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Abstract

The purpose of this study was to assess and describe the bullying behaviors in the classroom, in the lunchroom, and on the playground at an urban school, and to implement nearly cost-free strategies to reduce and prevent the incidences of bullying. In most schools, staffs have implemented some strategies, policies, or programs to prevent and reduce aggression. Little is known, however, about their effectiveness, as few programs have been carefully evaluated and disseminated (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, 2001 in Orphinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003).

This study spotlighted the deliberate efforts of one school to combat the menacing nature of bullying among school children. The following elements came together to form a reduction and prevention program: a restructured disciplinary system, increased adult supervision, classroom meetings, weekly school-wide meetings, silent mentoring for challenging students, student focus groups, positive school-to-home communications, and a student reporting system. The main objective was to create a low-cost and useable program that would result in fewer disciplinary referrals and improved school climate.

A qualitative research method was employed along with a quantitative research component. The study design had a pre- and postsurvey to gauge baseline data and results before and after the intervention strategies. The study also examined the number of behavior referrals and suspensions before and after the intervention strategies. During all phases of the investigation, there were participant observation, interviews with individuals, and focus groups.
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Chapter One

Introduction

Introduction

Bullying is now recognized as a common form of victimization on American school campuses and a significant school safety problem (Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton, & Scheidt, 2001). The prevalence of nonfatal physical aggression, verbal taunting, name-calling, and emotional abuse can be very high (Orphinas, Horne, & Staniszewski, 2003). There is little doubt among researchers that being the victim of aggression from peers can have serious emotional consequences, such as depression and low self-esteem (Hawker & Boulton, 2000). Children who are the targets of aggression may report psychosomatic complaints and bed wetting (Williams, Chamgers, Logan, & Robinson in Espelage & Swearer, 2003).

Almost every adult in the United States can recall a childhood experience of school aggression, and almost every child can tell a story of being a victim, a bully, or a bystander to the bullying (Loeber & Stouthammer-Loeber, 1998; Moffit, Caspi, Dickson, Silva, & Stanton in Leff, Power, Costigan, & Manz, 2003). According to the National Association of School Psychologists (NASP), about one in seven school children is a bully or a victim. The problem affects about 5 million elementary and middle school children in the United States (Giannetti & Sagarese, 2001).

“School aggression can create an atmosphere not conducive to learning” Orphinas et al., 2003). School climate, as a reflection of the positive or negative feelings regarding the school environment, may directly or indirectly affect a variety of learning outcomes (Peterson & Skiba, 2001). Many studies have demonstrated the association between
school climate and improved student behavior and academic achievement (Lehr & Christianson, in Leff et al., 2003). A school’s social climate can either foster or hinder a student’s ability to get along with others. Aronson (2000), suggested that the school has a critical role in developing emotional mastery.

Many state legislatures are interested in passing laws that would influence the expansion of school safety policies to include the development of bully prevention programs at the school site. Currently, 15 states have passed laws addressing bullying among school children, and many state lawmakers are considering such legislation (e.g., Michigan, Nebraska, and Pennsylvania) (Limber & Small, 2003).

The legislative findings in bullying statutes are noteworthy in that they reflect the seriousness with which the policy makers in several states consider the issue of bullying among students (Limber & Small, 2003).

Statement of the Problem

It became evident to this researcher, while reviewing student conduct reports at Kent Hills Elementary School in the Grand Rapids Public Schools (GRPS), that behavioral problems were predominantly bullying violations. The transgressions were frequently nonphysical and included name-calling, teasing, gossiping, and exclusion.

Bullying is an insidious problem in our schools that has not been attended to in any systematic or meaningful way. In the Grand Rapids Public Schools (GRPS) the act of bullying is assigned consequences in the Student Code of Conduct along with many other infractions, but there is no district-wide appeal to prevent or limit its occurrence. Only one of our neighboring school districts has launched a bully prevention campaign, paying
exorbitant fees to an outside consultant for awareness training.

Historically, bullying among school children has not been a topic of significant public concern. Many adults have viewed the experience of being bullied as a rite of passage for children and youth (Limber & Small, 2003). Bullying is an old phenomenon. European researchers have studied its effects for decades (Olweus, as cited in Bullock, 2002). Until recently the issue received less attention in the United States, perhaps because of a prevailing belief that bullying among children is inevitable. Since bullying among primary-aged schoolchildren is recognized as an antecedent for progressively more violent behavior in later grades, it behooves teachers to take notice (Saufler & Gagne in Bullock, 2002).

In most schools, staff have implemented some strategies, policies, or programs to prevent and reduce aggression. Little is known about their effectiveness, as few programs have been carefully evaluated and disseminated (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in Orphinas et al., 2003). Few studies have focused exclusively on bullying, so scholars and clinicians have used findings from international studies to guide prevention efforts in the United States (Espelage & Swearer, 2003). Tactics have included zero tolerance policies, targeted programs for perpetrators of aggression, and universal programs designed to teach conflict resolution to all students (Orphinas et al., 2003).

A concerted effort to reduce and prevent bullying would improve the well-being of the children and the teachers, as well as increase positive school climate and student achievement. Any strategies or programs selected would have to be low cost in light of the financial difficulties in the Grand Rapids Public Schools. In addition, the program
should be adapted to fit the needs of the school.

One of the most important features of any program is practicality and feasibility for ease in training and implementation. The program strategies that this researcher is proposing will make these characteristics the top priorities. The main features will include a restructured disciplinary system, increased adult supervision, and anti-bullying strategies that will contribute to safe and orderly schools and improved school climate.

Grand Rapids Public Schools is an urban school district with impoverished and transient populations, many of whom have below average achievement and persistent disciplinary problems. An ethnographic study of the bullying issue, coupled with recommendations for solutions, may benefit other Grand Rapids Public Schools.

The problem that I will address encompasses the following:

- The absence of programming for the reduction of bullying behaviors at the elementary school level despite research and newsworthy events that highlight the menacing nature of bullying.
- The absence of studies focusing exclusively on bullying.
- The need for programming that would result in fewer disciplinary referrals and would improve school climate.
- The need for programming that would be low cost, practical, and useable.

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of this study is to assess and describe the bullying behaviors at Kent Hills Elementary School in the classrooms, in the lunchroom, and on the playground and to implement nearly cost-free strategies to reduce and prevent the incidences of bullying.

Legislators should be commended for encouraging schools to implement bullying prevention programs. Although students in many schools would, undoubtedly, benefit from effective bullying programs, mandating the implementation of such
programs in K-12 schools probably is ill-advised, as many schools may be unable to afford even relatively inexpensive programs in the current tight budget climates in most states and communities. (Limber & Small, 2003, p. 450)

The conceptual framework characterized the scope and sequence of the study, which utilized a pre- and postsurvey supported with narratives and interviews from a descriptive field study. The implementation of the Bully Reduction and Prevention Program was represented by the key variables, outcomes, and implications (see Figure 1).

The basic premise of a whole-school campaign against bullying is that bullying is an intentional act and one that can be controlled if there is dedication by the staff, parents, and students to work together. To stop bullying, interventions must be put into place that can stop all attacks and protect the victims. In addition, the energy of the bullies must be redirected in a positive way, and the victims must be taught to become more assertive and confident (Ross, 2003).

The framework that this researcher has developed for Kent Hills School will be multifaceted. It pulls strategies from “Bully Proofing Your School” (Garrity, Jens, Porter, Sager, & Short-Camilli, 2000), “Schools Where Everyone Belongs” (Davis, 2005), and “Positive Discipline in the Classroom” (Nelson, Lott, & Glenn, 2000). Some activities are the result of information gleaned through attendance at conferences and workshops. It seemed critical to tailor a program to fit the students and staff at Kent Hills, and I have gathered a plethora of ideas and workable solutions with which to confront a challenging problem.

During the 2003-04 school year, our staff took part in a training session to acquire
Figure 1. Conceptual framework.
background on the issue of bullying, as well as to reflect upon our own awareness and attitudes. Lori Parrish, a social worker from the Oakland County Prosecutor’s Office, first trained me at the Kent County Coalition Against Violence and then trained the Kent Hills staff, using information and activities from “Bully Proofing Your School” (Garrity et al., 2000). This inservice, along with my research and additional training, lent itself well to the design and implementation of a school-wide program.

The programming at Kent Hills has the following components: (a) Monday Morning Meetings, (b) Morning Greetings, (c) Classroom Meetings, (d) A Restructured Disciplinary System, (e) Phone Calls Home, (f) A Student Reporting System, (g) Silent Mentors, (h) “Good News” Postcards, and (i) Increased Supervision.

The *Monday Morning Meetings* begin immediately after the bell has rung and students have put away their belongings. After the entire school pronounces our anti-bullying pledge, the meeting proceeds with an introduction or review of concepts regarding the bully, the victim, and the bystander. Much of this information was taken directly from “Bully Proofing Your School” (Garrity et al., 2000) and the “Bully Free Classroom” (Beane, 1999). Visual aids such as posters, overhead transparencies, and props are used to enhance the information. The meetings also include goal-setting, and the students are asked to choose two goals for the week. The meeting concludes with celebrations of anti-bullying behavior, good citizenship, and cooperation. The meeting agendas are planned and purposeful (see Appendix A).

The *Morning Greeting* is a simple yet effective strategy designed to welcome
each student into the classroom. The teachers and support staff have agreed to greet each student by name and to shake their hand or touch their shoulder as a way of connecting each morning (Davis, 2003).

Nelson, Lott, and Glenn (2000) provided the framework for Classroom Meetings. The building block process has been in place at Kent Hills for four years. The family or classroom meeting is viewed as a format for team building, problem solving, and ownership of the classroom by students. Specific procedures are designed to maximize the effectiveness of the classroom meeting in nurturing mutual respect, personal power, self-discipline, and judgment skills. The eight building blocks follow (see Appendix B):

1. Form a circle.
2. Practice compliments and appreciation.
3. Create an agenda. Develop communication skills.
4. Learn about separate realities.
5. Recognize the four reasons people do what they do.
6. Practice role-playing and brainstorming.
7. Focus on no punitive solutions.

It is critical to have a code of conduct operating smoothly with a clear stated set of rules that are effectively communicated to the students and their families (Olweus in Ross, 2003). Our Restructured Disciplinary System will be the base of our anti-bullying program. Our staff met in early August 2004 to develop a rubric of unacceptable behavior and their definitions and criteria for enforcement (see Appendix C). Another rubric mirrors the first and gives suggestions for alternatives to the undesirable behavior (see Appendix D).

The Grand Rapids Public Schools uses a Conduct Report form for reporting offenses against the Uniform Discipline Code (see Appendix E). In an effort to enforce
our new school rubric without the severity that is attached to the Conduct Report, we created the *pink slip*, which reflects the infractions listed on the discipline rubric (see Appendix F). When students are given a pink slip they are sent to the principal, who facilitates the *Phone Call Home*. Every effort is made to reach one of the parents or guardians to report the infraction. The student is expected to speak to the adult at home as well. A student who receives a pink slip is also relegated to time out during the lunch hour; a second pink slip nets two time-out sessions, and so on. The time-out center is supervised by a teacher who feeds the students their lunch and then supervises the completion of the *Think-About-It Form*, which requires the students to analyze their actions and plan for future situations (see Appendix G).

A *Student Reporting System* is employed through what is best known as the *suggestion box*. The locked boxes are visible in each classroom, and students are encouraged to write about their negative or positive encounters with other students. The students’ comments are regularly collected and cataloged. The students may remain anonymous, or they may identify themselves if they wish to report a problem that they want investigated or rectified. Peers often witness events and behavior that adults do not see (Ross, 2003).

Our staff members are *Silent Mentors*. Each classroom teacher refers one or two students who could benefit most from the attention of another adult. The mentors are silent because they and their intentions are unknown to the student. The purpose of this initiative is to regularly make a connection with a student to inquire about his/her studies and his/her well-being (Davis, 2003).
Another strategy that is already in place is the *Good News Postcard*, which is sent to a minimum of four students from each classroom every month. The classroom teachers write a personal note to their students, remarking on some positive aspect of their presence in the classroom (see Appendix H).

A last, and critical, component of our anti-bullying efforts is *Increased Supervision* of students. We have hired additional recess aides so that for every recess there are three adult supervisors for approximately 125 children. Student teachers are asked to accompany their teacher for recess duty so that the ratio of adult to student increases even more during those particular sessions.

Underlying all of these actions are the attitudes of the teachers and staff at Kent Hills Elementary School. We have made conscious decisions to fashion a school that is welcoming, kind, nurturing, and supportive. We have come together in agreement that our efforts in the reduction and prevention of bullying will improve classroom and building climate, increase achievement, and contribute to the overall well-being of students and staff. Our attitudes have been born of authors and speakers such as Payne (1998), Boyer (1999), and Kohn (1993). We have responded with a collection of patterns that have been formed through our research, discussions, philosophies, and personal character.
Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

Overview

Bullying, a subset of aggression, has been identified as a significant problem that can affect the physical and psychosocial health of those frequently bullied (Batsche & Knoff, 1994, in Espelage, Bosworth, & Thomas, 2000). Past research has advanced our understanding of aggression, but it has been limited by its focus on overt aggression. Thus, bullying behaviors characteristic of early adolescents, including verbal threats and teasing, are less understood. (Espelage, et al., 2000). Bullying may in fact begin with mild teasing as the bully carefully searches for a vulnerable target. Once the bully receives a response from his or her target, the teasing usually becomes more intense and persistent (Freedman, 2002).

Bullies hit, tease, threaten, start rumors about, and otherwise harass targets. They pressure others to keep quiet about bullying and to exclude the targets from their friendship. Bullies have a wish for power that is stronger than their empathetic sense, so they are willing to hurt others to feel powerful. Youngsters who bully deny what they have done, minimize the intent of the bullying, or blame their actions on others’ behavior. (Davis, 2003, p. 10)

Bullies choose targets with little social support. Bystanders watch in silence or nervously laugh. The bully may take this as a sign of approval. There is no research to support the notion that bullies express their low self-esteem through aggression (Olweus, 2003; Baumeister et al., in Davis 2003). Bullies generally have good self-esteem and are
self-confident and comfortable with their actions. Children are more likely to bully if adults and peers observe their behavior and do not stop it.

Reaching a national consensus on school bullying represents a significant challenge that will require balancing needs across researchers, educators, and public policy makers. Whatever the effectiveness of specific bully prevention programs, the national effort to minimize the effects of bullying will need to address the fundamental matters related to the definition of school bullying and the translation of best research practices into public policy and educational practice at the school site-level (Furlong, Morrison, & Grief., 2003).

In most schools, staff have implemented some strategies, policies, or programs to prevent and reduce aggression. Little is known about their effectiveness, as few programs have been carefully evaluated and disseminated (U.S. Department of Health and Human Services in Orphinas et al., 2003). Few studies have focused exclusively on bullying, so scholars and clinicians have used findings from international studies to guide prevention efforts in the United States (Espelage & Swearer, 2003). Tactics have included zero tolerance policies, targeted programs for perpetrators of aggression, and universal programs designed to teach conflict resolution to all students (Orphinas et al., 2003).

Hazler & Miller (2001) reported that participants reviewing brief scenarios identified more situations as bullying if they had a physical component. Educators indicated more cause for concern when physical harm or danger was present than for verbal, social, or emotional hurt. Simmons (2002) reported that teachers often dismissed or missed the verbal altercations in their classrooms, especially between their female
students. They appreciated the absence of physical conflict. Bullying with physical means is more common among boys. In contrast, girls often use more subtle and indirect ways of harassment, such as slander, spreading of rumors, and manipulation of friendship relationships. Nonetheless, harassment by nonphysical means, such as words and gestures, is the most common form of bullying also among boys (Olweus, 1993).

More than 5 million students in the United States are bullied frequently. Over 6 million bully consistently. These numbers make “bullying…the most common form of violence in our society” (NASP, 2002, in Davis, 2003, p. 18). Day-to-day acts of bullying and victimization have become a pervasive problem in many schools across the country (Leff, Power, Costigan, & Manz, 2003; Nansel et al., 2001, in Leff et al.,2003). Students who are victimized by bullies often have difficulty concentrating on their school work, and their academic performance tends to be “marginal to poor” (Ballard et al., 1999, in Lumsden 2002, p. 3). Rates of absenteeism are higher among the victimized students than are rates among their nonbullied peers, as are dropout rates. Youth who are bullied experience higher levels of anxiety, depression, loneliness, unhappiness, physical and mental symptoms, and low self-esteem. Students may become despondent, suicidal, or homicidal (Nansel et al., 2001, in Lumsden, 2002).

In a recent analysis of 37 school shootings, the United States Secret Service learned that a majority of the shooters had suffered “bullying and harassment that was long-standing and severe” (U.S. Secret Service Threat Assessment in Lumsden, 2002, p. 1). After the Columbine tragedy, schools stepped up their efforts to police weapons, drugs, and fighting. *Zero tolerance* became the buzzword of the day. Although Aronson
(2000) believed that Harris and Klebold were individually disturbed and that their terrible acts were pathological, he also believed that these young men were reacting in an extreme manner to a daily environment of rejection and exclusion.

The consequences for the bully are equally grim. Olweus (1993) reported that approximately 60% of boys who were characterized as bullies in grades 6-9 had at least one conviction by the age of 24. As young adults, former bullies had a fourfold increase in the level of relatively serious, recidivist criminality, as documented in official crime records. Similarly, Ross (in Davis, 2003) reported that children who bullied at age 8 had a 1-in-4 chance of having a criminal record by age 30, compared to the 1-in-20 chance that most children have. The former bullies were more likely to be convicted of serious crimes and were inclined to be abusive to their wives and children.

Studies indicate that bullies often come from homes where physical punishment is used, where the children are taught to strike back physically as a way to handle problems, and where parental involvement and warmth frequently are lacking. Students who regularly display bully behaviors generally are defiant or oppositional toward adults, antisocial, and apt to break school rules. (Ditzhazy & Burton, 2003)

Parents sometimes model aggressive behavior by yelling at their children, demeaning them publicly and privately and by hitting them (Coy, cited in Ditzhazy & Burton, 2003). The targets of bullies must be told by school professionals that the bullying is not their fault. This can be handled through careful questioning and reflection upon previous bullying incidences. In addition, adults can stop bullying from happening again, think
carefully before giving advice, brainstorm solutions with targets, and recruit peers to befriend isolated targets. Davis (2003) compared these measures with those that help young people deal with grief and loss. He opined that most school personnel know how to comfort a child who has suffered loss. Bullying involves loss: loss of safety, self-esteem, belonging, and control over one’s life.

The victims or targets of bullies are generally anxious and insecure. They exhibit low self-esteem and do not get even or defend themselves when confronted by the bully. Often socially isolated and physically weaker than their classmates, they are without social skills or friends. These victims frequently have overprotective parents (Ditzhazy & Burton, 2003).

Two specific targets were identified: provocative and reactive. The provocative targets disturb other students to get negative attention from them and sympathy from their teachers. Adults must hold the bully to the stated expectations even when the target is provocative. We must also teach the target how to get positive attention. The reactive targets respond to even minor problems with tears and drama. It is important to assist them in concentrating on the present, practicing other responses to small problems, and teaching them to calm themselves with imagery or breathing. The student must learn to cope with anxiety. All of the systems put into place for bullying infractions must be followed as for any other incident.

Eighty-five percent of school children are neither bullies nor targets. They are the bystanders (Davis, 2003). Olweus (1995, 2000, 2003, in Davis 2003) urged bystanders to tell adults, tell bullies to stop, and to make friends with victims of bullies and others who
have been excluded. Students also need to be reassured that it is safe to tell grown-ups.

Adults report crimes because they believe that the police will listen to them, take effective action, and protect them from retaliation. Initially, anonymous forms of the reporting of bullying may be desirable. Davis (2003) cautioned teachers who may discourage *tattling* to such an extent that students will not report anything. In addition, telling students to work it out for themselves simply will not work for the target of a bully. Students can also be taught that there is strength in numbers and that together they can stand up to bullies and tell them to stop. There should be assigned consequences for retaliation against bystanders.

**Historical Perspective**

Lawrence Kohlberg is one of the most frequently cited psychologists in the social and behavioral sciences. “His work is described and discussed in virtually every major developmental textbook on the current market” (Gibbs, 2003, p. 57). “Indeed, Kohlberg almost single-handedly innovated the field of cognitive moral development in American psychology” (Gibbs, 2003, p. 57). Kohlberg believed that there is a universal theory of moral development, and he outlined six distinct stages that are characterized by invariant sequence and cross-cultural universality (Power, Higgins, & Kohlberg, 1989).

Gilligan (1998) fondly referred to Lawrence Kohlberg as “Larry” and remembered him for his courage in countering the claim that psychology is a value-neutral social science. She recalled that Kohlberg was preoccupied with the idea of the good and whether it was possible to know the good. He frequently quoted Socrates: “Virtue is one and its name is justice.” Gilligan (1998) also admired Kohlberg for
inviting people who differed from him to talk with him in his classes.

Kohlberg fashioned a framework for thinking about moral development that is still referred to and followed today. He built upon Dewey’s philosophy of moral development, democratic classrooms, and cooperative learning. He expanded on Piaget’s stages of moral development by integrating the views of Dewey and Piaget and using his own brilliance to give them new form and structure.

It was Kohlberg’s hope that people would advance to the highest possible stage of moral thought so that society would contain individuals who understood social order and envisioned universal principles such as justice and liberty (Crain, 1985).

**Background and Early Beginnings**

Lawrence Kohlberg was born in 1927 and grew up in Bronxville, New York. Kohlberg attended Andover High School in Massachusetts, known for its bright, wealthy students. Following high school, Kohlberg moved to Israel and worked on a refugee freighter in an effort to support the Israeli cause (Crain, 1985).

Upon his return to America, Kohlberg applied to the University of Chicago. The scores on his admissions examination were so high that he had to complete only a minimal number of courses in order to graduate (Crain, 1985). It had been Kohlberg’s intention to become a clinical psychologist, but he became so intrigued by the theories of Piaget that he wrote his dissertation as an expansion of Piaget’s work (Power et al., 1989).

Kohlberg reconstructed and added to Piaget’s stages of moral development, using an adaptation of Deweyan views. Dewey’s original moral development stages that were
identified as impulsive (desires and needs), group-conforming (customs and rules), and reflective (conscience and principles) were later called preconventional, conventional, and postconventional. These levels were divided into two stages each as outlined by Kohlberg. He also added the adolescent and adult years to Piaget’s stages, which had ended with childhood (Gibbs, 2003).

Kohlberg worked with boys aged 10 through 14 and collected their responses to hypothetical moral dilemmas. His most famous dilemma is that of the husband, Heinz, who must decide whether to steal a prohibitively overpriced drug to save his dying wife. Kohlberg interviewed his subjects every four years (cited as every three years by Gibbs, 2003) for the next 20 years to see whether the stages he identified would hold up to Piaget’s criteria (Power et al., 1989). This longitudinal study also led to the refinement and revision in the description and scoring of the stages (Gibbs, 2003).

Piaget had identified certain basic age trends comprising schemas of moral thought that he expected would be invariant across factors of social class, culture, sex, and race. To Piaget, moral development would have an upward trend based on age with no regression or backsliding. Kohlberg’s longitudinal study found that there was some regression in the college years, and adjustments to his stages were made (Gibbs, 2003).

The career of Kohlberg turned from one of researcher to educator in the 1960s. He became interested in the application of his theories to education, mainly because of the work of his graduate student, Moshe Blatt, who believed that deliberate interventions could result in individuals advancing to a higher moral stage. Blatt conducted a study in which three groups received one of the following treatments: teacher-led moral
discussions, peer-led moral discussions, and participation in a control group that received no treatment. The results have been termed the *Blatt effect* and surprised even Kohlberg. One fourth to one half of the students in the teacher-led discussion group moved partially or totally to the next stage of moral development. Blatt’s work initiated a process by which Kohlberg’s theory of moral development could be used for practical applications (Power et al., 1989).

Thus began Kohlberg’s creation of the Cluster School, a model for a *just community*. The school became a laboratory for the application of Kohlberg’s theories.

**Early Childhood Education and Moral Development**

DeVries and Kohlberg (1987) examined two approaches that were used to promote social and moral reasoning among young children. The first was structured as a specific class period set aside to teach moral reasoning. In this instance, a filmstrip program was utilized to demonstrate a variety of dilemmas to young children and was followed up by discussion. Once again, Blatt’s study (Power et al., 1989) was replicated with positive results. After a 12-week session, many of the children had moved ahead to the next stage and had retained that advancement after a year’s time. The Stone project replicated Blatt’s work in 20 schools and provided three criteria necessary for changes to occur in the stage of moral development. They are as follows: (a) Moral education is more effective as a dialogue between children rather than a direct teaching method; (b) the teacher, armed with the curriculum, is the facilitator who presents and probes, and then presents reasoning at the next highest stage; (3) all elements must be present for change to occur, and they must be supplied by either the teacher or the
students. The integral component for the children is to have children in a group who are representative of more than one stage. For the teacher, the critical factor is the Socratic method of questioning and probing (DeVries & Kohlberg, 1987).

The second approach for teaching moral reasoning is the construction of a just community within the classroom. In this way, the democratic values, rules, and social norms are all embedded within the daily life of the classroom. Teachers must use a constructivist approach so that young children construct their moral thinking and actions as they live them. Teachers can begin by discussing the nature of rules with their students; indeed, they will need a set of preliminary ground rules in order to get the children to become active listeners (DeVries & Kohlberg, 1987).

These rules form the foundation, or support structure, enabling the children to operate in a classroom meeting for short periods of time with teacher reinforcement for listening to the speaker and maintaining physical boundaries. Devries and Kohlberg (1987) reported that children as young as four became quite interested in rule-making and were able to create a list of rules and add to them throughout the week. The children learn a sense of belonging as they participate in decision making and conflict resolution. Along with the classroom meeting structure is cooperative learning, which enhances caring for each other, empathy, communication, and compromise. Cooperative learning has the potential for stimulating structural cognitive advance (DeVries & Kohlberg, 1987).

Theory

Kohlberg’s theory rests on the following premises: (a) that the essence of mature, or profound, moral judgment is not a socialized or internalized norm but instead a logical
ideal that is constructed in part through exchanges of perspective with others, (b) that the progressive age trend in the succession of phases toward this ideal is essentially the same in any culture, and (c) that mature moral development can in its own right motivate mature moral behavior (Gibbs, 2003).

Table 1

Kohlberg’s Three Levels and Six Stages of Moral Development

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level and Stage</th>
<th>What is right</th>
<th>Reasons for doing right</th>
<th>Social perspective</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level 1: Pre-conventional</td>
<td>Avoiding breaking rules backed by</td>
<td>Avoidance of punishment</td>
<td>Doesn’t consider the interests of others</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Heteronomous morality</td>
<td>punishment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Individualism</td>
<td>Acting to meet your own interests</td>
<td>Serve your own needs</td>
<td>Aware that everyone has his own interests to pursue</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II: Conventional</td>
<td>Living up to others expectations</td>
<td>Be a good person in your eyes and</td>
<td>Aware of shared feelings; the Golden Rule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Mutual interpersonal</td>
<td></td>
<td>those of others</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expectations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: Social system and</td>
<td>Fulfilling duties, laws, contributing to society</td>
<td>Keep the institution going</td>
<td>Takes the point of view of the system that defines roles and rules</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conscience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III: Post-conventional</td>
<td>Rules relative to groups should be</td>
<td>The greatest good for the greatest</td>
<td>Considers moral and legal points of view</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5: Social contract</td>
<td>upheld</td>
<td>number</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6: Universal ethical principles</td>
<td>Following self-chosen ethical</td>
<td>Belief in universal moral principles and a sense of commitment to them</td>
<td>Persons are ends in themselves and must be treated as such</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>principles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Kohlberg also outlined a theory to account for (a) how the stages develop between an individual and his environment (b) how an individual passes from one stage to the next (c) why some people develop further than others, and (d) the relation between cognitively based structures and one’s moral feelings and actions. Kohlberg created a manual for the administration and scoring of the moral development stages (DeVries & Kohlberg, 1987).

Current Perspective

There have been many studies that have replicated the Blatt Effect on the basis of the moral development theories of Kohlberg. Some of them included: Enright, Lapsley, Harris and Shauver in 1983, Schlaflit, Rest, and Thoma in 1985, and Lapsley, Enright, and Serlin, which was still in press in 1989 (Power et al., 1989). At the time of these studies, none had been conducted to examine what specific critical components promoted moral development advancement. However, as my reading progressed, I discovered the Stone Project which identified the following critical elements: a curriculum composed of moral dilemmas, a group composition consisting of children at varying stages of moral thought, and Socratic questioning by the teacher (Devries & Kohlberg, 1987).

In current literature, Gibbs (2003) discussed and critiqued Kohlberg’s theories and stages of moral development. He examined Kohlberg’s metaphorical Stage 7, which explored metacognition, contemplative reflection, and existential concerns. After the attainment of Stage 6, questions remained: “Why be moral? Why be just in a universe that appears unjust? Why live?” The ultimate moral maturity requires a mature solution to the meaning of life (Gibbs, 2003, p. 70).
Although Gibbs recognized Kohlberg for his contributions to the cognitive-developmental approach and cognitive moral development in American psychology, he believed that Kohlberg’s stage theory distorted basic moral judgment and maturity. Gibbs believed that Kohlberg’s construction of the stage was being confused with internalization. Gibbs professed that adults who reflected upon their morality and formed ethical principles had not constructed a new Piagetian stage but had engaged in an existential inquiry with personal relevance for ethical living.

Gibbs (2003) continued his treatise on moral development with a discourse on Hoffman’s theories. Hoffman’s theories shifted the thinking in moral development from the *right* to the *good* and from cognitive sources to affective sources, such as empathy and benevolence.

Damon (in Junn & Boyatzis, 2004) reported that current theories regarding moral development abound and compete. Whereas one moral development theory considers biological forces, such as emotional disposition, another points to the influences of social interactions and experience, and yet another explores moral judgment ensuing from cognitive ability. What the theories have in common is the belief that no single source causes moral or immoral behavior. Damon (in Junn & Boyatzis, 2004) pointed to parents as the original source of moral guidance. The authoritative parent best sets firm and consistent rules while allowing for communication, discussion, and potential revision of the rules.

The classroom meeting can become the vehicle for discussing moral issues with students. All of the necessary criteria with which to move children forward in their stage
of moral development can be made available as outlined by Devries and Kohlberg (1987): moral dilemmas, either constructed or real; children who are in different stages of moral thought; and a teacher who uses questioning and probing, as is often done in order to enhance higher order thinking skills.

The message that Devries and Kohlberg (1987) delivered in early childhood education was that a skilled teacher can and should embed moral development within the framework of the classroom and in the avenue of the classroom meeting. Young children are capable learners when there are structures and supports in place to guide their learning. Classroom meetings can be meaningful for young children if the problems discussed matter to them.

*The Columbine Massacre*

Their intention had been to kill 250 people--it was recorded on video tapes made weeks before the rampage. Eric Harris and Dylan Klebold killed 15 people, including themselves, and injured 23; ninety-five incendiary devices failed, keeping the casualties lower than had been planned (Aronson, 2000). The country’s biggest outrage was not that the boys had access to weapons or that they knew how to make bombs; it was the location--affluent suburban America.

Although schools are generally considered safe places to be, the number of incidents involving the killing of multiple victims in and around schools has risen sharply. As news of the Columbine Massacre unfolded, the first reaction was one of blame. Were the administrators or teachers to blame? Was security lax? What about the boy’s parents--how could they be unaware of the trouble that was brewing? Why aren’t
our schools teaching right from wrong, and what about violent videos and television? (Aronson, 2000).

Aronson (2000) pointed to two types of blame: (a) that which is aimed at finding a cause and appropriate interventions, and (b) the blaming that is mere condemnation. He believed we feel a bit less helpless if someone can be held accountable. Aronson also noted the impatience of the media, politicians, and school officials to formulate quick solutions. Some early recommended strategies included allowing prayer in school or posting the Ten Commandments, restricting violent entertainment, instituting more gun control, requiring students to call teachers *sir* and *ma’am*, and identifying and monitoring students who acted differently from the norm.

There were two phenomena that Aronson (2000) presented in an effort to explain the human role of *social animal*: (a) We are all influenced by the social situation in which we operate, and (b) we often underestimate the power the social situation has on the people around us. A social situation wields extraordinary power over an individual. As human beings we are all deeply influenced by other people and how they treat us. Ross, Amabile, & Steinmetz (1977) demonstrated the high incidence of obedience by participants in carefully staged experiments in powerful social situations.

As a social psychologist, Aronson (2000) reported the need to scrutinize the social atmosphere in high schools in America to find the answers to the questions regarding Columbine. Although Aronson (2000) believed that Harris and Klebold were individually disturbed and their terrible acts pathological, he also believed that these young men were reacting in an extreme manner to a daily environment of rejection and exclusion.
Howe (1972, in Aronson 2000) relayed the story of the British cholera epidemic in which the legendary Dr. John Snow removed the well-pump handle when it was discovered to be the source of the illness. There was no attempt to clean up the water or educate the masses—simply remove the handle. There is no single pump handle to make our schools safer. Gun control, metal detectors, and less violent programming have some merit and proven success, and yet they still do not address the main problem.

In his studies of high schools, Morse (1999) found them to be competitive, cliquish, and exclusionary with regular taunting and put-downs. Students were having miserable middle and high school experiences. How connected students feel at school is an important factor in protecting them from extreme emotional distress, drug abuse, and violence. Aronson recommended teaching empathy, reducing competition, and fostering cooperation in order to actively reduce bullying and taunting.

Aronson (2000) remarked,

> It is astonishing to me that we permit children to be victimized by the kind of verbal violence that adults would not tolerate in their own workplace. Indeed, in many instances, adults subjected to such harassment would sue not only the perpetrator, but also their employer for allowing such an intolerable work environment. (p. 102)

**Prevention Programs**

There is a rapidly growing list of commercially available bullying prevention programs. Such programs vary widely in their approaches and in their proven effectiveness. To date, careful evaluations have been conducted of very few bullying

**Kohlberg: The Cluster School.** As early as 1960, Kohlberg was creating a school for students with behavioral and academic problems. The goal was to teach moral reasoning through a curriculum of moral dilemmas to groups of children at varying stages of moral thought, using Socratic questioning. Known as the Blatt Effect, after a teacher-led 12-week session, one fourth to one half of the students moved ahead to the next stage of moral development (Power et al., 1989).

Kohlberg created the Cluster School, a model for a just community. The Cluster School, in Cambridge, Massachusetts, came about as a result of grants from the Kennedy and Danforth Foundations. Kohlberg signed on as a consultant for the project and was eventually invited to sit on the governing board. The board agreed on the following principles of governance:

- The school would be governed by direct democracy. All major issues would be voted on at weekly meetings.
- A number of standing committees would exist; the members would be students, teachers, and parents.
- Social contracts would be used to define responsibilities and rights.
- Students and teachers would have the same basic rights, including freedom of expression, respect from others, and freedom from physical or verbal harm. (Power et al., 1989, p. 84)

Because it was an alternative school, the student body included students with learning and behavioral problems. The teachers on the staff shared administrative duties. Even though Kohlberg thought that there should be at least a part-time administrator, the teachers felt that the democratic character of the school might otherwise be compromised. The staff realized early on that they would have to nurture the democratic process. The
weekly community meetings began with chaos and dissent but in due time developed into meaningful dialogues about a democratically run institution. Staff and students had been accustomed to bureaucracy, so it took staff training and persistence to change the thinking and action. The students began to see themselves as becoming more responsible, and teachers felt that instead of simply teaching an isolated subject, they were educating the whole person (Power et al., 1989). Ultimately, the Cluster School was composed of three internal institutions: the advisor group, the community meeting, and the disciplinary committee, also known as the D.C. The advisor groups were made up of smaller factions of the school. They met to prepare for the community meeting. Also, the advisor group gave students and staff the opportunity to socialize and share more personal concerns than those typically discussed in a community meeting (Power et al., 1989). The community meeting was characterized as the essence of the community, almost ritualistic in nature. Everyone assembled to discuss and occasionally to vote. Matters and concerns were dealt with as moral issues with “good moral discussion” at the crux of the problem-solving process (Power et al., 1989, p. 83).

The procedure of the community meeting had twelve steps. Its import once existed in the planning and preparation that had been used as a means of deliberate intervention into the moral development of the students. The sequence follows:

1. The meeting is called to order by the rotating chair (teachers in lieu of administration).
2. The visitors are introduced.
3. The report of the Discipline Committee is given.
4. A discussion held, and a vote is taken on the D.C. report.
5. The advisor groups report on their previous discussion of central issue.
6. The floor is opened for discussion on the central issue.
7. A member makes a proposal for dealing with the issue
8. A straw vote is taken.
9. The minority members present their positions and reasoning.
10. The majority members respond in kind.
11. A real vote is taken.
12. The meeting is adjourned (Power et al., 1989).

The Disciplinary Committee had three functions: handing out fair punishments, mediating disputes between individuals within the community, and counseling students with disciplinary problems. Discipline was viewed through Durkheim’s eyes as the morality of the classroom as a small society. “When students break the rules, the morality of the school society is threatened” (Power et al., 1989, p. 23). We are more typically used to student discipline issues being handled privately. Student privacy, peer-group loyalties, and responsibility were handled quite publicly. Kohlberg opposed secret ballots for voting so that students would stand up for themselves in public without being intimidated and encouraged openness and honesty as the discussion and an outcome of a meeting were revealed (Power et al., 1989).

Olweus: Norway. Olweus (1993) cited a 50% reduction in bullying as a result of his three-tiered approach in Norway. The goal of his intervention program was to reduce as much as possible, preferably to eliminate completely, existing bully/victim problems in and out of the school setting and to prevent the development of new problems. A general condition is awareness and involvement by all participants, followed by the three focus areas.

Measures at the School Level

- Questionnaire survey
- School conference day on bully/victim problems
- Better supervision during recess and lunch time
- More attractive school playground
• Contact telephone
• Meeting between staff and parents
• Teacher groups for the development of the social milieu of the school
• Parent circles

Measures at the Class Level

• Class rules against bullying: clarification, praise, and sanction
• Regular class meetings
• Role playing, literature
• Cooperative learning
• Common positive class activities
• Class meeting among teacher, parents, and children

Measures at the Individual Level

• Serious talks with bullies and victims
• Serious talks with parents of involved students
• Teacher and parent use of imagination
• Help from neutral students
• Help and support for parents (parent folder, etc.)
• Discussion groups for parents of bullies and victims
• Change of class or school

Olweus (in Davis, 2003) inverted the home characteristics that make children more prone to bullying in order to create school characteristics where adults spend time in positive interaction with students and use consistent discipline. Davis (2003) created a visual of the house and added *empowering the bystander* (see Figure 2).

![Bullying Prevention Diagram](image)

*Figure 2. Bullying prevention house diagram.*
Davis capitalized on the Olweus model and built upon it by requiring clear, school-wide definitions of unacceptable behavior and consistently enforced consequences. He believed that if the adults at school modeled respectful behavior and held bullies responsible for their actions, then they could help bullies develop empathy, support the victim in meaningful ways, and empower the bystanders to take a stand against bullies. The following steps make up the overall program offered by Davis: (see Appendix I):

- Uniform and clear expectations for behavior that apply school wide
- A discipline system for aggression that outlines predictable, escalating consequences
- Positive staff-student interaction
- Acknowledgement of positive behavior
- Support for targets and young people who need friends
- Classroom instruction in emotional literacy, problem-solving, and conflict resolution
- Bystander training and empowerment

Davis’s model has a deliberate concentration on student and staff connections. The U.S. Department of Health and Human Services *Report on Violence* (in Davis, 2003) recommended ways to create student-teacher bonds:

- creating one-to-one time with students; using appropriate self-disclosure; having high expectations of students that convey a belief in their capabilities; networking with parents, family members, friends and neighbors of students; building a sense of community within the classroom; and utilizing rituals and traditions within the classroom. Underlying all these strategies…is the communication of dignity and respect through “a considerate tone of voice and receptive manner when speaking to and about students…taking time to listen to students and taking their concerns seriously,” and conveying the message that they trust students are doing their best
given their developmental level and life circumstances.” (Davis, 1999, in Davis 2003, p. 68)

Davis (2003) provided a brief assessment tool for evaluating the school climate as it pertains to pupil-teacher interaction. The questions follow:

- Do adults initiate social conversations with students? Do they greet and praise them?
- Do adults talk with students respectfully? Do they model respect and inclusion for all?
- Do adults spend time with students in activities that both enjoy?
- Do adults mentor at-risk students?
- Do adults give feedback about each others’ behavior with students?
- Does the school protect time for adults to interact informally with students? (p. 69)

Additional suggestions for creating pupil-teacher bonds included the following: agreeing as a staff on greeting students each morning with a positive comment, modeling respect and inclusion, making sure that positive comments outweigh the negative, conducting advisor-advisee activities or meetings, and/or implementing a silent mentoring program.

Commercial programs include the “Bully-Free Classroom” (Beane, 1999), “Bully Busters” (Newman, Horne, & Bartolomucci, 2000), and “Bully Proofing Your School” (Garrity et al., 2000). These programs offer a manual for teachers, handbooks for parents, and surveys for parents, staff, and students. They offer activities designed to increase knowledge awareness and include exercises for increasing prosocial skills and changing negative behavior. The programs often come with reproducible pages for use in the classroom, along with skits and plays for performance by children. “Bully Proofing Your School” became popular on the east side of the state when the Oakland County Prosecutor’s Office hired a full-time social worker to implement this anti-bullying program in the Oakland County schools. It will play an important role in the anti-bullying
campaign at Kent Hills School. The foundation of our program, however, comes from the work of Davis (2003), who built a rich, purposeful, and practical premise for changing the face of school climate.

**Aronson: The Jigsaw Classroom.** The *Jigsaw Classroom* is a structure for fostering cooperation and reducing competition in the classroom. Aronson (2000) advised making the classroom environment as appealing to young people as their after school jobs, where there is an absence of taunting, put-downs, and exclusion, and people do not go around humiliating one another. He recommended restructuring the academic experience so that the process of learning and the atmosphere it created would be more important than the content.

Students learn something from the manner in which the product is attained or communicated. If teachers lecture, they send the message that they are an expert source of information. If teachers dispatch students to the library, they send the message that it is useful for students to become skillful researchers. If teachers require the interview of a person with experience related to the topic, they send the message that not all information is limited to books. With such approaches, students learn something from the process as well as from the content (Aronson 2000). If teachers require students to take notes, read the textbook, raise their hands as soon as they know the answer, and take tests graded on a curve, then the academic setting is designed to encourage students to compete against each other. “When the grades come some students are big winners, some big losers, and most fall in the nameless middle zone” (Aronson, 2000, p. 133). School becomes competitive inside and outside of the classroom.
Cooperative learning assignments must be carefully structured in order for them to work. The jigsaw model has a successful, 30-year history. Aronson (1978) used the following scenario as an example:

The students in a history class are divided into small groups of five or six students each. Suppose the task is to learn about World War II. In one jigsaw group let us say that Sara is responsible for researching Hitler’s rise to power in prewar Germany. Another member of the group, Steven, is assigned to cover concentration camps; Pedro is assigned Britain’s role in the war; Melody is to research the contribution of the Soviet Union; Bill will handle Japan’s entry into the war; Clara will read about the development of the atom bomb. (p. 135)

In due course, the members will come back to the group with an organized and well-developed report for the group. The situation is prearranged so that the only access a member has to the other reports is by listening intently. Each student in the group educates the group about his or her specialty. With the purpose of maximizing the effectiveness of the individual reports, the students do not go immediately back to their groups, but first meet with members from the other jigsaw groups who had the identical assignment. This becomes the expert group from which students can gather information, share ideas, and rehearse their presentations (Aronson & Patnoe, 1997).

The benefits of the jigsaw classroom are as follows:

- It is an efficient way to learn the material.
- It encourages listening, engagement, and empathy by giving each member of the group an essential part to play in an academic activity.
- Group members must work together to accomplish a common goal.
- Each person depends on all the others.
- Group goals and individual goals complement and bolster each other.
This system of “cooperation by design” facilitates interaction among all students in class, leading them to value one another as contributors to their common task.

Aronson (1978) reported that cooperative learning is successful and that 30 years of scientific research has borne this out. The data demonstrate that through cooperative learning structures such as the jigsaw, the classroom develops a positive social atmosphere where students learn to like and respect one another and where teasing, name-calling, and bullying are sharply reduced. Students report that they like school more. Tormentors become supportive helpers and anxious victims, or losers, begin to enjoy learning and feel accepted for who they are.

The Jigsaw Classroom is powerful because group members must learn to pay attention to one another, to listen keenly, and to try to figure out the best way to communicate with other people in the group. In the course of paying attention, one individual learns to take the perspective of the other, which builds empathy, compassion, and understanding (Aronson, 2000, p. 20).

The way we behave toward another person leads us to give good reason for our treatment of that person. If we hurt someone, we might try to reduce the bad feeling we have about it by convincing ourselves that the person deserved the pain. Likewise, whenever we exert extra effort on a person’s behalf, we try to justify that effort by finding something about the person that convinces us that the good deed was worth doing, and we will like the person better afterwards. Through the creation of a classroom where there are no losers, there will be “nobody left to hate” (Aronson, 2000, p. 20).

**Conclusion**

The literature is replete with studies demonstrating the harmful effects of bullying
among school children. The powerful residuals for the bully and the victim should
provide the impetus for educators, parents, schools boards, and communities to take
action. The most recent studies identified the bystander as a significant force in the
handling of bullying problems at school. The characteristics of the triad--bully, victim,
and bystander--have been observed and reported.

Although careful evaluation and assessment of programs is in its infancy, there is
documented evidence about the effects of some programs. For example, the Olweus
model (Olweus, 1993), Kohlberg’s Cluster School (Power et al., 1987), and the Jigsaw
Classroom (Aronson 1978) presented data that support the positive outcomes of their
programs in schools and classrooms. The recent work of Davis (2005) built upon the
work of Olweus (1993) and highlighted the critical dimension of the bystander. In
addition, the theories and concepts related to the reduction and elimination of bullying
have been captured in a practical manner for use in a school setting.

Bullying among school children has been a hot topic in the media across the
nation. The Columbine Massacre was perhaps the catalyst for the renewed interest in
bullying. After all, as early as 1960, Kohlberg had begun to turn his theories on moral
development into educational practice, with the goal of teaching moral reasoning to
students with behavioral and academic problems through a curriculum of moral dilemmas
and Socratic questioning by the teacher (Power et al., 1987).

Immediately following the school shooting in Littleton, Colorado, the media,
educators, and communities were calling for quick resolutions to the crisis. Upon further
study and reflection, it became apparent that the Columbine shooters and subsequent
school shooters had been the victims of bullying. The Secret Service reported that a majority of 37 school shooters had suffered “bullying and harassment that was long-standing and severe” (U.S. Secret Service Threat Assessment in Lumsden, 2002, p. 1).

Overall, it is clear from a review of the literature that bullying has become a menacing problem within our schools. Educators, parents, and communities have the knowledge, through research, to begin a program of awareness and education, followed by a curriculum of reduction and prevention strategies and interventions.
Chapter Three

Research Design

*Methods and Procedures*

In an effort to describe the phenomenon of bullying among school children, I utilized qualitative research methods. First of all, qualitative research studies can help us to understand complex educational occurrences by providing a description of the context and setting in which the study occurs. Second, qualitative research affords a window for examining incidences from the perspectives of the persons living the experience. Third, the problem can be studied holistically rather than fragmented into various components (Haller & Kleine, 2001).

Haller and Kleine (2001) highlighted several common features that characterize qualitative research:

- It is conducted through an intense or prolonged contact with a field or life situation.
- The researcher’s role is to get a systematic and integrated overview.
- The researcher attempts to retrieve data based on the perceptions of the “insiders.”
- A main obligation is to explain how people understand and take action.
- Many interpretations are possible but some are more compelling because of theory or internal consistency.
- The researcher is the main measurement device.
- Most analysis is done with words which can be organized to compare, contrast, analyze and assign patterns.

Bogdan and Biklen (1992) remarked that data collected on the premises are supplemented by the understanding that is gained by being on location. The researchers’ insight is considered the key instrument for analysis. Field notes become the crucial data log out of which analysis will emerge. The field notes provide for a chronological description of what is happening. They include a description of events, people, and
conversations. The researcher must be concrete and distinguish verbatim accounts from those that are paraphrased or based on general recall (Lofland & Lofland, 1995).

This study used The Colorado School Climate Survey (see Appendix J), which provided a quantitative comparison of the perceptions of students, staff, and parents before and after the bullying intervention strategies were implemented. The choice between qualitative and quantitative evaluation does not have to be limited to one or the other. Designing evaluations that draw from both are holistic. The findings are often more valid than the findings of a study that uses one method exclusively (Fowler, 2000).

Qualitative research can be conducted in a myriad of ways with many long traditions behind them. Wolcott (in Miles & Huberman, 1995) use a tree to showcase nearly two dozen strategies organized by preferred styles of collecting data. The actions listed at the base of the tree aptly describe this researcher’s approach to qualitative study: experiencing, enquiring, and examining.

Tesch (in Miles & Huberman, 1994) presented a graphic organizer that sorts 27 types of qualitative research. At first glance, this chart seemed cluttered, complicated, and perhaps overwhelming. It is, however, detail oriented, organized, and easy to follow. My interest in the interaction between children draws me to the discovery of regularities, themes, and patterns. Three questions form the foundation for this depiction: (a) What are the characteristics of the language itself? (b) Can we discover regularities in human experience, and (c) Can we comprehend the meaning of a text or action?

Miles and Huberman (1994) discussed three approaches to qualitative data analysis: (a) interpretive, (b) social anthropology, and (c) collaborative social research.
Interpretivists conceptualize human activity as text or a collection of symbols expressing meaning. Phenomenologists read and reread transcripts to capture the essence of a single account. The social interactionist’s interpretation comes through an understanding of group interactions.

Social anthropology, or ethnography, best describes this researcher’s approach to the analysis of data as characterized by extended contact with a community, concern for mundane events, as well as for unusual ones, and direct participation in local activities (Miles & Huberman, 1994). This researcher examined behavioral regularities, language, rituals, and relationships that exist in the daily lives of children at school. The researcher’s journal entries became data to be analyzed. The third approach to data analysis is collaborative social research, in which researchers and local actors may have opposing interpretations of the data.

Jacob (1987) reviewed terms such as Ecological Psychology, Holistic Ethnography, Ethnography of Communication, Cognitive Anthropology, and Symbolic Interactionism. This researcher made a connection between Jacob’s work and that of Guba and Lincoln (1989) through the characteristics described as the central features of research traditions. Kuhn (in Jacob, 1987) identified the central features as assumptions about human nature and society, foci of the study, and methodology. Guba and Lincoln (1989) called them the ontological question, the epistemological questions, and the methodological question.

The ontological question, or the assumptions about human nature and society, look at the nature of reality and what can be known about it. The epistemology question,
or the foci of the study, explores the relationship between the knower and what can be known. The methodological question or methodology, examines how the knower will go about finding out what it is he/she believes can be known.

On the subjective-objective dimension, this researcher leans more towards the realism end of the continuum. For example, the interactions of children are real, a person is either a bully or not, and a person is either a victim or not. There are specific characteristics and descriptors that are relegated to a bully or to the victim of a bully that make them real to the researcher. As the bully-victim relationship is studied, this researcher takes more of a stance as a nominalist in an effort to make discoveries about people and their perceptions. What characteristics do children view as real in regards to other children, victims, bullies, and bystanders? What assumptions can be made from their discernment?

With the epistemological question, this researcher falls somewhere in between positivism and antipositivism. As a person, this researcher generally holds more of a positivist view and believes that knowledge is absolute. As an investigator, this researcher is interested in the construction of knowledge, especially if it assists the researcher in understanding the informants.

Regarding methodology, this researcher takes a subjectivist point of view. This researcher is determined and committed to being entrenched with children so as to better understand their perspectives. This researcher wants to feel the power of the bully, the pain of the victim, and the helplessness of the bystander. The ideographic approach will
assisted this researcher in recalling childhood interactions and the accompanying feelings that emit ridicule, affection, sadness, and exclusion.

**Questions**

“As you evaluate a research problem in a qualitative study you should focus on the questions that will be addressed” (Haller & Kleine, 2001, p. 199). The following questions will be investigated:

- How do children interact?
- Which children choose each other?
- Do the interactions differ according to location?
- Does the classroom climate affect the interactions of children?
- What is positive classroom climate?
- Does the teacher use deliberate strategies or interventions to promote positive classroom climate?
- What are the characteristics of the bully/victim/bystander?
- Are the children aware of their roles?
- Does the teacher recognize bullying behavior?
- What are the consequences for the bully?
- Is there any support for the victim?
- Can deliberate interventions retard or deter bullying behavior?

The study design has a pre- and postsurvey to gauge baseline data and results before and after intervention strategies (see Appendix J). During all phases of this investigation, there was participant observation, interviews with individuals, and focus groups. The research subjects were the students at Kent Hills Elementary School in kindergarten through grade five.

My instrumentation tools were a survey, and data logging from my field study which included interviews and focus groups. I administered the Colorado School Climate Survey (CSCS) to students, parents, and staff. The survey provides information about four domains: (a) incidences of bullying experienced directly by the respondent,
including verbal, physical, and exclusionary forms; (b) incidences of bullying observed by the respondent; (c) perceptions of safety in various locations in school; (d) perceptions of overall school climate, including adult and student helping behavior, sense of acceptance, and enjoyment of school (Garrity et. al, 2000).

The purpose of the survey was to assess the nature and extent of bullying at Kent Hills Elementary School. The parent survey was sent through the mail, teacher surveys were directed at a staff meeting, and the student surveys were administered by the researcher and an assistant during the school day. The first-grade and second-grade students completed the survey one-on-one because of low reading levels; students in other grade levels were given the survey in a whole-class setting. Kindergarten students will not participate in the survey because of the language, which was too sophisticated for their level of oral language development.

The field data allowed me to be a participant observer on the playground, in the lunchroom, and in the classrooms in order to “(a) collect the richest possible data, (b) achieve intimate familiarity with the setting, and (c) engage in face-to-face interaction so as to participate in the minds of the settings’ participants” (Lofland & Lofland, 1995, p. 17). I was a known investigator as the principal of Kent Hills Elementary School. This was a comfortable position for me, as I already spend time in classrooms, on the playground, and in the lunchroom every day. The children and staff are accustomed to my presence. Field studies are inherently and by design open-ended regarding analysis. Intellectually and operationally, analysis emerges from the interaction of the gathered data and focusing decisions (Lofland & Lofland, 1995).
The log is the repository of all of the data that is collected through participant observation and interviews. The log is a chronological record of what the researcher learns and the insights he/she garners. The researcher must separate observations from thoughts about observations (Ely, Anzul, Friedman, Garner, & McCormack-Steinmetz, 1991).

Ely et. al. (1991) discussed interviews and how the researcher can use them to discover how the informants organize their behavior. The researcher asks those who are being studied to act as the teacher and instruct him or her in the ways of life they find meaningful. This approach fits perfectly with the participant observer role that this researcher wanted to take on.

Interviews with a random sampling of students and focus groups provided additional data from the field and allowed this researcher to include the kindergarten students, who were observed but who did not take the survey. This researcher also directed two focus groups, each of which was composed of 10-12 students, some of whom had demonstrated noncompliance to the behaviors outlined in the discipline rubric, along with others who were model students. Fourth-grade and fifth-grade students were encouraged to participate.

Ely et al. (1991) discussed the informal interview, which often happens by chance, and the formal interview, which is preplanned and takes place off location. Interviews are at the heart of doing ethnography because they seek the words of the people that are being studied, the richer the better, so that the researcher can understand their situations with increasing clarity. Bogdan and Biklen (in Ely et al., 1991) described
an interview as a purposeful conversation, usually between two people, that is directed by one in order to get information. The major purpose of an ethnographic interview is to learn to see the world from the eyes of the person being interviewed.

Spradley (1979) guided the researcher by relating five types of descriptive questions: grand tour questions, mini-tour questions, example questions, experience questions, and native-language questions. This researcher used each of these types of questions as they lent themselves to the content and direction of the interviews.

Another component of the interview record is the translation of the language. Every informant will have his/her own language based on his/her age and station in life. It is important for the researcher to identify the speaker with quotation marks or brackets. It was essential to quote the informant word for word (Spradley, 1979). This researcher had to listen carefully to children and take copious notes. Children frequently misuse grammar and sentence structure in addition to adding slang and cultural idioms. This researcher must avoid rephrasing and correcting for language-usage errors.

*With-in case sampling* is an important feature of qualitative research. With-in case sampling is almost always nested within some other facet. In this study it was children, within a classroom, within a school, within a neighborhood. With-in school sampling must be theory driven. Choices of informants, episodes, and interactions are being driven by the conceptual question. To get to the construct, we need to see different instances of it at different moments in different places, with different people. The prime concern is with the conditions under which the construct operates. With-in case sampling has an iterative, or rolling, quality that works in progressive waves. Observing, discussing, and
picking up documents leads us to new sources of sampling (Miles & Huberman, 1994).

The investigation parameters in this study are presented in Table 2.

Table 2

*Sampling Parameters*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sampling parameters</th>
<th>Sampling choices</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Settings</strong></td>
<td>classrooms, playground, lunchroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Actors</strong></td>
<td>children with different characteristics: age, race, gender, teachers with varying styles</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Events</strong></td>
<td>instruction, group work, self-directed learning or learning free play, athletic activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Processes</strong></td>
<td>choosing playmates, work partners or groups, choice of verbal or body language used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Delimitations*

1. The study was conducted during the 2004-2005 school year.
2. The participants were students in grades kindergarten through five at Kent Hills Elementary School.
3. The students were racially diverse with low-to-middle socioeconomic status.

*Limitations*

1. The teachers have varying approaches regarding classroom climate and bullying prevention. In spite of training, not all teachers operated in identical ways.
2. The strategies to prevent and reduce bullying were selected by the researcher on the basis of research recommendations, not proven effectiveness.
Significance of the Study

Commercial programs are designed to prevent or reduce bullying at school. The publishers assume that all schools are equal and that a *one size fits all* approach will be effective. My goal was to assess and evaluate the bullying conditions at Kent Hills Elementary School and tailor strategies for responding to our needs assessment. With a racially and economically diverse population, there may be some insights that could also benefit other urban schools. The study was conducted with a minimum of time invested in by teachers but with specific actions to be carried out to maximize effectiveness. The survey, or pretest, gave me the baseline data in addition to valuable information to share with staff and community, some of whom misjudge the seriousness of this phenomenon.

The James Bean School in Sidney, Maine, is becoming known nationwide for its anti-bullying curriculum and climate. A visit to the school and conversations with the staff and students clarifies the effectiveness of the action they have taken. The school has approximately 400 students in a rural setting, with small class sizes and low diversity rates. The school community experiences many of the same societal issues as we at Kent Hills in Grand Rapids, Michigan do, but differs in neighborhood crime rates, the number of transient students, and the number of chronic disciplinary offenders. It was interesting and important to put theory into action in a school where students and teachers have unparalleled challenges.

Relationship building has been a recurring theme over the years as I have researched classroom climate, building climate, brain-based classroom practices, rewards
and punishment, disciplinary procedures, and, now, the prevention of bullying among school children. It will have a predominant role in the campaign to reduce and prevent bullying.

*Human Subjects Review*

The subjects in this study were the students at Kent Hills Elementary School in kindergarten through grade 5. The parents of the students were sent an informed consent document through the U.S. mail that explained the study and served as a permission form for their children’s participation in the study (see Appendix K). The staff and parents in the school community contributed via a pre- and postsurvey, membership in community meetings, and participation in the strategies and interventions designed to reduce and prevent bullying.

The identities of the students, parents, and staff involved in this study have been protected in numerous ways. No names of any individuals have appeared in any portion of the study. The names of the students on the pre- and postsurvey were numerically coded, only for the purpose of checking returns and confirming and disaggregating data. Graphs and charts representing the data illustrated patterns of behavior, not the behavior of individual students. The staff pre- and postsurveys were submitted anonymously and were coded only for the purpose of rechecking data for accuracy.

The parental pre- and postsurveys were prearranged in a system that required an envelope within an envelope for inscrutability. The inner envelope contained the survey, which was returned sealed and unmarked for anonymity, whereas the outer envelope had a place for a signature, which allowed the parent to participate in a raffle used as an
incentive for survey returns.

During the period of data collection, all surveys, interview notes, focus group reports, and anecdotal records were locked in a file cabinet in the administrative office at Kent Hills Elementary School to prevent perusal by any other individual. The parents of the students who chose to participate in the interviews and focus groups received written notices of their children’s selection for the interview or focus group process.

The parents were given an orientation at the beginning of the study and will be provided with a written report as well as the opportunity to meet and discuss the results of the study and the implications for Kent Hills Elementary School.
Chapter Four
Strategies, Interventions, and Results

Overview

A search of the literature provided rich sources for solutions to the persistent problem of bullying. It was important to the school that strategies and interventions be low-cost, practical, and time efficient. It was also important that the culture of the school be infused with positive characteristics, with the goal of making Kent Hills a school “where everyone belonged.” Elements were selected that would contribute to a comprehensive approach, attacking the problem at many levels. The Restructured Disciplinary System, in conjunction with increased supervision, Monday Morning Meetings, and classroom meetings would lend themselves to increased awareness, skill building, problem solving, and alternative behaviors. The Morning Greeting, Good News Postcards, and Silent Mentors bestowed culture-building qualities.

The assessment of the nature and extent of bullying at Kent Hills was garnered through focus groups, interviews, and the Colorado School Climate Survey (Garrity et al., 2000). Information was collected from the staff, students, and parents. Olweus (1995) recommended a three-prong plan for gathering data and focusing intervention efforts: (a) the school level, which includes parents, (b) the classroom level, and (c) the individual level. Olweus (1995) held that close cooperation between home and school is desirable if bully/victim problems are to be efficiently counteracted. “Change is certainly possible without parental involvement, but schools and students benefit when parents are involved as equal members of the team” (Davis, 2005, p. 146).
The School Community

Kent Hills Elementary School sits on 14.5 acres of tree-dotted green space with mildly sloping hills at the back perimeter. It is located on the northeast end of the city of Grand Rapids, Michigan. Kent Hills is one of 30 elementary schools in the Grand Rapids Public Schools, an urban district with approximately 21,000 students. Kent Hills was built in 1953 and currently houses 208 students in grades kindergarten through five.

The students at Kent Hills are neighborhood children who walk or ride to school with their caregivers. Two buses transport 10 learning-disabled students from other parts of the city; all others live in the immediate area. Families are as diverse as society at large. There are households headed by two parents, single parents, and grandparents, with home owners and renters alike. The neighborhood has a large complex of low-income apartments where many of our students live. The student population is 37% Caucasian, 40% African American, 19% Hispanic, and 4% Asian and Native American. The free and reduced lunch rate is 75%. The students at Kent Hills have recently become part of a long-standing, district-wide trend of mobility (Grand Rapids Public Schools, 2005).

Table 3

Summary of Student Demographics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Total Enrollment</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>African-American</th>
<th>Asian American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Native American</th>
<th>White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrollment % of Total</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>0.82%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>1.63%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The teaching staff at Kent Hills has seniority that ranges from 26 to 33 years. One teacher has been at Kent Hills for his entire career, and three other teachers have spent 15-17 years in their current assignments (Grand Rapids Public Schools, 2005). This longevity has given the teachers the chance to reflect upon Kent Hills Elementary School and its history. The staff has observed a decrease in parental involvement, an increase in the free and reduced-priced lunch calculation, and an increase in academic and behavioral problems (Grand Rapids Public Schools, 2005). The staff has had to make the appropriate adaptations to meet the cognitive and affective needs of an ever-changing population of students.

Table 4

*Descriptive Data of Teaching Staff*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Experience (yrs) in GRPS</th>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>K</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>3&lt;sup&gt;rd&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;/5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elementary</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5&lt;sup&gt;th&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Parent Teacher Association (PTA) is still a vital organization, but most of the officers and accompanying volunteers have full-time jobs and are not a presence in the school during the day as they once were. The attendance rate at the fall 2004 Open House was 75%. The fall Parent-Teacher conferences were attended by 87% of the parents; spring conference attendance was 86% (Grand Rapids Public Schools, 2005).

Many of the 2004 incoming kindergartners did not know shapes, colors, or how to write their names. Fourteen of the kindergartners could not count past five at the beginning of the 2004-05 school year. However, at the conclusion of the same school year, 12 students had begun to read, and many of them had mastered kindergarten skills and concepts. Our Michigan Educational Assessment Program (MEAP) scores are at 77% in English Language Arts and 50% in Mathematics (Grand Rapids Public Schools, 2005).

An atmosphere of caring and nurturing is characteristic of the culture at Kent Hills. The teachers’ actions clearly indicate a feeling of ownership over all students in the school, not just the ones in their classroom. The staff actively helps those in need. A variety of drives have been held for teachers and their families as well as for students and their families. The teachers respect and support each other, pitch in when necessary, and often collaborate on planning and instruction. Many of them have become close, personal friends. There are rich traditions at the school that include several unique holiday celebrations, craft workshops, fine arts exposure, and family roller skating. Former students visit their teachers often and former employees remain active in school affairs.
Restructuring of the Disciplinary System

Davis (2005) recommended uniform and clear expectations for behavior that would apply school wide, as well as a discipline system for aggression that outlined predictable, escalating consequences. This researcher’s first task became the redesign of the current disciplinary code, which was actually a series of classroom management plans individually authored and implemented by teachers. The district conduct report united staff in a limited fashion. The conduct report was the vehicle for more serious offenses, but the consequences were also subjective and arbitrary (see Appendix E).

With the support and input of the staff, this researcher patterned a discipline rubric after other content area rubrics that succinctly stated descriptors and assessment qualifications (see Appendix C). The pink slip accompanied the discipline rubric by mirroring the infractions. It may be likened to a detention or behavior referral, and it encompassed minor transgressions and bullying incidences, such as teasing, exclusion, profanity, and disrespectfulness. The pink slip was printed on carbonless paper for efficient and accurate record keeping, and the pink copy was sent home, hence its name. The critical features of the rubric-driven system were clarity, consistency, school-wide application, and parental involvement. Kohn (1996) remarked, “Children need to be told exactly what the adults expect of them, as well as what will happen if they don’t do what they’re told” (p. 2).

Any student who received a pink slip for an infraction made a timely phone call home under the supervision of the principal. In addition, the student served a time-out session during the 40-minute lunch period. The time-out sessions were held in Room
122, our staff workroom, which can hold as many as 25 students if necessary. The students were supervised by one of our Resource Room teachers whose time was offset with an extended lunch hour and compensatory time. At the lunch bell, students reported directly to Room 122, where the cook had already prepared and delivered their lunches. A system was put into place for the logistics of the program in order for it to run efficiently. Before the students ate lunch, they completed a *think-about-it* form that required reflection on their behavior and its consequences (see Appendix G). The time-out supervisor assisted the younger students who may have been in the emerging stages of reading and writing. After the students ate and cleared their places, they sat silently until the bell signaled the end of the lunch period.

An accumulation of three pink slips required a meeting with parents and the possibility of a behavior plan formulated by the principal, parents, teacher, and counselor or social worker. More serious offenses were still covered by the district conduct report, which could lead to suspension or a disciplinary review at the district level.

A further attribute of the restructured disciplinary system was *increased supervision* in all areas of the school campus. Garabino and deLara (2002) believed that children need to live within a structure of adult authority. As principal, this researcher hired additional recess aides so that the ratio of adult to child increased from 1:60 to 1:40. Two recess supervisors monitored the playground before breakfast as well. At the close of the school day, classroom teachers walked with their students a short distance, and staff members monitored two major intersections until all children had passed. Olweus (1993) determined that the greater number of teachers supervising during break periods,
the lower the level of bully/victim problems in the school.

The restructured disciplinary system was effective and allowed the staff to implement the remainder of the program. Teachers commented that they appreciated knowing exactly what to do in any situation. The students seemed to be comforted by the knowledge that the adults at school would take care of them and that their being bullied or harassed would not be tolerated. Some of the parents approached the new methodology with gratitude and asked how they could help. A small group of parents met with this researcher every month to discuss how the program was working, how they could support their own children, and how they might help other parents to support the school’s efforts.

A few reluctant parents reacted to the consequences of bullying as unnecessary. “After all,” one parent of a fifth-grade girl remarked, “girls do gossip.” Another parent was furious that her son was given a pink slip for a bystander violation. She could not see that encouraging and cheering on a fight was also participating in the fight.

In order to balance the disciplinary framework, specific strategies were put into place to enhance the culture at Kent Hills Elementary School. The *Morning Greeting* entailed a daily salutation and a friendly touch by classroom teachers for each of their students. This researcher observed this activity daily and gently reminded teachers to use the *Morning Greeting* if its absence was noted. The *Morning Greeting* quickly spread to the Resource Room teachers, the Reading Itinerant, and the Speech Pathologist. It was another link added to the culture of the school.

The Morning Greeting immediately perked up the children as they reported to their classrooms. This researcher heard teachers commenting on the weather, a weekend
birthday party, incoming homework, a new pet, or a television program. The connection between teachers and students was strengthened with every passing day.

*Good News Postcards* were sent to four students each month with messages of pride, encouragement, and celebration. Teachers were able to find positive qualities in each of their students and also recognized effort or extended a hopeful comment to a struggling student. Students and parents alike made positive comments about the *Good News Postcards*. “You need to give positive reinforcement to a child who does something nice if you want him to keep acting that way” (Kohn 1996, p. 3). Children enjoyed receiving mail and appeared to be especially delighted because it was from their teacher. The parents also commented that children rarely received their own mail, so the postcard had the added value of causing a bit of excitement at home and spotlighted their success.

The *Good News Postcards* were distributed to teachers at the end of each month in a folder entitled Monthly Report. It was the responsibility of the teachers to return the folder to the principal with their school newsletter entry, a copy of their classroom newsletter, and the four completed postcards. A monitoring sheet served to assist the teachers in keeping track of the recipients. A volunteer stamped and addressed the postcards and mailed them on the first of each month. This system repeated itself throughout the school year. Requests for additional postcards were not uncommon.

The role of the *Silent Mentor* was to take an active interest in another teacher’s student who was challenged academically, socially, or emotionally. This facet ensured that a minimum of two adults supported our most difficult or needy students, the first being the child’s own classroom teacher. Support staff, such as the paraprofessional, the
cook, the custodian, and the librarian, also served as silent mentors, thus allowing for a larger pool of students, who were recommended by the classroom teachers and assigned to the silent mentors in a lively and interactive meeting.

Davis (2005) reported that “silent mentoring programs are easier to set up than formal mentoring programs, require less paperwork, and are less likely to bring about feelings of loss and disappointment when mentors are busy and temporarily unable to follow through on their mentoring commitments” (p. 72). The silent mentors simply greeted and conversed with their students more than others and led the students to conclude that the silent mentors were talking to them because they liked them.

Anecdotes of the staff were relied upon to convince this researcher that the effort had been worthwhile. Staff members detailed curiosity on the part of the students, deepening, more intimate conversations, the students’ seeking out the adult, and the students’ reporting their struggles and successes without being asked. One staff member inquired as to whether the extra attention to the student would be taken as approval for the student’s often inappropriate behavior or mistaken for popularity. Further discussion among staff illustrated the need for knowledge of the student, affirmation of suitable behavior and citizenship, and a focus on learning and academic pursuits.

Underlying the disciplinary system were staff-student connections that could be defined as reciprocal caring and respectful relationships. Davis (2005) stated that teachers of well-managed classrooms were described by students as capable and caring. They monitored homework as well as behavior in class and out of class. These teachers
intervened when students were not treating each other appropriately. Classrooms with positive social structures were those where students focused on schoolwork during class and where there were clear class norms about supporting each other and doing schoolwork. Roland and Galloway (in Davis, 2005) found that classrooms meeting these two criteria had significantly less bullying than classrooms that did not, and this was indicated at Kent Hills by the number of pink slips, conduct reports, and suspensions that were distributed. The effort to create relationships with students was fundamentally sound at Kent Hills. The staff members supported and encouraged each other in their endeavors to accept all students, form relationships, and nurture them. Our mission statement pledged to provide a safe, nurturing environment.

*Monday Morning Meetings.* The *Monday Morning Meeting* formed the foundation for the anti-bullying project, and it unified our school with common language, common goals, and a theme of community building. The meetings took place immediately after the morning bell and lasted for 15 minutes. The students in grades kindergarten through five lined up to enter the building at the bell and headed directly to the gymnasium for the *Monday Morning Meeting.* The meeting had three components: instruction, celebrations, and goals (see Appendix A).

The instruction portion of the meeting followed a scaffolding approach in which one skill builds upon the next. The students and staff alike received weekly instruction on the dynamics of the bully/victim/bystander. In addition, the lessons supplied thought-provoking and self-reflecting exercises to challenge commonly held beliefs and practices
that were mired in the school culture. The lessons were presented in a variety of formats that included lecture, discussion, audience participation, and multimedia presentations. The students were also involved through role playing and low-level competitive events.

As principal, this researcher selected skill-based instruction that would best teach the social pragmatics that students need for modifying and improving their behavior. “Little doubt exists that children who aggressively act out against the environment are at high risk for future problems and that they will benefit from being taught constructive behavioral alternatives” (Coie, 1985, and Parker & Asher, 1985, in McGinnis & Goldstein, 1990, p. 4). Researchers found that even preschoolers and kindergartners can be effectively taught to find alternative problem solutions enabling them to inhibit inappropriate behaviors and enhance interpersonal adjustment (Maccoby, 1980, in McGinnis & Goldstein, 1990).

The lessons began with definitions and descriptions of the bullying problem, including the dynamics of the bully/victim/bystander triad. An anti-bully pledge was written by our third-grade teacher and pronounced by the assembly at each meeting. The lessons included but were not limited to the following (see Appendix A):

- Utilizing visual aids in an interactive fashion with the students to identify bullying behaviors; afterwards displaying them in a well-traveled area
- Discussing how the victim or target is impacted by bullying, strategies for the victim to protect him/herself and for appropriate interventions by bystanders
- Signing a life-size anti-bully pledge hung in an prominent school location
- Using self-talk to minimize victimization and to change individual actions
- Role playing situations that occur naturally at school with problem-solving responses and solutions
- Presenting visual aids for each child for the self-talk and stop-and-think strategies; presenting a visual aid for each classroom representing the shield of protection for victims and targets
- Practicing the use of dialogue and brave talk when confronted by a bully;
practicing the dialogue and actions of a bystander
- Investigating bullying on television, exploring friendships, and reflecting upon one’s own behavior and possible contribution to the problem of bullying ("Bullyproofing Your School" [Garrity et al., 2000], “The Bully Free Classroom” [Beane, 1999], & “Skills Streaming” [McGinnis & Goldstein, 1990]).

The weekly lessons were sometimes created in response to the actions of the students during the previous week. Reexamination of the concepts and skills was frequent, just as a teacher might review math facts or practice handwriting exercises. Role playing and discussion were recurrent so that the students could integrate new actions into their repertoire of behaviors. This new conduct was sometimes in direct opposition to what had been taught at home, and as a result, we had discussions about behaviors that were allowable at home but not at school.

The celebration segment of the meeting relied upon the submission of events or occurrences that teachers or staff observed. Celebrations consisted of examples of good citizenship, homework returns, hard work, effort, cooperation, and exemplary behavior. The audience provided recognition with applause and cheering. As with the instruction component, events from the preceding week often dictated what celebrations would transpire. The celebrations included but were not limited to

- a classroom having 100% homework returns
- compliments issued to students while on a field trip
- students demonstrating exceptional effort on a standardized assessment
- an individual student helping a kindergartener carry her lunch
- students contributing to a food drive for the local pantry
- students donating books and toys for a family who had had a house fire
- students expressing “please” and “thank you” in the lunch line
- an individual student returning a lost cell phone (Coyne, 2005)
Boyer (1993) referred to a “celebrative community,” where the heritage of the institution is recalled and where rituals affirming both tradition and change are shared. Kohn (1993) encouraged “celebrations of learning” instead of external rewards.

The goal-setting piece emanated from the children and their ideas. They were encouraged to think about and respond to a request for ideas for the upcoming week. The student replies were varied and included but were not limited to the following:

- listen to your teachers
- don’t throw wood chips on the playground
- no cussing or using obscene gestures
- include everyone in your playing
- no hitting or pushing
- no name calling or making fun of someone else’s parents
- no messing with bystanders; don’t encourage anyone to fight; get help from an adult

The goals were quickly printed up after each meeting and distributed to each classroom for further discussion and for posting in a prominent location. Each subsequent week, an informal assessment was made through staff and student feedback on what level of success was achieved with our stated goals (Coyne, 2005).

This researcher has observed the genuine engagement of the children during the Monday Morning Meetings. Students will stop this researcher in the hallway or in the lunchroom to make a suggestion for the next meeting or to report on how they personally are doing on the goal for the week. Classrooms have submitted stories and poetry for use at a school-wide meeting, such as *The New Kid on the Block*, who liked to fight, scared kids, stomped on toes, and swiped balls! It is often quiet enough to hear a pin drop as the students listen to the instructional portion of the meeting. The students are interested in that which is relevant to them and which will increase joy and well-being.
Classroom meetings. Classroom meetings promoted a sense of community, which is to say that students feel cared about and were encouraged to care about each other. Together, they experienced a sensation of being valued and respected; the children mattered to each other and to the teacher (Kohn, 1996, p. 105). “If we want children to grow into compassionate people, we have to help them change the way the classroom works and feels, not just the way each separate member of that class acts” (Kohn, 1996, p. 105).

Nelsen, Lott and Glenn (2000) outlined eight steps for conducting a classroom meeting, each with a specific purpose and outcome in mind (see Appendix B):

1. Form a circle so that everyone can see each other and the meeting becomes a different and special part of school.
2. Facilitate compliments and appreciation to encourage positive growth in the classroom.
3. Create an agenda that eventually will be student-driven.
4. Develop communication skills by teaching the students to listen and use I messages.
5. Teach about separate identities by providing opportunities for learning empathy, tolerance, and compassion.
6. Assist the students in recognizing the reasons people do what they do (undue attention, revenge, assumed inadequacy).
7. Practice role-playing and brainstorming problem-solving skills.
8. Focus on nonpunitive solutions.

A major benefit of the *Positive Discipline in the Classroom* (Nelsen et al., 2000) class meetings is that all students are learning conflict-resolution skills, and all will use those skills every day, not only to solve crises but also to prevent problems together. The staff at Kent Hills was trained by the district’s Behavior Interventionist, and we completed a book study of *Positive Discipline in the Classroom* (Nelsen et al., 2000) prior to the training sessions. The classroom meeting was of paramount importance in transforming
the educational structure of the classroom. Positive classroom climate helped shape the
building climate. Students needed to have time set aside to get together and resolve
conflicts, make decisions, share news, and review what had happened the previous day or
weekend. The students learned the skills of listening, understanding another’s
perspective, and taking responsibility for the values of the classroom (Kohn, 1993).

The teachers reported that the classroom meeting had become the vehicle for
saying “hard things in a nice way.” One of the first-grade teachers remarked that her
students frequently asked for a classroom meeting if she did not conduct one each day, or
if a problem arose, one of her students quickly interjected, “We better talk about this at
meeting time.” Many of the teachers had previously used some type of format for
discussion, but the Positive Discipline in the Classroom (Nelsen et al., 2000) model gave
the meeting more purpose and formality. The students occasionally used this time to
bring up academic matters as well, for example, how they did not understand a new
concept as it was presented by the teacher. The classroom meeting period increased trust
and safety that allowed this type of dialogue to occur.

Although the classroom-meeting structure began long before the bullying
prevention program, it was the portion of the program that was most difficult to put into
practice. This researcher frequently modeled a classroom meeting for the hesitant
teachers who were unsure about conducting one on their own. The classroom meeting
had the potential to be a free-for-all if not properly structured, and perhaps that was the
fear. Many of the teachers did not follow the Positive Discipline model with its eight
steps but opted for a format that was less of a recipe. This researcher found that to be
acceptable; the most essential criteria were to hold a discussion that served to build connections, solve problems, and affirm the worth of each other in a regular and consistent manner. The meetings that this researcher observed often got off topic, but those also appeared to be the times when appropriate self-disclosure occurred on the part of the students and the teacher, thus strengthening the relationships.

*Student Reporting Boxes.* A *Student Reporting Box* was placed in each classroom as a method of gaining information. Students frequently believed that there would be retaliation if they told on a classmate, and they often did not distinguish between reporting and tattling. When grown-ups report crimes to the police, they do so with the belief that they will be taken seriously, that effective action will be taken against the offender, and that they will be safe from further harm (Davis, 2003). The students who are targets of bullying want the same kind of reassurance. The *Student Reporting Boxes* represented a direct pipeline to the principal. As principal, this researcher held the only keys to the boxes so that student messages could be anonymous or signed, depending on what students wanted this researcher to know and what action, if any, they expected this researcher to take.

Sixty-three percent of the messages in the Student Reporting Boxes were anonymous, and 38% were signed (Coyne, 2005). These messages represented direct reports of bullying and named the offender and what the person did to him or her or to someone else. Thirteen percent of the communications excluded any names and appeared to be therapeutic in nature. A singular note chastised a substitute teacher for real or perceived unfair treatment, and two messages complimented my work
as a principal! One message served as a confession and apology, and two notes served as compliments to other students. The most poignant note was from a 5th grader.

We played basketball in gym today. One of the fifth-grade girls was never once passed the ball, not even by her own teammates. She cried all the way back to class. (Coyne, 2005)

Three cases of sexual harassment were uncovered, all involving the same male student but affecting three different female students. A pattern of regular abuse toward a fourth-grade male student was discovered as well. Of the incidences that were direct reports of bullying, 6% were complaints of exclusion, 15% were complaints of name calling, 27% were grievances of teasing, and 31% were protests of hitting, kicking, or pushing. The remaining 13% did not fall into a bullying category (Coyne, 2005).

On the basis of the notes from the reporting boxes, it was clear that their purpose had been fulfilled. Incidences that were not brought into the open were discreetly tucked inside the reporting boxes. This researcher can only make a supposition that the anonymous authors were relieved to be able to express themselves in a nonthreatening way. This researcher also noted that the numbers of notes in the catalog of reports diminished over time, another indication that the program was operating as planned, leading to fewer accounts of bullying. This researcher did not divulge any information from the reporting boxes unless a teacher or parent had to be notified of a serious matter. The greatest challenge was for the youngest students, whose handwriting and writing abilities were just beginning to emerge. These students were encouraged to confide in a teacher or parent who could also act as scribe.
Results of student reporting boxes.

Focus groups. Two focus groups were formed that were composed of fourth- and fifth-grade boys and girls. Invitations were extended to all fourth- and fifth-grade students, explaining that the topic would be bullying at Kent Hills School. The students needed to make a commitment that would include giving up their lunch hour and recess one lunch session per week throughout the school year. The parents of the students who expressed interest in belonging to the focus group were notified of this aspect of the research study, in writing and by telephone from this researcher. Ultimately, the group consisted of 13 fifth graders and 6 fourth graders, 9 of them boys and 10 of them girls (see Table 4). The members were divided into two separate focus groups that met on Tuesdays and Wednesdays, respectively. The students brought their lunches and came directly to a reserved room and quickly adapted to an easygoing pace of give and take.
The meetings began with directed questions and evolved into rich conversations, and students freely contributed and asked questions.

Table 5

*Description of the Focus Group Participants*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grade</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>African American</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4th grade</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th grade</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals:</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The task was to investigate the nature and extent of bullying at Kent Hills. The students were forthright and anxious to speak. Comments such as “Kurt isn’t who you think he is” started us on a journey of mutual trust and honesty. The students’ desire to divulge information was clear, and our ground rule regarding discretion placated any reluctance on their part.

Initially the group attempted to define and describe bullying behaviors. The members of the group readily agreed that physical attacks were by far the worst sort of bullying but then hesitated about their definitiveness when a female student suggested that spreading rumors was more insidious and hurtful. The group members felt that girls and boys equally spread rumors, which often had long-ranging consequences involving large groups of students. The rumors had a way of growing and permeating social groups.
The rumor spreading was included on the pink slip under *gossip* (see Appendix F). Some parents were reluctant to accept gossip as a disciplinary issue but regarded it as “something that kids do.” This became an issue that would be discussed at the monthly parent meeting. Parent education was necessary in promoting a new program philosophy.

The group members also agreed that talking about another person’s parents was a major source of discord and verbal abuse. The notion that the whole concept of putting down someone’s parents was often reacted to in a disproportionate way was discussed. This researcher noted that it was a necessary topic for school-wide discussion. Payne (1999) reminded us that in families of poverty, people are the most prized possessions, with the matriarch of the family firmly in control. The students would later discuss in concrete terms how to respond to parental put downs and to understand that in such a situation the bully does not usually even know the parent but is “pushing a button” to get a reaction.

The students at Kent Hills use the word *cussing* to refer to any obscenity or swear word. The focus group members stated that students use these words out of the earshot of teachers and will usually deny cussing if it is reported. The conversation explored negative role models, which included parents and grandparents who used cuss words as a regular part of their vocabularies. The debate soon became that of paths in life and the possibility of taking a different path than that of the family or neighborhood.

In outlining gender issues in bullying, the students created lists of predominant behaviors as shown in Table 6.
Table 6  
*Bullying Behaviors by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Boys</th>
<th>Girls</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fight with fists</td>
<td>Slap, scratch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuss</td>
<td>Cuss</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get in your face</td>
<td>Have an attitude; “head moves”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make fun of others</td>
<td>Pick on boys as a way of flirting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use obscene gestures</td>
<td>Think they’re “hard”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Both boys and girls in the focus groups felt that boys should look out for girls. One male student in particular was cited as being protective of girls in the classroom and on the playground. This researcher asked the students what they thought were the causes of bullying, in other words, “Why does a boy or girl become a bully?” The students cited the following reasons:

- “Some kids are depressed.”
- “Kids think its cool; they do it to show off.”
- “Their parents cuss and fight too much; they are bad role models.”
- “They watch Channel 58/BET: there are messages of violence and sex, and the men hurt the women.”
- “MTV should be included; it is like BET, and they use bad language.”
- “I saw on the news that children who are abused become bullies.” (Coyne, 2005, p. 4)

When the students were asked what parents and families could do about these issues, their first suggestion was that families eat dinner together. We took an informal poll, and nearly all of the students shared a story of regularly eating alone, preparing their own
dine

res, or even if mom or dad prepared dinner, everyone’s eating where and when they wanted to. They agreed that eating dinner together would be a good time to talk and teach good manners.

Each reason for bullying that the students contributed led to a lengthy discussion. For example, when the student related the news story about child abuse, several other students recalled witnessing abusive incidences: a child getting slapped by a grown-up, a mother pushing a child into a car. The conversation about the influence of television also included the movies, how late children are allowed to stay up, and characters who model bullying on television. The students in the focus groups took home a worksheet called “Bullying on TV” (Beane, 1999) and took notes as they watched their favorite programs on television. They discovered that Raven on “That’s So Raven,” Lisa on “Sister, Sister,” and Bart on the “Simpsons,” were occasionally bullies but rarely received consequences or learned a lesson from their actions. The students uttered their disappointment about this revelation.

The focus group also spoke about the Monday Morning Meetings and their effectiveness or lack thereof. The students thought that some of the students in their classrooms did not take the meetings seriously and got off topic when asked to discuss a point with a partner. They agreed that the “little kids” were really “into it,” and maybe as they kept growing, they would be more interested.

As the students continued speaking about the anti-bully campaign, they reported that some kids still bully but are careful to do it discretely. They also stated that some bullies threatened to lie about the victim if they were reported. They wondered if the
teacher would believe the victim.

Near the end of the school year, the focus group students conducted a school-wide poster contest with the theme of *no name calling*. The students felt that some of the anti-bully program was working; for instance, there were fewer fights. The students, however, did not think that Kent Hills had made much progress in reducing name calling. Sixty students submitted poster entries, and the focus groups reveled in setting criteria for quality, judging the posters, and awarding prizes at a *Monday Morning Meeting* (see Appendix A). The student groups also wrote and performed three skits with the subjects of gossip, exclusion, and fighting with bystander involvement.

The focus group meetings were likely the most enjoyable and eye-opening element of this project. This researcher was privy to intimate details of family living, student relationships at school, and the joy and sadness of being a child. The students were excited to have an important role, empowered by the conversations, and serious about finding solutions to common problems at school. This researcher surveyed the teachers of these students. The teachers commented that several individuals had made improvements academically but most notably in behavior, citizenship, and leadership.

This researcher witnessed the pride with which these students performed role plays and presented their anti-bullying contests. A new level of maturity appeared to settle over some of them. The skits that were written and performed by these students were videotaped and have been classified as the Fifth-Grade Legacy and will be shown to the students the following school year. The bond that was formed between the students and this researcher was palpable. The relationship was personal, yet professional, as the
students discovered a higher level of thinking, feeling, and believing in themselves.

*Observations: The classroom.* Overt bullying in the classroom was not as big a problem as it was in other locations, but more subtle forms of bullying were sometimes present: a student bumping into another student on his/her way to the pencil sharpener, knocking something off a desk, or slipping a derogatory note to another. Teachers were alerted to these devious ploys through training, and although they were not completely unaware of them before training, they were seeing these offenses in a new light and were meting out consequences more efficiently. Also, the classroom meetings were beginning to create a new sense of caring and appreciation for each other that contributed to a decrease in covert bullying.

The youngest of the students in kindergarten and first grade experienced bullying in the classroom to a greater degree because of the learning center structure in which children were up and moving around and were still learning how to interact with each other. Teachers were using the program *Skills Streaming* during their classroom meetings in order to assist children in shaping their social skills (McGinnis & Goldstein, 1990).

Overall, the teachers at Kent Hills School have strong classroom management techniques, so offenses committed in the classroom were kept to a minimum. There were a handful of students whose unacceptable behavior was not limited by location. These students were placed on behavior plans and given conduct reports or suspensions.

*Observations: The Playground.* The playground was a rich source of information. The children often wanted to walk with this researcher or simply talk about everything: family, friends, problems, financial woes at home, a parent being released from jail,
children who tease them at school, and their birthday parties and pets.

The younger students on the playground invariably teamed up with students of like gender and age but engaged in cross-gender chasing. The play equipment was vigorously used but with made-up games shared by two or more students. Younger students misread social cues more frequently than older students and sometimes called names or used physical aggression in a misguided attempt to make friends.

These youngsters demonstrated a pattern to their bullying: they made fun of first or last names; hit, pushed or kicked; or told the other person that he/she would no longer “be his/her friend.” Children were most devastated by the withdrawal of friendship. As the program embarked, the children took advantage of additional personnel on the playground to assist them with conflicts. In addition, children began to learn how to settle conflicts on their own. The classroom meetings as well as the school-wide meetings were teaching the students social pragmatics and problem-solving skills. Like any other new concept, this teaching would require repetition and practice year after year.

The older students on the playground were more sports oriented, and unless there was a conflict within a game, these students played relatively well without incident. Those students who were not participating in an organized game could be sneaky with their bullying. They were adept at staying out of the line of vision and out of the earshot of the recess supervisors. Students in the fourth and fifth grades spread rumors and gossiped, and offenses were committed by both genders. Groups of students sometimes banded against one or two other students. This researcher became a mediator in trying to overcome these conflicts and repair the damage that was done by the gossip. With
training, practice, and consistent consequences, the gossip and rumor spreading dwindled as evidenced in Figure 7. Students expressed surprise over getting into trouble for telling rumors and spreading gossip but in time seemed to understand the rationale. Their excuse was usually “I was just kidding.”

Physical aggression was still the number-one infraction but was decreasing as well. Fighting was generally the reason for suspensions, and the number of suspensions had declined (see Figure 8). This researcher gave great credit to the students who were able to find alternatives to fighting and physical aggression. Some of the students came from families where conflicts were solved and punishments handed out in physically aggressive ways. The same can be said for profanity and disrespectfulness, which was often modeled for the students more than kind or caring behavior. It was promising to see students embracing a more peaceful way of behaving and living.

A neglected aspect of instruction was regular, positive feedback on the playground. Adults excelled in the classroom at giving affirmation but usually did not speak to the students on the playground unless it was corrective. “You need to give positive reinforcement to a child who does something nice if you want him to keep acting that way” (Kohn, 1996, p. 3).

*Observations: The Lunchroom.* The lunchroom took on a life of its own. The climate seemed to change with the weather and the season. Voices might be loud or soft; children might be restless or not. Because this researcher was in the lunchroom everyday, the children took this opportunity to talk about their successes or difficulties. Even if another adult had settled a difference, the conflict was reported. The children were
anxious to help one another open milk cartons, and even though one particular student was able to manage his own wheelchair, several students rushed over to help him. This researcher was amused by the fourth- and fifth-grade lunch helpers who would wear their hair nets long after they had to. For children who seemed so conscientious about their dress and hair, this was a curious phenomenon, but perhaps it was a status symbol that went with the job.

There were recognizable dynamics in the lunchroom. For example, the first and second graders sat mixed by race and gender and got excited about the person sitting next to them. The third graders liked to sit in the same seats each day, even tried to save seats for each other, but tolerated change well. The fourth-grade students arranged themselves into girls’ and boys’ tables, and the fifth graders had no discernable pattern. What this researcher found interesting was that the students lined up in alphabetical order to make the lunch scanner’s job more efficient, and so, the outcome could actually have been the same every day, but it was not. The students rearranged themselves nearly every day despite the fact that classrooms were also assigned to specific tables. Lunchroom behavior was similar to that in the classroom, that is, not much happening at the surface, but with less conflict under the surface than in the classroom. After all, the children were engaged in an important activity: eating! This was the location, however, where this researcher could see the signs of exclusion. Although not widely prevalent, there were situations where one student could be observed eating alone. This researcher talked with the child to discover the reason and watched daily to see if a pattern was emerging. Sometimes it would turn out to be nothing more than the desire to eat quietly, more times
than not it would be the way the students were in line and took their places; no one was intentionally leaving anyone out. When it was apparent that no other students wanted to sit near a specific child, this researcher would engage a small group to befriend the child at least during the lunch period. Often a new student would enroll who would be a perfect match for that child.

The most serious case turned out to be the same student to whom no one would pass the basketball in gym class. The student had a few friends in a lower grade level but did not connect well with students her own age. It was necessary to orchestrate a plan whereby the students in her class would scrutinize their own behavior, look out for this student, and accept her into the group if even for just the lunch period. The students were a little worried that this student would begin to think they were best friends and wanted to hang out all the time. It was evident that this work would be intense and ongoing.

*Interviews*

This researcher had the opportunity to speak with children on a daily basis and easily conducted interviews with open-ended questions for longer responses and explanations. Some of the interviews included only one or two questions and were just long enough to gather some information while I supervised the playground or the lunchroom. Other interviews were planned in and contained the following questions:

- What do you like best about coming to school?
- What is the worst part?
- What is the best thing about your classroom?
- What about the kids?
- Who is your best friend?
- Does anyone bother you or act like a bully?
The answers that the students provided often led this researcher to subsequent questions. Two formal interviews that this researcher conducted were with boys aged 8 and 11. The eight-year-old was the proverbial bully, a child with Attention Deficit Hyperactive Disorder (ADHD) who had run out of medication as he had many times before. He often spent his recess and lunch hour with this researcher so as to keep him out of mischief and the other children out of harm’s way. He was allowed to read or play a game as this researcher supervised the lunch room. This student expressed his affection for school and his teacher and quickly identified the roles that each of his classmates played in the classroom. He did not seem aware of his propensity for bullying and considered himself a victim of three other male students. He, like other children I spoke with, felt that the punishments should be tougher. It has been the observation of this researcher that children generally suggested harsher consequences for each other than adults would have imposed. This was evident while I observed classroom meetings and students were asked to suggest appropriate consequences for unacceptable behavior. The children do not want to be hurt, and they want the adults to stop it at all costs.

The 11-year-old was poignantly clear about the bullying that he had suffered. “I would like to shoot about half of this school,” he remarked. When asked why, he responded, “They hurt people emotionally. They spread rumors. You should have a talk with every class; I think you should say names, too.” This student easily gave a litany of names. This researcher asked him what they said about him. He replied, “They say I want
girl things, that I’m ugly and a booger eater (I’m not).” “And on the first day in PE (Physical Education), a boy told me he would be my friend--he promised me--and what did he do? He ended up picking on me.”

As this researcher worked with this student to improve the situation, it became clear that he was not willing to meet other students half way and that he felt his opinions and wishes were the most important. In spite of his discomfort around his classmates, he was not willing to play a role in resolving the issue.

This student was a provocative victim, one whose own behavior added to the bullying. He represented a smaller group of victims who behaved in ways that caused irritation and tension around them. “It is not uncommon that their behavior provokes many students in the class, thus resulting in negative reactions from a large part of, or even the entire class” (Olweus, 1993, p. 33). It was important that his teachers and parents help this child to find reaction patterns that were less aggravating.

Common themes emerged throughout the interview process with a variety of students. Students knew their classmates and the pecking order in their classroom well. The children disapproved of the bullies, but some children, especially girls, found them to be exciting and handsome. All were in favor of stopping bullying behavior.

Pink Slips

The pink slip was a critical component of the restructured disciplinary system at Kent Hills because it applied consequences to the infractions listed on the discipline rubric. The students knew precisely what was expected of them and were held accountable for their actions by the disbursement of the pink slips. Each staff member
carried a small clipboard with pink slips and a writing implement during recess supervision. The application of the pink slip was regularly discussed to maximize consistency. Two hundred seventy-three pink slips were issued to 100 students for the 2004-05 school year (Coyne, 2005). Thirty-eight students received 1 pink slip, 41 students received 2-4 pink slips, 10 students obtained 5-6 pink slips, and 10 students were given 7 or more (see Figure 4). The infractions ranged from a low of three for negative bystander involvement to a high of 92 for physical aggression, for example, hitting, pushing, kicking, or throwing objects (see Figure 5). Behavior plans were established for the 10 students who received 7 or more pink slips.

![Figure 4. Breakdown of the 100 students who received pink slips.](image)

The behavior plans had significant results in most of the cases. One student had been given a long-term suspension for numerous fights and came back to school on a half-day plan. The other supports put into place for this child were counseling, both in school and privately, as well as mentoring from a church affiliate. Another male student was evaluated and diagnosed with an emotional impairment. A recommendation was
made for an alternative placement for the 2005-2006 school year. It is clear from Figure 6 that physical aggression was a considerable problem. Also, physical aggression, as well as the other categories of pink slips, were predominantly committed by boys rather than girls (Coyne, 2005).

![Bar chart showing number of pink slip infractions in each category.]

*Figure 5.* Number of pink slip infractions in each category.

After physical aggression, behavior that disrupted learning and disrespectfulness, which included defiance, talking back, and disregard for directions, followed as having the next largest numbers of offenses. Physical violence was the most common problem among students as indicated by the pink slips and conveyed through the student reporting boxes. The 47 incidences of *other* represented nonbullying infractions that included cheating, theft, and unsafe playground practices.
The pink slip and time-out process was successful for the 38 students who received one pink slip and then did not receive one again, as well as for the 108 students who never received even one pink slip. This researcher made an effort to connect to these students as positive bystanders who could assist and support the targets of bullying.

Figure 6. Number of conduct reports in 2003-04 before treatment and in 2004-05 after treatment.

Conduct Reports

The conduct report of the Grand Rapids Public Schools was used throughout the district for Level II offenses, which included leaving school grounds, fighting, falsifying information, harassment, and false activation of fire alarms. The conduct report had elevating consequences, with the fourth report resulting in a suspension (see Appendix...
E). The number of conduct reports decreased significantly after the bullying prevention and reduction efforts at Kent Hills. This researcher was aware that other variables played a role. For example, in the 2004-05 school year, Kent Hills had 30 fewer students and a particularly difficult fifth-grade classroom of students. Nevertheless, the drop was dramatic. The primary offense again mirrored the results from the reporting boxes, and the pink slip infractions with fighting or physical violence led the way.

Whether a student was issued a pink slip or a conduct report for fighting depended upon the severity of the incident. The conduct report always had been for serious offenses and was in part the reason Kent Hills implemented the pink slip. There seemed to be a missing piece to the puzzle when meting out consequences for unacceptable behavior.

In addition to fighting, profanity and disrespectfulness were major problems among the students. One might expect that teasing would have a higher number of violations, and it actually did in the categories of the pink slip, where 22 offenses occurred. The conduct report was part of the Uniform Discipline Code of the Grand Rapids Public Schools. It outlined the seriousness of offenses at varying levels with consequences that usually resulted in suspension as subsequent offenses occurred. No recommendations were made for intermediate corollaries.
Figure 7. Number of conduct report infractions by category.

Suspensions

The fall in the number of suspensions was remarkable. Even more notable was that six students received all of the suspensions. In past years, the number of suspensions had been rising; 45 was the highest. The 11 suspensions during the 2004-05 school year were issued for fighting, sexual harassment, and multiple conduct reports. Although the pink slips, conduct reports, and suspensions ranked high for fights or physical aggression, the number of incidences was still markedly reduced from that of the 2003-04 school year.

It was apparent that the bullying prevention and reduction project had had an impact on the students’ ability to avoid physical confrontation. Lessons 7, 9, 10, 11, 17, and 20
from the Monday Morning Meetings taught students how to handle conflicts in nonphysical ways (see Appendix A). Lesson 7 encourages the students to choral read self-talk that reinforces the notion that students can find other ways, that students can do better. Lesson 10 is entitled *20 Things to Do Instead of Hurting Someone Back*. Physical violence was the most straightforward to define, reduce, and eliminate.

*Figure 8*. Number of suspensions before and after treatment.

*The Colorado School Climate Survey (CSCS)*

The survey I chose was the Colorado School Climate Survey from “Bully Proofing Your School” (Garrity et al., 2000). I selected it primarily because of the recommendation it was given by the Center for Study and Prevention of Violence (2003) in Colorado, which evaluates and rates programs designed to reduce and prevent violent behavior, for example, Safe Schools, Youth and Guns, and Violence Against Women.
The survey was administered by the researcher in the third-, fourth-, and fifth-grade classrooms. Students in grades one and two were surveyed individually because of the reading level required to adequately respond. This researcher completed many of the individual surveys but also hired former student teachers to assist with the project. Teachers and support staff completed the surveys at a staff meeting, and parent surveys were sent via U.S. mail. The raffle of gift cards from Meijer stores were offered as incentives for the completion and return of the surveys.

The preliminary surveys were administered in the fall. The same survey was used again as a posttest in the spring. In the interim, all elements of the bullying prevention and reduction project had been implemented: a Restructured Disciplinary System, which included the pink slip and phone calls home; the Monday Morning Meetings; Silent Mentors; Classroom Meetings; Good News Postcards; and the Morning Greeting.

**Student Surveys**

The survey had four sections and subsections in the first two categories:

1. Has this happened to you? If so,
   (a) What did you do?
   (b) Who was it done by?
   (c) Who did you tell? and
   (d) Where did it happen?
2. Have you seen this happen to someone else? If so,
   (a) What did you do?
   (b) Who was it done by?
   (c) Who did you tell? and
   (d) Where did it happen?
3. How safe do you feel? and
4. What is your school like? (p. 54)
The students were classified as *low risk* if they indicated that the frequency of bullying behaviors that happened to them occurred never to one time per week. They were classified as *high risk* if their responses signified that the frequency of bullying behaviors occurred two or more times per week. *Low risk-witness or high-risk witness* denoted that the student saw the behavior happen to someone else.

Initially, the results of the student surveys were bewildering and disappointing. It seemed as if the pretest and posttest had become mixed up. The pretest appeared to show more positive behaviors by the students, whereas the posttest demonstrated a decline in appropriate actions and responses by the bystanders. For example, when asked to state if they were hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids, the high-risk students reported an 8% increase at the time of the posttest. The low-risk students showed a 5% increase in the number of times they hit, pushed, or kicked the kid back. The low-risk witnesses reported a 16% increase in the number of students they saw get hit, pushed, or kicked by someone else and a 16% increase in the number of times they saw kids not let someone join what they were doing (see Table 7).

As far as improvement, the low-risk students reported an 8% decrease in the number of incidences of being hit, pushed, or kicked and an 11% decrease in the number of times they were teased or called names. Low-risk students and high-risk students reported increases of 3% and 10%, respectively, in the action of ignoring or walking away from conflict. Also, both groups of students sought more help from adults in dealing with conflict (see Table 8).

This researcher believes that by raising the level of awareness about the bully
problem, students became more sophisticated in their scrutiny of one another’s behavior. The common language and definitions allowed them to be more critical observers, thus causing some of the survey data to appear distorted. Additionally, at the beginning of the school year, when the survey was administered, the students were just getting to know each other, and some students experienced a “honeymoon” period. This researcher would like to examine other survey instruments and understand more about this process in order to achieve a more accurate depiction of the “before and after.”

Table 7

The Colorado School Climate Survey for Students: Section 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Has this happened to you?</th>
<th>Low-risk students</th>
<th>High-risk students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During the past month:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I was hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids said mean things, teased me, or called me names</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids told stories about me that were not true</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids did not let me join in what they were doing</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>86%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids took things that belong to me</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids threatened to hurt me or take things</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked who performed the behaviors, a nearly 30% decrease of group action was reported by the low-risk and high-risk students alike. Actions committed by girls
girls held steady pretest and posttest, while actions initiated by boys increased as reported by both the low-risk and high-risk students. The playground was the main location for bully behaviors to transpire, with a 10% decrease in classroom occurrences (see Table 19).

Table 8

*The Colorado School Climate Survey for Students: Section 1a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If any of these happened to you (check all that apply):</th>
<th>Low-risk students</th>
<th>High-risk students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got help from an adult at school</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>81%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got help from another kid</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I hit, kicked or pushed the kid</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I told the kid to stop</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I told the kid I agreed with what he or she said about me</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I avoided the kid so I would not get hurt or teased again</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got help from my parents</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I ignored it or walked away</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I said mean things, teased, or called the kid names</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I tried to stop the kid by saying or doing something funny</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I said things to myself to help myself feel better</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did nothing</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The action performed by the target or victim that suggests avoiding the bully showed showed a decrease of 16% by the low-risk students and a 3% decrease by the high-risk
students. Lessons 13-17 in Appendix A recommend avoidance as a possible strategy for protection, but it is only one proposal; other tactics encourage the victim or target to stand up for him/herself or use a comeback. Clearly, the students did not choose avoidance as the primary means of solving conflicts with a bully. The students conveyed a decrease in incidences happening in the hallway and lunchroom as well as to and from school. Not only was the playground the main setting for disturbances to occur, both the low-risk and high-risk students report an increase of problems on the playground (see Table 9).

Table 9

*Colorado School Climate Survey: Sections 1b, 1c, and 1d*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was it done by?</th>
<th>Low-risk students</th>
<th>High-risk students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a girl</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a boy</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a group</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who did you tell?</th>
<th>Low-risk students</th>
<th>High-risk students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no one</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a friend</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an adult at school</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a parent</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did it happen?</th>
<th>Low-risk students</th>
<th>High-risk students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playground</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>84%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallways/lunchroom</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to and from school</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The second section of the survey explores the point of view of the witnesses and their perspectives of what they had observed. Once again, many of the results were more positive at the time of the pretest, which leads this researcher to note that as the level of awareness was raised, so was the students’ sensitivity to definitions and specific actions.

Table 10

*Colorado School Climate Survey: Section 2*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Have you seen this happen?</th>
<th>Low-risk witness</th>
<th>High-risk witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-risk witness = checked never to one time per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-risk witness = checked two or more times per week</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For the following, check only ONE box for each item.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>During the <em>past month:</em></td>
<td>Low-risk witness</td>
<td>High-risk witness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I saw someone get hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard kids say mean things, tease or call someone names</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>78%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard kids tell stories about someone that were not true</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I saw kids not let someone join in what they were doing</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>89%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I saw or heard that kids took things that belong to someone else</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>97%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard kids threaten to hurt someone or take things</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>93%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Upon being asked “What did you do?” regarding the incidences that were witnessed, the students reported doing less and helping less at the spring posttest, with the exception of “standing up to the bully.” In this case the low-risk witnesses demonstrated a 1% increase, and the high-risk witnesses showed a 9% increase in their willingness to stand
up to the kid who was hurting or teasing someone else. Students were encouraged to care about each other and to be positive bystanders instead of silent observers (Table 11).

Table 11

*Colorado School Climate Survey: Section 2a*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you do?</th>
<th>Low-risk witness</th>
<th>High-risk witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Post-test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I did nothing</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I asked the kid who was hurt/teased/left out to play with me</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I helped the kid who was hurt/teased/left out to get away</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I helped the kid come up with ideas about how to handle the problem</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got help from an adult at school</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stood up to the kid who was teasing or hurting the other kid</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talked to the kid who was hurt/teased/left out about how he/she felt</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The low-risk and high-risk witnesses agreed that the number of girls committing offenses had not changed, that the number of boys involved in offenses had decreased, and that offenders as groups had increased. The witnesses in both classifications declined to share what they knew with a friend or their parents to a greater degree. A lessening of breaches occurred in the classroom, the hallways and lunchroom, and on the way to and from school. The playground remained the prime location for problems (see Table 12).
Table 12

*Colorado School Climate Survey: Sections 2b, 2c, and 2d*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was it done by?</th>
<th>Low-risk witness</th>
<th>High-risk witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a girl</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a boy</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>54%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a group</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who did you tell?</th>
<th>Low-risk witness</th>
<th>High-risk witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no one</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a friend</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an adult at school</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a parent</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did it happen?</th>
<th>Low-risk witness</th>
<th>High-risk witness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playground</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallways/lunchroom</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to and from school</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 13 through 18 pose the following questions: “How safe do you feel?” and “What is your school like?” Both the low-risk and high-risk students and witnesses felt *very safe* in their classrooms (64%), followed by the bathrooms (43%), and the lunchroom (37%). The number of students who felt very safe in the classroom increased from the pretest to the posttest. Like other areas of the survey, most of the remaining categories show a decrease. For example, regarding before- or after-school activities,
the number of students indicating that they felt very safe dropped by 8%. Those going to and from school reported a 4% decrease in feeling very safe. Fewer low- and high-risk students and witnesses reported feeling very unsafe and scared on the posttest in each location except for the restroom. The improvements ranged from 1% to 5%.

The missing cases can be accounted for by students who did not participate in before- or after-school activities and by the lower elementary students, who have individual bathrooms within their classrooms.

Both the low- and high-risk students and witnesses pointed out that kids who misbehave take a lot of the teachers’ time. Between 13% and 17% of the respondents demonstrated an increase from the pretest to the posttest. The low-risk and high-risk students and witnesses reported that it is often true that teachers and staff help if they see someone being bullied, but in the grouping almost always/always true, there was a 9-12% decrease in the perception of teacher assistance.

The final six questions in the survey produced similar results for the pretest and posttest in the often true group. The almost always/always true group also shows results with fewer gaps than for some of the other questions but undoubtedly with decreases in positive outcomes on the posttest by 7-13%. When given the statement I am afraid to go to school, students and witnesses in both the low-risk and high-risk groups reported a 6-7% decrease in their fear from the pretest to the posttest.

Students and witnesses in the low-risk and high-risk groups who marked never/hardly ever true in response to When I’m upset, other kids try to comfort me or cheer me up indicated a 3-5% decrease from the pretest to the posttest.
Table 13

How Safe Do You Feel? Section 1

During the past month, this is how safe I felt in each of these places.

|                     | Pretest |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|---------------------|---------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                     | Very    | Unsafe               | Kind                 | Kind                 | Safe                 | Very                 | Missing              | Low Risk Students and Witnesses (checked 2 or more times) | Very                 | Unsafe               | Kind                 | Kind                 | Safe                 | Very                 | Missing              |
|                     | unsafe  | and scared           | of unsafe            | of safe              |                      | safe                 | cases                |                      | and scared           | of unsafe            | of safe              |                      |                      |                      |                      |
| 1%                  | 2%      | 5%                   | 10%                  | 19%                  | 63%                  | 2%                   | In my classroom      |                      | 1%                   | 6%                   | 2%                   | 8%                   | 19%                  | 64%                  | 5%                   |
| 9%                  | 4%      | 21%                  | 26%                  | 13%                  | 26%                  | 5%                   | On the playground    |                      | 8%                   | 10%                  | 23%                  | 23%                  | 24%                  | 13%                  | 5%                   |
| 3%                  | 1%      | 5%                   | 13%                  | 25% 5                | 53%                  | 3%                   | In the hallways and lunchroom |                      | 2%                   | 2%                   | 11%                  | 10%                  | 34%                  | 40%                  | 5%                   |
| 10%                 | 5%      | 11%                  | 15%                  | 14%                  | 45%                  | 4%                   | Going to and from school |                      | 8%                   | 14%                  | 12%                  | 14%                  | 15%                  | 38%                  | 7%                   |
| 2%                  | 3%      | 8%                   | 16%                  | 19%                  | 52%                  | 7%                   | In the bathroom/locker-room |                      | 7%                   | 6%                   | 6%                   | 10%                  | 28%                  | 43%                  | 5%                   |
| 6%                  | 4%      | 8%                   | 3%                   | 25%                  | 54%                  | 25%                  | At before- or after-school activities |                      | 3%                   | 3%                   | 11%                  | 8%                   | 25%                  | 29%                  | 4%                   |
### Table 14

**What Is Your School Like? Section 1**

Check the ONE box that best describes your school

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Never/hardly ever true</strong></td>
<td><strong>Never/hardly ever true</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes true</td>
<td>Sometimes true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often true</td>
<td>Often true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low-risk students and witnesses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Low-risk students and witnesses</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Missing cases</th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
<th>Missing cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never/hardly ever true</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often true</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>66%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never/hardly ever true</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes true</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often true</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Never/hardly ever true</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes true</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often true</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 15

*What Is Your School Like?  Section 2*

Check the ONE box that best describes your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never/hardly ever true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sometimes true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Often true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Risk Students and Witnesses</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school tries to make everyone feel included</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually play with someone at recess</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I’m upset, other kids try to comfort me or cheer me up</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like going to school</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid to go to school</td>
<td>75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people at this school are kind</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 16

**How Safe Do You Feel?**

During the past month, this is how safe I felt in each of these places (check only ONE).

<p>|                      | Pretest |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      | Posttest |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |                      |
|----------------------|---------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
|                      | 1%      | 3%                   | 6%                   | 10%                  | 21%                  | 59%                  | 1%                   | In the classroom     |                     |                      | 1%       | 7%                   | 3%                   | 8%                   | 17%                  | 64%                  | 5%                   |                     |
|                      | 11%     | 5%                   | 20%                  | 24%                  | 13%                  | 27%                  | 5%                   | On the playground    |                     |                      | 8%       | 10%                  | 24%                  | 21%                  | 25%                  | 13%                  | 5%                   |                     |
|                      | 4%      | 1%                   | 6%                   | 13%                  | 26%                  | 50%                  | 1%                   | In the hallways and lunchroom |                     |                      | 3%       | 3%                   | 11%                  | 11%                  | 32%                  | 40%                  | 5%                   |                     |
|                      | 12%     | 7%                   | 12%                  | 14%                  | 16%                  | 40%                  | 3%                   | Going to and from school |                     |                      | 8%       | 13%                  | 11%                  | 14%                  | 18%                  | 36%                  | 5%                   |                     |
|                      | 3%      | 4%                   | 10%                  | 14%                  | 21%                  | 49%                  | 8%                   | In the bathroom/locker-room |                     |                      | 6%       | 7%                   | 7%                   | 11%                  | 26%                  | 44%                  | 4%                   |                     |
|                      | 6%      | 5%                   | 9%                   | 3%                   | 25%                  | 52%                  | 18%                  | At before- or after-school activities |                     |                      | 4%       | 4%                   | 14%                  | 8%                   | 26%                  | 44%                  | 4%                   |                     |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never/hardly ever true</td>
<td>Sometimes true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other kids help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td>8% 31% 21% 40% 3%</td>
<td>28% 16% 24% 31% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids tell adults at school when other kids are being bullied or picked on</td>
<td>11% 22% 20% 47% 4%</td>
<td>14% 22% 24% 41% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone is alone at lunch or recess, others will invite him or her to join in</td>
<td>15% 25% 29% 32% 4%</td>
<td>18% 26% 28% 28% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids at this school encourage other kids to do the best they can at their schoolwork</td>
<td>9% 21% 29% 41% 4%</td>
<td>22% 20% 14% 45% 3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are clear rules at this school</td>
<td>10% 5% 14% 71% ---</td>
<td>6% 10% 16% 69% 4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers and staff help if they see someone bullied or picked on</td>
<td>1% 4% 9% 86% ---</td>
<td>1% 7% 18% 74% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids who misbehave take a lot of my teacher’s time</td>
<td>9% 14% 26% 51% 1%</td>
<td>10% 11% 11% 68% 5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults at this school care that the students do the best work they can</td>
<td>4% 9% 17% 70% 3%</td>
<td>8% 7% 23% 62% 4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 18

*What Is Your School Like? Section 2*

Check the ONE box that best describes your school.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High-risk students and witnesses</strong></td>
<td><strong>Never/hardly ever true</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>My school tries to make everyone feel included</strong></td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I usually play with someone at recess</strong></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>When I’m upset, other kids try to comfort me or cheer me up</strong></td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I like going to school</strong></td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>I am afraid to go to school</strong></td>
<td>74%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Most people at this school are kind</strong></td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parent Surveys

The results of the parent surveys were comparable to the student surveys, with the posttest results often appearing more positive than the pretest. At the same time, the pretest and the posttest individually followed a pattern of higher percentages in the never column with lower percentages in the column labeled 5 or more times (see Appendix L). For the question How safe is your child? some of the scores representing location in the very safe column declined from the pretest to the posttest, but the number of unmarked cells in the categories very unsafe and scared and unsafe and scared increased (see Appendix L).

For the question What is your school like? parents increased their scores regarding the valuing of parental involvement, the kindness of the people at school, and the satisfaction with having their child attend this school (see Appendix L).

Staff Surveys

When asked how often their students were hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids, the staff clearly noted that it happened less than 5 or more times a week. In fact, with the exception of one 6% score in the 5 or more times a week column, the pretest and the posttest were without marked cells for the question Has this happened to your students? The question Who was it done by? brought a 42% decrease in the number of staff who had marked girls in the pretest. There was a 3% increase in the number of boys committing infractions and a 5% increase in the number of groups being involved.

Under the question How safe are your students? there was a slight drop in the classroom category for very safe from the pretest to the posttest but an increase between 7% and 21% for all other categories in the very safe column (see Appendix M). What is
your school like? brought positive increases in all areas of the first portion of the table.

The continuation of the table demonstrates that 100% of the staff liked working at Kent Hills both at the time of the pretest and at the time of the posttest. The staff responses indicate a 20% increase in feeling safe at Kent Hills from the pretest to the posttest, bringing it up to 100%.
Chapter Five
Summary, Conclusions, Implications, and
Recommendations for Further Study

Summary

This study chronicled the assessment of the nature and extent of bullying among school children at an urban school. In addition, it recorded the story of the approaches used as interventions and instruction for the reduction and prevention of bullying. This researcher sought to address the following problems:

- The absence of programming for the reduction of bullying behaviors at the elementary school level despite research and newsworthy events that highlight the menacing nature of bullying.
- The absence of studies focusing exclusively on bullying.
- The need for programming that would result in fewer disciplinary referrals and would improve school climate.
- The need for programming that would be low cost, practical, and useable.

The purpose of the study was to assess and describe the bullying behaviors at Kent Hills Elementary School in the classroom, in the lunchroom, and on the playground and to implement a nearly cost-free line of attack to reduce and prevent the incidences of bullying.

The conceptual framework characterized the scope and sequence of the study, which utilized a pre- and postsurvey and data from the distribution of pink slips, conduct reports, and suspensions. Also, narratives from a descriptive field study recounted the Focus Group sessions, Monday Morning Meetings, classroom meetings, and all other elements that composed the anti-bullying campaign.
The basic premise was that a whole-school campaign against bullying would define bullying as an intentional act that could be controlled by the dedication of the staff’s, the parents’, and the students’ working together. The intervention strategies and the instructional program included the following components:

1. a restructured disciplinary system
2. increased supervision
3. classroom meetings
4. Monday Morning Meetings
5. morning greetings
6. a student reporting system
7. silent mentors
8. Good News postcards
9. Focus Groups

The staff supported the efforts of this researcher and participated in training so as to dispel myths, create awareness, and teach the principles of the bully/victim/bystander triad. Moreover, the staff worked with this researcher to develop the foundation and particulars of the program mechanisms. Much of the lineup that we initiated came from Davis’s model, which had a deliberate concentration on student and staff connections. Davis capitalized on the Olweus framework and built upon it by requiring clear, school-wide definitions of unacceptable behavior and consistently enforced consequences. He believed that if the adults at school modeled respectful behavior and held bullies responsible for their actions, then they could help bullies develop empathy, support the victim in meaningful ways, and empower the bystanders to take a stand against bullies (Davis 2003). The literature characterized the harmful effects of bullying among school children. The powerful residuals for the bully and the victim should provide the impetus for educators, parents, school boards, and communities to take action.
Conclusions

1. Creating a School Where Everyone Belongs: It was important to present a sketch of a vision to the staff at Kent Hills and then have them join in to complete the portrait of a school that was safe and orderly and relatively bully-free. The staff members were all faced with the same issues: increasing disciplinary problems, increased poverty, decreased parental involvement, and a decline in academic achievement. The vision was presented as a method of improving all aspects of the school climate. The deliberate nature of the program, the consistency of the disciplinary code, and the consequences and the high expectations for the students have become testimonials to the effectiveness of this endeavor. As this researcher writes this in the second year of the program (9-28-05), the binder for pink slips is nearly empty. Kent Hills School is not problem-free or completely bully-free, but this school is a place of joy where learning is rarely interrupted and the children play safely and happily on the playground, with caring adults nearby to help if necessary.

2. The Importance of Training: The teachers and support staff at Kent Hills Elementary School were trained by social worker Lori Parrish from Oakland County, Michigan. Ms. Parrish was responsible for bully prevention in the Oakland County Public Schools. The training enabled our staff to reflect upon their own feelings and biases about bullying. It also served to educate the staff on the vocabulary, definitions, seriousness of the issue, and the recommended tactics with which to combat the problem. Role playing and practice prepared the staff to take action. This researcher attended additional conferences in preparation for program leadership. They included the Kent County Coalition Against
Violence seminar with Dr. Marcia McEvoy, a psychologist from Grand Rapids, Michigan, who has become known as an specialist in bully prevention; the satellite teleconference of a wide range of professionals discussing the bullying epidemic; and the televised documentary “Bullied to Death.” The training component laid the foundation for the anti-bullying campaign.

3. The Need for a Comprehensive Program: The program that this researcher developed and implemented was multifaceted, and students, staff and community each played a role that would contribute to the success of the program. The shared vocabulary and definitions and raised awareness of the problem became factors in managing the problem. The nine elements that encompassed the array revealed a global plan that attacked the crisis of bullying among school children from every angle. The program afforded clear expectations, appropriate consequences, positive affirmation, parental involvement, relationship building between teachers and students, and student input and feedback.

4. The Principal as Leader: The principal leads the charge in the campaign to reduce and prevent bullying by facilitating the weekly meetings, enforcing the disciplinary code, supporting the efforts of the staff, and role modeling appropriate responses to conflict. The principal ties all of the components of the program together and takes the main burden of the work away from the teachers, who are constantly bombarded with new demands in curriculum and instruction. This is not to minimize the role of the teachers in the effort to decrease bullying. They must build relationships with their students, conduct classroom meetings, and hold students accountable for their actions.
The principal and the teachers present a powerful united front. With the principal at the forefront of the anti-bullying program, its influence reaches all members of the school community. As the leader of the building, the principal sets the stage for a culture of caring and acceptance and the refusal to tolerate unkind actions or words. The anti-bullying pledge promises to create a school where everyone belongs.

5. Other Schools Want to Join: After the initial year of the bullying prevention program, other principals began to inquire about the program. All were faced with similar issues and were searching for solutions, beginning with a safe and orderly environment. A study group was formed, and to date (Fall 2005), six urban schools in the Grand Rapids Public Schools have initiated this researcher’s bullying reduction and prevention campaign with positive early results. Our team meets regularly to discuss and refine the program.

*Implications*

1. The teaching of pragmatic social skills is critical for replacing inappropriate behaviors with acceptable ones. The social skills must be taught, reviewed, and appraised, just like reading or math. The bullying prevention and reduction program is like an academic pursuit. It must have longevity, remediation, and enrichment.

2. The students want clear and consistent rules and expectations. Regardless of how they protest to the contrary, the students find comfort in the sanctuary of known variables.

3. A restructured disciplinary system with a matching rubric and penalties is key to changing the dynamics of behavior in the school setting. Students have become
familiar with rubrics and understand that specific actions beget success or failure.

4. Relationship building serves to maintain a positive environment while eliminating negative actions. It also increases the level of caring so that students are reluctant to act in a way that displeases their teacher or hurts a fellow student.

Recommendations for Further Study

1. The district leadership should examine widespread use of an anti-bullying initiative that has the potential to create positive climate changes.

2. Schools should continue to study the impact of programs that reduce and prevent bullying behaviors. A long-term study could capture more extensive data.

3. Pre- and postsurveys for the study of the bullying problem should be examined and trial tested for efficiency and accuracy.

4. The connection between deceased incidences of bullying and academic achievement should be studied.

5. Correlations to other urban settings as well as suburban locations should be studied. Bullying is not limited by socioeconomic status, race, or class. Outcomes from a similar program in varied settings would be beneficial.

This study served to design and implement a program that would prevent and reduce bullying behavior and its impact on school children. The anecdotal records as well as the data review of conduct reports and suspensions point to a significant decline in bullying incidences, with the implication of improved school climate. Early positive and dramatic results would further support a district’s decision on
whether or not to implement such a program on a wide scale. This low-cost program would be well worth the effort of individual schools or school districts with a desire to change the culture of their schools and to contribute to the well-being of the students, the staff, and the community.
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Appendices
the following lessons are intended to be done in sequence; each skill builds upon the next

each lesson is accompanied by a sleeve or folder with the accompanying materials

read the lessons ahead of time; some of them require preparation

use the vocabulary that is most appropriate for your population; the lessons are not scribed so that you may use your own style to facilitate the lessons

use may want to include weekly birthdays and other events in your celebrations

you may need a minute or two each meeting to give feedback on the progress being made on playground, lunchroom, and classroom behavior

watch the clock carefully, especially in the beginning, you will not have time for long lectures, demonstrations, etc

the final six lessons are extra and optional; they can be interspersed throughout the year or can be used at the end of the first 20 lessons, any lessons may be repeated

“You as the principal are first and foremost the role model for your staff, students, and parents. They will observe your reactions, imitate your behavior, take your lead, and feel your warmth and compassion and pass it on to others. As for discipline, firmness with mutual respect and dignity should rule the day.”

Michele Coyne
Introduction:

- State your expectations for the *Monday Morning Meetings*
  1. come into the building at the bell
  2. hang up your coats; move directly into line
  3. move in an orderly fashion to the gymnasium
  4. come in quietly and sit on the floor in your assigned area
  5. all talking and noise must stop at designated signal

- All rise for the "Pledge of Allegiance" (be seated afterwards)

- Welcome students and staff; introduce new staff if you have not already done so (ie. flag raising ceremony)

- Give an introduction to *Monday Morning Meetings*
  1. Goal #1 will be to reduce and prevent bully behaviors.
  2. Goal #2 will be to learn about how victims or targets can protect themselves.
  3. Goal #3 will be to teach the bystanders to help the victims or targets.
  4. Each meeting will have a teaching point (principal will instruct).
  5. Each meeting will have celebrations (facilitated by principal; celebrations submitted by staff).
  6. Each meeting will have goal-setting (facilitated by principal; submitted by students - 2 goals per week)

- Point out the Anti-Bully Pledge; recite together (pledge to be reproduced on large posters and displayed in at least two areas of the gym)

- Encourage pride and applause for the meeting; dismissal
Lesson 2

The Bully:

- As the students are entering the gym and sitting down, hand out at random the pages of bully infractions; ask them to hold them face down until you call for them (in accompanying folder)

- Review expectations for the Monday Morning Meeting

- All rise for the "Pledge of Allegiance" (be seated)

- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together

- Talk for a minute or two about the bully
  1. bullies can be boys or girls - boys are usually physical; girls make others feel bad or will refuse to be a friend
  2. bullies: hurt, tease, make fun of, gossip about, or leave others out of games or friendships
  3. the most common form of bullying is teasing
  4. bullies are kids who need to feel powerful

- Have the students holding the "bully cards" to begin standing one at a time to read their card (you may have to read for some). Have the students walk up to the front of the gym with the cards. It is powerful to see them all together for the volume and variety of ways that kids bully others.

- Celebrations

- Goals

- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal
Appendix A (continued)

Lesson 3

The Victim/Target:

- All rise for the "Pledge of Allegiance" (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Remind the students of the bully infractions; announce where they are on display
- Talk for a minute or two about the victim/target
  
  1. explain that the person being hurt or teased is called the victim or target
  2. victims or targets are often unable to defend themselves
  3. victims or targets often get upset easily
- Produce the large poster regarding victims, have two students hold it at the front of the gym; principal reads the chart to students
- Celebrations

- Goals

- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

*Resource: "Victims" poster, page 88, *The Bully Free Classroom* by Beane*
Appendix A (continued)

Lesson 4

The Bystander:

- All rise for the "Pledge of Allegiance" (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Ask students to name some bully behaviors (30 seconds)
- Echo read the "victims" poster (use the first person version)
- Talk for a minute or two about the bystander
  1. about 85% of all students are bystanders
  2. The bystanders far outnumber the bullies
  3. bystanders often watch in silence as others are bullied; the bully often thinks the bystanders approve
- Figure out ahead of time about how many students would comprise the 15% of your students who bully others. Select that number of students ahead of time and have them stand at your request. Point out how many bystanders are left over.
- Brainstorm with the students - what can a bystander do to help?
  1. get help from an adult
  2. tell the bully to stop
  3. report to the principal (teacher) in your classroom “reporting box”
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal
Lesson 5

A Little Quiz:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Ask students to name some bully behaviors (30 seconds)
- Echo read the “victims” poster
- Have an overhead projector ready and use the quiz in the adjacent sleeve; call on individuals to answer or have students call out (you read your audience)
- After the quiz, put up the answer sheet and go over it with the students
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: True or False? Page 17, The Bully Free Classroom by Beane
Lesson 6

HA - HA - SO:

- All rise for the "Pledge of Allegiance" (be seated)

- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together

- Have six students hold the HA HA SO shields in various areas of the gym while you explain what each acronym stands for; give an example of each

- Present one shield to a classroom representative who comes up to the front of the gym (applause). Make a big deal of the protection it carries with it. Give each teacher a written explanation of the acronyms.

- Celebrations

- Goals

- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Lesson 7

Talk Sense to Myself:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Have a HA HA SO shield available; review the acronyms and give examples
- Put the “Talk Sense to Myself” transparency on the overhead; choral read the message. Have the cards copied, cut, and counted out into ziplock bags ahead of time - present one packet to a classroom representative who comes up to the front of the gym (applause).
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: "Talk Sense to Myself," Page 139, The Bully Free Classroom by Beane
Lesson 8

Appendix A (continued)

Review Session:

- All rise for the "Pledge of Allegiance" (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- What are bully behaviors? Quickly ask for 10-20 behaviors
- Echo read the "victims" poster
- Talk to a friend sitting next to you about HA HA SO for 30 seconds; what does it mean? Ask for a few responses.
- Choral read "Talk Sense to Myself"
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal
Lesson 9

Stop and Think:

• All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)

• Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together

• Echo read “Talk Sense to Myself” (no visual is necessary)

• Tell a friend sitting next to you what you will do next time you are about to hurt, tease, or name-call

• Show the students a large model of the “Stop and Think” symbol and talk about what that means

• Present the stop and think symbols to each classroom; have a classroom representative come up to receive the packet (applause)

• Celebrations

• Goals

• Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: Stop and Think, Page 140, The Bully Free Classroom by Beane
20 Things to Do Instead of Hurting Someone Back:

- All rise for the "Pledge of Allegiance" (be seated)

- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together

- Have a group of your older students at the front of the gym in a line holding the "20 Things..." Hold the microphone up to their mouths as they read the page.

- Celebrations

- Goals

- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: 20 Things To Do Instead Of Hurting Someone Back, page 33, *The Bully Free Classroom* by Beane
Lesson 11

What Should You Do?:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Put the “What Should You Do?” survey on the overhead. Decide how you want the students to respond (raise your hand, call it out, etc.)
- Put up the answer guide and make a brief comment on each answer. This may take two meetings.
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal


Appendix A (continued)
Lesson 12

Review Session:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Have a HA HA SO shield available; review the acronyms and give examples
- Choral read the “victims” poster
- Have the “Stop and Think” model available; review
- Echo read the “Talk Sense to Myself” bookmark; no visual is necessary
- Ask students to brainstorm what the bystander can do. Lead a discussion

Celebrations

Goals

- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal
Lesson 13

Bullies Are a Pain In the Brain; Do You Have A Bully Problem?
Part 1:

- All rise for the "Pledge of Allegiance" (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- **Part 1: overhead story reading**
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

*Resource: Bullies are a Pain in the Brain by Romain*
Bullies Are a Pain In the Brain – What Can You Do About Bullies? Part 2:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Part 2: overhead story reading
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

*Resource: Bullies are a Pain in the Brain by Romain*
Bullies Are a Pain In the Brain; Five Myths About Bullies; Part 3:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Part 3: overhead story reading
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: Bullies are a Pain in the Brain by Romain
Bullies Are a Pain In the Brain; Do's And Don'ts For Dealing With Bullies: Part 4:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Part 4: overhead story reading
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: Bullies are a Pain in the Brain by Romain
Bullies Are a Pain In the Brain; Are You A Bully? Part 5:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Part 5: overhead story reading
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: *Bullies are a Pain in the Brain* by Romain
Lesson 18

Review Session:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Have a HA HA SO shield available; review the acronyms and give examples
- Choral read the “victims” poster
- Have the “Stop and Think” model available; review
- Echo read the “Talk Sense to Myself” bookmark; no visual is necessary
- Ask students to brainstorm what the bystander can do. Lead a discussion
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal
Lesson 19

Ways to Stay Bully Free:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Review the HA HA SO shield
- Use chart paper or an overhead to brainstorm ways to be bully free
- Present prepared packets of the “Ways to Stay Bully Free” bookmarks; have a classroom representative come to the front of the gym (applause).

- Celebrations
- Goals

- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: Ways to Stay Bully Free, page 100, The Bully Free Classroom by Beane
Lesson 20

Are You a Bully?:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)

- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together

- Use the overhead projector to for “Are You a Bully” transparency. The students do not have to respond out loud, but should think quietly about their answers.

- Celebrations

- Goals

- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: Are You a Bully?, page 130, The Bully Free Classroom by Beane
Lesson 21

Getting Along the Best I Can:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Blow up the “Getting Along...” page(s) on a poster, overhead, or whiteboard; lead a discussion. Present a folder with copied pages for each classroom; complete and return them to you.
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: Getting Along the Best I Can, page 233, Bully Proofing Your School by Garrity et al.
Lesson 22

Bullying on Television:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)

- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together

- Lead a discussion about TV characters who model bullying all the time. Ask the students to help you by watching any TV program and filling in the “Bullying on TV” form; Ask teachers to follow up with a discussion after the papers are submitted.

- Celebrations

- Goals

- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: Bullying on TV, page 64, The Bully Free Classroom by Beane
Pushing Your Buttons and Skills to Disengage:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Use the overhead or a blown-up poster for “Pushing Your Buttons.” Lead a discussion about “buttons.” Ask the students to talk with the person next to them about what their “buttons” are. Talk about planning for the next time someone pushes your buttons and what you will do (skills to disengage).
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal
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Role Plays/Skits or Contests:

- All rise for the “Pledge of Allegiance” (be seated)
- Say the Anti-Bully Pledge together
- Use the role plays provided in the folder or create your own; these can be taught and practiced in advance by the principal or classroom teachers and performed at a Monday Morning Meeting
- Consider a poster, poetry or writing contest to increase awareness
- Celebrations
- Goals
- Congratulate students on their attention and participation, encourage applause; dismissal

Resource: Getting Along the Best I Can,” page 233, Bully Proofing Your School by Garrity et al.
Classroom Meeting:

1. Form a circle
   - Everyone can see everyone else
   - Class meetings are a different and special part of school

2. Compliments and appreciation
   - Compliment others for what they have done, not for what they wear
   - Learn how to receive compliments as well as to give them
   - Initially awkward, sincerity will take over with practice
   - Positives in the classroom will grow with this exercise

3. Create an agenda
   - Provide a notebook for agenda-setting
   - Set up an agenda-setting time and location
   - The agenda should be driven by the students

4. Develop communication skills
   - Learn how to listen and take turns
   - Use “I” statements

5. Learn about separate realities
   - Provide opportunities for students to learn empathy, tolerance, and compassion
   - Learn to understand and respect differences

6. Recognize reasons people do what they do
   - Undue attention (to keep people busy with me)
   - Revenge (to get even)
   - Assumed inadequacy (to be left alone)

7. Practice role-playing and brainstorming
   - Learn these skills through practice with sample agenda items
   - Learn problem-solving skills

8. Focus on nonpunitive solutions
   - Concentrate on solutions instead of punishments
   - Eliminate humiliation and punishment
Appendix C

**Discipline Rubric:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Teasing:</strong> name calling, insulting, or other behavior that would hurt other’s feelings or make them feel bad about themselves</th>
<th><strong>Exclusion:</strong> starting rumors, telling others not to be friends with someone, or other actions that would cause someone to be without friends</th>
<th><strong>Physical Contact:</strong> Hitting, pushing, grabbing, kicking, tripping <strong>Aggressive Play:</strong> Running, pushing, wrestling, fake fighting</th>
<th><strong>Bystander Involvement:</strong> Encouraging or acting upon other students’ inappropriate behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Disruptive Behavior:</strong> any action that interferes with the learning of others students</td>
<td><strong>Disrespectfulness:</strong> Defiance, attitude, uncooperativeness</td>
<td><strong>Disregard for Safety Rules:</strong> Inappropriate use of playground equipment</td>
<td><strong>Profanity:</strong> cuss words, obscene words or gestures</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Consequences for pink slips:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>First Time</strong></th>
<th><strong>Second Time</strong></th>
<th><strong>Third Time</strong></th>
<th><strong>Intervention</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>One (1) time out at lunch recess; <em>student calls home</em></td>
<td>Two (2) time outs at lunch recess; <em>student calls home</em></td>
<td>Three (3) time outs at lunch recess; <em>student calls home</em></td>
<td>Staff and parents meet; behavior plan may be indicated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*More severe behavior including fighting, sexual harassment, cheating, stealing, or vandalism will result in a conduct report or a suspension.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instead of <strong>Teasing:</strong> use friendly and kind words when playing with others</th>
<th>Instead of <strong>Exclusion:</strong> include other classmates in your play and study groups; try to make others feel special and wanted</th>
<th>Instead of <strong>Physical Contact:</strong> Give a high five or shake hands; solve problems by talking it out or walking away</th>
<th>Instead of <strong>Negative Bystander Involvement:</strong> Stand up for anyone who is being teased or hurt; get adult help</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Instead of Disruptive Behavior:</strong> pay attention to the teacher, listen, and follow directions; do the right thing without being told</td>
<td><strong>Instead of Disrespectfulness:</strong> Talk to grown-ups and other students in a kind and respectful manner; talk in a soft voice without anger or yelling</td>
<td><strong>Instead of Disregard for Safety Rules:</strong> be safe by using the play equipment correctly, walk in the halls</td>
<td><strong>Instead of Profanity:</strong> use words that are not hurtful or mean, but kind, caring, and friendly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix E

GRAND RAPIDS PUBLIC SCHOOLS
CONDUCT REPORT

Student's Name ___________________________ Date __________________
Teacher's Name ___________________________ Grade __________________
School __________________ __________________ Reported by __________________
==========================================================================
Your child was given this Conduct Report today by one of our staff mem
The unacceptable behavior(s) is/are listed below:

LEVEL II ACTS OF MISCONDUCT

____ Throwing objects (snowballs, stones, etc.)
____ Leaving school grounds without permission
____ Using or displaying profane, obscene language, gestures or materials
____ Harassing other students
____ Cheating
____ Disruptive behavior
____ Theft/Vandalism
____ Falsifying information (behavior potentially dangerous e.g., falsifying a note)
____ Fighting, pushing, intentionally hurting other student
____ Failure to cooperate with school personnel (leaving the classroom without permission, etc.)
____ Disrespect for rightful authority
____ False activation of fire alarm
____ Other __________________

Description of Incident: _____________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Action Taken: _______________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Student Corrective Plan: _____________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________
____________________________________________________________________

Occurrence: 1st __, 2nd __, 3rd __, 4th (Out-Of-School Suspension) __

____________________________________________________________________
Teacher's signature __________________ Parent/Guardian signature ___________ Principal's signature __________________

Please discuss the above behavior with your child. Sign and return the yellow copy to school. Working together is the key to having a successful school. If you have any questions, please call your school.

== COPIES: White - Principal
Yellow - Parent/Guardian signs and returns to school
Pink - Parent/Guardian personal copy
Gold - Teacher ==
KENT HILLS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

☐ Playground Communication to Teacher
☐ Classroom Incident Report

Date___________ AM___ Lunch___ PM___

Pink Slip # 1 2 3
(equals # of time-outs)

Teacher_________________ Student___________________

☐ Teasing ☐ Disruptive Behavior ☐ Disrespectfulness
☐ Exclusion ☐ Abuse of Equipment ☐ Profanity
☐ Aggressiveness/Fake Fighting ☐ Hitting/Kicking/
☐ Bystander Involvement ☐ Pushing/Tripping

Reported by________________________

White Copy - Office Yellow Copy - Teacher Pink Copy - Student/Parent
Think-about-it form

Name___________________________

Date________________________

What did you do? Start with “I.” Tell me later what the other student did.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

What was wrong with that behavior? Who did you hurt? How do you know you hurt them?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

What problem were you trying to solve? Did you want attention? Did you want to be left alone? Were you already mad about something else?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

Next time you have a problem, how will you solve it without hurting anyone? List three ways.

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
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Good News from Kent Hills...

Good News from Kent Hills...

Good News from Kent Hills...

Good News from Kent Hills...
Appendix I

10 STEPS TO BUILDING SCHOOLS WHERE EVERYONE BELONGS

**RULE:** Treat each other with respect: too vague

1. Establish clearly defined school wide expectations
   - Eg. No teasing. Teasing is name-calling, starting rumors, using gestures...

2. Use predictable and escalating consequences for aggression
   - Use planned, rubric-based consequences

Avoid anger and frustration

3. Maintain a positive emotional tone
   - Model friendly and respectful communication

4. Acknowledge positive actions
   - Be specific and descriptive

Threats, lectures and anger do not work

5. Opportunities for aggressive youth to think about their actions
   - Strengthen conscience
   - Find other ways to meet needs

85% of the students watch silently

6. Develop a peer climate
   - Bystanders discourage bullying
   - Peers befriend targets

7. Protect targets and bystanders
   - Keep them safe by enforcing consequences

8. Reverse feelings of self-blame
   - Targets need to feel included and experience their strengths

9. Help targets build friendships
   - Encourage peers to reach out in friendship

10. Build on the strengths of your community
    - Track improvements
    - Recognize achievements
### Appendix J

**Handout 3-8**

**Colorado School Climate Survey**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never</th>
<th>less than 1 time per week</th>
<th>1 time per week</th>
<th>2-4 times per week</th>
<th>5 or more times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I was hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids said mean things, teased me, or called me names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids told stories about me that were not true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids did not let me join in what they were doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids took things that belong to me</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids threatened to hurt me or take things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Has This Happened to You?

For the following, check only **ONE** box for each item.

If any of these happened to you (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you do?</th>
<th>I got help from an adult at school</th>
<th>I got help from my parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I hit, kicked, or pushed the kid</td>
<td>I ignored it or walked away</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I told the kid to stop</td>
<td>I tried to stop the kid by saying or doing something funny</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I told the kid I agreed with what he or she said about me</td>
<td>I said things to myself to help myself feel better</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I avoided the kid so I would not get hurt or teased again</td>
<td>I did nothing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J (continued)

HANDOUT 3-8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was it done by?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a boy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did it happen?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallways/lunchroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to and from school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bathroom/locker room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before or after school activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who did you tell?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an adult at school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have You Seen This Happen?

For the following, check only ONE box for each item.

(Check the box ONLY if the item happened to someone else (not to you)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the past month:</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>less than 1 time per week</th>
<th>1 time per week</th>
<th>2–4 times per week</th>
<th>5 or more times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I saw someone get hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard kids say mean things, tease, or call someone names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard kids tell stories about someone that were not true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I saw kids not let someone join in what they were doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I saw or heard that kids took things that belong to someone else</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I heard kids threaten to hurt someone or take things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If you heard or saw any of these things happen (check all that apply):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What did you do?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I did nothing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I asked the kid who was hurt/ teased/ left out to play with me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I helped the kid who was hurt/ teased/ left out to get away</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I helped the kid come up with ideas about how to handle the problem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I got help from an adult at school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I stood up to the kid who was teasing or hurting the other kid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I talked to the kid who was hurt/ teased/ left out about how he/she felt</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix J (continued)

HANDOUT 3-8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who was it done by?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a girl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a boy</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a group</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did it happen?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playground</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallways/lunchroom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to and from school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bathroom/locker room</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before or after school activity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who did you tell?</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>no one</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a friend</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an adult at school</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a parent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bus driver</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>other</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How Safe Do You Feel?

During the past month, this is how safe I felt in each of these places (check only ONE box for each):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very unsafe &amp; scared</th>
<th>unsafe &amp; scared</th>
<th>kind of unsafe</th>
<th>kind of safe</th>
<th>safe</th>
<th>very safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In my classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the hallways and lunchroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to and from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the bathroom/locker room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>At before or after school activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Is Your School Like?

Check the ONE box that best describes you/your school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never/hardly ever true</th>
<th>sometimes true</th>
<th>often true</th>
<th>almost always/always true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The other kids help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids tell adults at school when other kids are being bullied or being picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone is alone at lunch or recess, others will invite him or her to join in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids at this school encourage other kids to do their best and they can at their schoolwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix J (continued)

#### HANDOUT 3-8 (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never/hardly ever true</th>
<th>sometimes true</th>
<th>often true</th>
<th>almost always/always true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are clear rules at our school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers and staff help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids who misbehave take a lot of my teacher's time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults at this school care that the students do the best schoolwork they can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My school tries to make everyone feel included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I usually play with someone at recess</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When I'm upset, other kids try to comfort me or cheer me up</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like going to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am afraid to go to school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people at this school are kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grade: ___________  I am a: Boy ☐  Girl ☐**

**I usually go to and from school by:** (check only one)

- walking
- bike
- car
- bus

**I am:**

(check all that apply)

- Asian
- African American
- Hispanic
- Native American
- White

**Other: ____________________

© 1999 by Carry, Jens, Porter, Sager, and Short-Camilli
Appendix J (continued)

**Handout 3-9**
Colorado School Climate Survey

School __________________________  Code __________________________
Date ____________________________

**Elementary School Parent Report**

This set of questions asks you to tell about your child’s school and things that may or may not have happened to him or her at school. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer the questions to show what you think about your child’s school.

**Has This Happened to Your Child?**
For the following, check only ONE box for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the past month:</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>less than 1 time per week</th>
<th>1 time per week</th>
<th>2–4 times per week</th>
<th>5 or more times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My child was hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids said mean things, teased, or called my child names</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stories were told about my child that were not true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids did not let my child join in what they were doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids took things that belong to my child</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other kids threatened to hurt my child or take things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any of these happened to your child (check all that apply):

**Who was it done by?**
- a girl
- a boy
- a group

**Who did your child tell?**
- no one
- a friend
- an adult at school
- a parent
- bus driver
- other

**Where did it happen?**
- classroom
- playground
- hallways/lunchroom
- going to and from school
- bathroom/locker room
- before or after school activity
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HANDOUT 3-9 (continued)

How Safe Is Your Child?
During the past month, this is how safe I felt my child was in each of these places (check only ONE box for each):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>very unsafe &amp; scared</th>
<th>unsafe &amp; scared</th>
<th>kind of unsafe</th>
<th>kind of safe</th>
<th>safe</th>
<th>very safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the hallways and lunchroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to and from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In the bathroom/locker room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

What Is Your Child’s School Like?
Check the ONE box that best describes your child’s school experience:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>never/hardly ever true</th>
<th>sometimes true</th>
<th>often true</th>
<th>almost always/always true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The other kids help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids tell teachers when other kids are being bullied or picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone is alone at lunch or recess, others will invite him or her to join in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My child’s school tries to make everyone feel included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids at this school encourage other kids to do the best they can at their schoolwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a consistent disciplinary policy at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers and staff help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids who misbehave take a lot of the teacher’s time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrators support teachers in dealing with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults at this school care that the students do the best schoolwork they can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parental involvement is valued by this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like having my child at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people at this school are kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Elementary School Staff Report

This set of questions asks you to tell about your school and things that may or may not have happened at this school. There are no right or wrong answers. Please answer the questions to show what you think about your school.

**Has This Happened to Your Students?**

For the following, check only ONE box for each item.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>During the past month:</th>
<th>never</th>
<th>less than 1 time per week</th>
<th>1 time per week</th>
<th>2–4 times per week</th>
<th>5 or more times per week</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students were hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students said mean things, teased, or called other children by name</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students told stories about other students that were not true</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students did not let other students join in what they were doing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students took things that belong to other students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students threatened to hurt other students or take things</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If any of these happened to a student (check all that apply):

**Who was it done by?**

- a girl
- a boy
- a group

**Who did the child tell?**

- no one
- a friend
- an adult at school
- a parent
- bus driver

**Where did it happen?**

- classroom
- playground
- hallways/lunchroom
- going to and from school
- bathroom/locker room
- before or after school activity
Appendix J (continued)

**HANDOUT 3-10 (continued)**

**How Safe Are Your Students?**

During the past month, this is how safe I felt students were in each of these places (check only ONE box for each):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>very unsafe &amp; scared</th>
<th>unsafe &amp; scared</th>
<th>kind of unsafe</th>
<th>kind of safe</th>
<th>safe</th>
<th>very safe</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>On the playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the hallways and lunchroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Going to and from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in the bathroom/locker room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**What Is Your School Like?**

Check the ONE box that best describes this school:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>never/hardly ever true</th>
<th>sometimes true</th>
<th>often true</th>
<th>almost always/always true</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Other kids help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids tell teachers when other kids are being bullied or picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If students are alone at lunch or recess, others will invite them to join in</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids at this school encourage other kids to do the best they can at their schoolwork</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school tries to make everyone feel included</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a consistent disciplinary policy at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers and staff help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who misbehave take a lot of my time</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The administrators help me in dealing with students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teachers respect each other and try to work together</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults at this school care that the students do the best schoolwork they can</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Most people at this school are kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like working at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at this school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Informed Consent for Bullying Research Project

Dear Parents and Guardians:

I am a doctoral student at Eastern Michigan University. I want to conduct research at Kent Hills Elementary School with the purpose of studying bullies, victims, and bystanders. I will conduct a pre and post survey to determine if anti-bullying interventions that I implement are effective. In addition, I would like to conduct interviews with individual students and small groups. This research study has the capacity to benefit the students, staff, and parents of Kent Hills School by reducing and preventing the incidences of bullying and by improving school climate.

This study will take place during the second semester of the 2004-05 school year. Student participation in the study is voluntary. If a research activity takes place in the classroom and your child does not wish to participate, an alternative activity will be provided. Interviews with individuals and small groups will be held only during nonacademic class time. The only foreseeable risk of this project may be the discomfort of the participants as they reflect upon their own behavior.

An orientation meeting will be held at the start of the semester to answer questions you may have. At the conclusion of the study, I will hold a meeting to discuss my findings. No student names will be used at any time during public discussions. During the research, student names will be coded for my organizational purposes only.

If you have additional questions about my research project during the course of the study you may contact Dr. Helen Ditzhazy at Eastern Michigan University (734) 487-0255, Dr. Julie Chlebo at Grand Valley State University (616) 331-6669, or Dr. Walter DeBoer at the Grand Rapids Public Schools, (616) 819-2000.

My child___________________________may participate in the research study conducted by Principal Michele Coyne as it relates to bullies, victims, and bystanders in class, in the lunchroom and on the playground and at Kent Hills Elementary School.

I understand that my child may withdraw from the study at any time and that their privacy will be respected by assigned numbers for student identification. The research project will last for the second semester of the 2004-05 school year. Participation in the focus groups or interviews is voluntary. Students may withdraw at any time without penalty.

My child___________________________may not participate in the research study conducted by Principal Michele Coyne. I understand that there will be no consequences for refusing to participate.

Parent/Guardian Signature____________________________  Date______________

This research has been reviewed and approved by the EMU UHSRC. If you have questions on the approval process, please contact either Dr. Patrick Melia or Dr. Steven Pernecky at (734) 487-0379.
Has This Happened to Your Students?

For the following, check the ONE box for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never Less than 1 time per week 1 time per week 2-4 times per week 5 or more times per week Missing Cases</td>
<td>Kent Hills Staff Never Less than 1 time per week 1 time per week 2-4 times per week 5 or more times per week Missing Cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
<td>7% 27% 33% 33% --- 6%</td>
<td>Students were hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students said mean things, teased, or called names</td>
<td>6% 31% 13% 44% 6% ---</td>
<td>Students said mean things, teased, or called names</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students told stories about other kids that were not true</td>
<td>6% 50% 38% 6% --- ---</td>
<td>Students told stories about other kids that were not true</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students did not let other students join in what they were doing</td>
<td>13% 38% 38% 13% --- ---</td>
<td>Students did not let other students join in what they were doing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students took things that belong to other students</td>
<td>31% 31% 25% 13% --- ---</td>
<td>Students took things that belong to other students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students threatened to hurt others or take things</td>
<td>25% 50% 13% 13% --- ---</td>
<td>Students threatened to hurt others or take things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who was it done by?</td>
<td>Staff</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a girl</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a boy</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a group</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who did the child tell?</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no one</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a friend</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an adult at school</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a parent</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did it happen?</th>
<th>Staff</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playground</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallways/lunchroom</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to and from school</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bathroom or locker room</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before or after school activity</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How Safe Are Your Students?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th></th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very unsafe and scared</td>
<td>Unsafe and scared</td>
<td>Kind of unsafe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the classroom</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>On the playground</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the hallways and lunch room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Going to and from school</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In the bathroom/locker room</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>At before or after school activities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

In the classroom
---

On the playground
---

In the hallways and lunch room
---

Going to and from school
---

In the bathroom/locker room
---

At before or after school activities
---
### What Is Your School Like?

Check the ONE Box That Best Describes Your School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never/hardly never true</td>
<td>Miss cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Some times true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Often true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Almost always/Always true</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The other kids help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids tell adults at school when other kids are being bullied or picked on</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone is alone at lunch or recess, others will invite him or her to join in</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids at this school encourage other kids to do the best they can at their schoolwork</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school tries to make everyone feel included</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers and staff help if they see someone bullied or picked on</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a consistent discipline policy at this school</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults at this school care that the students do the best work they can</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Is Your School Like? (CONTINUED)

Check the ONE Box That Best Describes Your School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never/hardly ever true</td>
<td>Kent Hills Staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students who misbehave take a lot of my time</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some time true</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students who miss cases</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some time true</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Teachers respect each other and try to work together</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some time true</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Most people at this school are kind</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some time true</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like working at this school</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some time true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe at this school</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some time true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Almost always/always true</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing cases</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Has This Happened to Your Child?

For the following, check the ONE box for each item:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Kent Hills Parents</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Never</td>
<td>Less than 1 time per week</td>
<td>1 time per week</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students were hit, pushed, or kicked by other kids</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students said mean things, teased, or called names</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students told stories about other kids that were not true</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students did not let other students join in what they were doing</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students took things that belong to other students</td>
<td>74%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students threatened to hurt others or take things</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who was it done by?</td>
<td>Parents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
<td>Posttest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a girl</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a boy</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a group</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Who did the child tell?</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no one</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a friend</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an adult at school</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a parent</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Where did it happen?</th>
<th>Parents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>classroom</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>playground</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>hallways/lunchroom</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>going to and from school</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bathroom or locker room</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>before or after school activity</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## How Safe Is Your Child?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very unsafe and scared</td>
<td>Unsafe and scared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|                        | Very unsafe and scared | Unsafe and scared | Kind of unsafe | Kind of safe | Safe | Very safe | Miss cases |
|------------------------| 3%      | ---      | 1%        | 12%        | 39%  | 45%  | 3%        |
|                        | 3%      | 3%       | 10%       | 25%        | 37%  | 22%  | 4%        |
|                        | 1%      | 3%       | 3%        | 13%        | 48%  | 32%  | 3%        |
|                        | 2%      | ---      | 13%       | 12%        | 32%  | 41%  | 4%        |
|                        | 2%      | 2%       | 14%       | 53%        | 30%  | 7%   | ---       | In the bathroom/locker room |

**In the classroom** --- 

**On the playground** 2% --- 12% 14% 50% 21% ---

**In the hallways and lunch room** --- --- --- 7% 64% 29% ---

**Going to and from school** 2% 2% --- 19% 38% 38% ---

**In the bathroom/locker room** 2% 2% --- 7% 61% 27% 2%
## What Is Your School Like?

Check the ONE Box That Best Describes Your School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kent Hills Parents</th>
<th>Never/ hardly ever true</th>
<th>Some times true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Almost always/ Always true</th>
<th>Missing cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The other kids help if they see someone being bullied or picked on</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids tell adults at school when other kids are being bullied or picked on</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If someone is alone at lunch or recess, others will invite him or her to join in</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kids at this school encourage other kids to do the best they can at their schoolwork</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This school tries to make everyone feel included</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The teachers and staff help if they see someone bullied or picked on</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a consistent discipline policy at this school</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adults at this school care that the students do the best work they can</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never/ hardly ever true</th>
<th>Some times true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Almost always/ Always true</th>
<th>Missing cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
What Is Your School Like? (CONTINUED)

Check the ONE Box That Best Describes Your School:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never/hardly ever true</th>
<th>Sometime true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Almost always/always true</th>
<th>Missing cases</th>
<th>Kent Hills Parents</th>
<th>Never/hardly ever true</th>
<th>Some time true</th>
<th>Often true</th>
<th>Almost always/always true</th>
<th>Missing cases</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>Students who misbehave take a lot of the teacher’s time</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>The administrators helps teachers in dealing with students</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Parental involvement is valued at this school</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>Most people at this school are kind</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>I like having my child at this school</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>