2), 148-170.
- Schwartz, D. Dodge, K.A., Petit, G.S., & Bates, J.E. (1997). The Early Socialization of Aggressive Victims of Bullying. *Child Development*, 68(4), 665-675.
- Shantz, D. (1986). Conflict, Aggression, and Peer Status: An Observational Study. *Child Development*, 57(6), 1322-1332.
- Sheras, P. (2002). *Your child: bully or victim? Understanding and ending school yard tyranny*. New York: Skylight Press.
- Slee, P.T. & Mohyla, J. (2007). The PEACE Pack: an evaluation of interventions to reduce bullying in four Australian primary schools. *Educational Research*, 49(2), 103-114.
- Smith, J.D., Cousins, J.B., & Stewart, R. (2005). Antibullying Interventions in Schools: Ingredients of Effective Programs. *Canadian Journal of Education*, 28(4), 739-762.
- Smith, P.K., Cowie, H., Olafsson, R.F., & Liefoghe, A.P.D. (2002). Definitions of Bullying: A Comparison of Terms Used, and Age and Gender Differences, in a

- Fourteen-Country International Comparison. *Child Development*, 73(4), 1119-1133.
- Suckling, A., & Temple, C. (2002). *Bullying: A whole-school approach*. Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers.
- Sullivan, Keith. (2000). *The Anti-bullying handbook*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- The Complete Newgate Calendar, London, Navarre Society Ltd., 1926. Retrieved December 4, 2007 from <http://tarlton.law.utexas.edu/lpop/etext/completenewgate.htm>.
- The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program 2003. Brief information about Dan Olweus. Retrieved from <http://www.clemson.edu/olweus/history.htm>.
- Van Rossem, R. & Vermande, M.M. (2004). Classroom Roles and School Adjustment. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 67(4), 396-411.
- Welsh, W.N. (2000). The Effects of School Climate on School Disorder. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 567, 88-107.
- Zin, M. (2001). Bullying and being bullied: To what extent are bullies also victims?. *American Educational Research Journal*, 38(2), 351-370.