ABSTRACT

BULLYING EDUCATION AND PREVENTION PROGRAM

A GRANT PROPOSAL PROJECT

By

Melissa Tapia

May 2015

Bullying is a serious problem that affects youth from all backgrounds and can negatively affect their development. The purpose of this project was to develop a program, identify potential funding resources, and write a grant to fund a bullying prevention program at Woodrow Wilson Middle School in Pasadena Unified School District. The proposed program will take a school-wide approach and implement Second Step, an evidence-based program to prevent bullying. Students will participate in classroom activities to build empathy, communication, bullying prevention, emotion management, and prevent substance abuse. Some enhancements such as assemblies, parent trainings, and incentives will be added to the program to promote collaboration between the school and the home and actively engage all of the systems related to bullying. Implications for social work practice are discussed. The actual submission and/or funding of the grant were not required for the successful completion of this project.

BULLYING EDUCATION AND PREVENTION PROGRAM

A GRANT PROPOSAL PROJECT

A THESIS

Presented to the School of Social Work

California State University, Long Beach

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Social Work

Committee Members:

Julie O'Donnell, Ph.D. (Chair)
Steve Wilson, Ph.D.
Mimi Kim, Ph.D.

College Designee:

Nancy Meyer-Adams, Ph.D.

By Melissa Tapia

BSW, 2012, California State University, Long Beach

May 2015

UMI Number: 1586171

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS
The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript
and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed,
a note will indicate the deletion.

UMI 1586171

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.
All rights reserved. This work is protected against
unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code

ProQuest LLC.
789 East Eisenhower Parkway
P.O. Box 1346
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The most absolute appreciation to my amazing husband, Matthew De Luna, who went to work every day and worked so hard to allow me to dedicate myself to my studies. I am truly grateful for the opportunity you have given me and your patience and understanding during the late nights and long hours. You supported, encouraged, and loved me unconditionally through both the best and worst of times. Thank you for always believing in me and encouraging my passion for social work. I could not have done this without you, I love you.

Para mis padres Arturo y Maria Tapia, estoy muy agradecida por las oportunidades que me han dado en seguir mi pasión y por el apoyo que siempre me han dado, en todas las formas posibles. Su apoyo y orientación constante me dio la fuerza para superar los obstáculos y seguir una educación mas alta. Gracias por crear oportunidades para mí que ustedes nunca tuvieron; sus esfuerzos y dedicación a sus hijos nunca fueron o seran despreciados. Les debo mucho de mi éxito a ustedes, mis modelos, ejemplos, y heroes.

To my siblings, Jennifer Tapia, Arthur Tapia II, Israel Tapia, and Michelle Tapia, who showered me in unconditional love and support throughout my life. Thank you for always being my biggest supporters and best friends. You all taught me valuable lessons in life, shaped the person I am today, and always kept me humble. You had more of an impact in my life than you will ever know. I am grateful to God for giving me such an amazing family to share my life and milestones with.

With sincere gratitude to my in-laws, The De Luna Family, who welcomed me into their home and provided me with encouragement, understanding, and love every day. I am short of words to really express how grateful I am to be a part of your family and how thankful I am for the support you all have always given me. This past year has been a tough journey but you always made sure I was taken care of in every way possible. I am forever appreciative for all that you have done for Matthew and I.

To my advanced standing cohort, especially Reyneida Felix, Marisol Dominguez, Cristina Alcaraz, Tibisay Cordova, Jonathan Bibriesca, and Orizbeth Cortez, thanks for making this ride worthwhile and for cheering me on from the very beginning. I truly appreciate our friendships and all the experiences we went through together. I am walking out of this program not only with a wealth of knowledge but also some amazing new friendships.

A very special thanks to my thesis advisor, Julie O'Donnell, Ph.D., who brought out work from me that I never thought was possible. You challenged and guided me to produce my best work and believed in me when I did not. Thank you for all the challenges, lessons, and encouragement. I would also like to thank my committee members, Mimi Kim, Ph.D., and Steve Wilson, Ph.D. I am grateful to have had the pleasure of having such a great committee with an abundance of knowledge.

Most importantly, I thank God for the amazing blessings over the years and the life he has given me to live.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Page

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS iii

LIST OF TABLES viii

CHAPTER

1. INTRODUCTION 1

Potential Effects of Bullying 2
School-Based Bullying Prevention Programs 3
Purpose of the Project 4
Woodrow Wilson Middle School 4
Multicultural Relevance 5
Social Work Relevance 7

2. LITERATURE REVIEW 8

Definitions of Bullying 8
Types of Bullying 9
Cyber-Bullying 10
Participants in Bullying 11
Potential Consequences of Bullying 12
Bullying and Mental Health 13
Bullying and Suicide Risk Behaviors 14
Bullying and School Performance 15
Bullying and Self-Esteem 16
Potential Long-Term Effects of Bullying 18
Childhood Bullying and Illegal Behaviors in Adulthood 18
Childhood Bullying and Adult Employment and Education 19
Childhood Bullying and Adult Mental Health and General Health 20
Characteristics of Bullies and Victims 21
Familial Factors 22
Race and Ethnicity 23
Sexual Orientation 24
Children with Disabilities 25
School-Based Responses to Bullying 26
Best Practices in Bullying Prevention 26

CHAPTER Page

Early Intervention: Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP) 27
Second Step 29
Safe Schools Ambassadors Program 32
Steps to Respect 33
PeaceBuilders 35
Conclusion 37

3. METHODS 38

Identification of Potential Funding Sources 38
Joseph Drown Foundation 39
Target Population 40
Sources for Needs Assessment 41
Consultation with School and School District 42

4. GRANT PROPOSAL 43

Description of Organization 43
Woodrow Wilson Middle School 44
Current Programs 45
Statement of Need 46
Program Description 47
Program Objectives 48
Objective 1 48
Objective 2 49
Objective 3 50
Objective 4 51
Objective 5 51
Program Evaluation 51
Budget Narrative 53
Personnel 53
Equipment 53
Program Supplies 54
Office Supplies 54
Incentives 54
Evaluation 54

5. DISCUSSION 55

Lessons Learned 55
Literature Review 55
Identification of Funding Sources 56
Grant Writing 57
Budgeting 58

CHAPTER Page

Implications for Social Work Practice 59

REFERENCES 61

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE Page

1. Line-Item Budget 52

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Bullying occurs when an individual is repeatedly victimized by the negative actions by one or more peers (Olweus, 1997). There are multiple types of bullying including physical, verbal, and cyber-bullying (Bannik, Broeren, van de Looij–Jansen, de Waart, & Raat, 2014; Ockerman , Kramer, & Bruno, 2014). In 2009, 28% of students, in the United States, ages 12 through 18, reported they were bullied at school and about 6% had experienced cyber-bullying either on or off school grounds (U.S Department of Education, Institute of Education Sciences [IES], 2011). Similarly, a Metro West Massachusetts survey found one-third of high school students identified themselves as victims of bullying (Schneider, O'Donnell, Stueve, & Coulter, 2012). Among these victims, 16% were victims of school bullying, 9% experienced both school and cyber-bullying, and 6% indicated they were victims of cyber-bullying only (Schneider et al., 2012). It is likely bullying statistics underestimate the true extent of the problem as research suggests as much as 65% of bullying incidents go unreported (IES, 2011).

Research has shown that bullying occurs at all grade levels but peaks during middle school, a time when adolescents are developing physically, psychologically and socially (Borowsky, Taliaferro, & Mcmorris, 2013; Carney & Merrell, 2001; Nansel, Overpeck, Pilla, Ruan, Simons-Morton , & Scheidt, 2001). The most frequent targets of bullying tend to be children and adolescents who differ from their peers by sexual

orientation, the presence of disabilities, or other factors that may set them apart. Students may also be more likely to be bullied based on familial factors such as family conflict (Borowsky et al., 2013; Estell, Farmer, & Cairns, 2007; Fite, Evans, Cooley, & Rubens, 2014; Ockerman et al., 2014; Schneider et al., 2012). Bullies and victims are not the only parties involved in and impacted by bullying. Bystanders, those students who witness bullying but do not participate, may also be affected by the experience (Olweus & Limber, 2010; Rigby, 2007).

Potential Effects of Bullying

Youth who become victims of bullying may face negative consequences such as low self-esteem, decreased school performance and attendance, and mental health challenges (Borowsky et al., 2013; Chang, Lee, Chiu, Hsi, Huang, & Pan, 2013; Landstedt & Persson, 2014). Children who are victimized are also at increased risk for depressive thoughts associated with their bullying experiences, which can potentially lead to suicidal ideation (Kitagawa, Shimodera, Togo, Okazaki, Nishida, & Sasaki, 2014; Landstedt & Persson, 2014). Many youth attempt to cope with bullying by not attending school due to fear of being victimized, which can negatively impact their attendance and academic achievement (Feldman, Ojanen, Gesten, Smith-Schrandt, Brannick, Totura, Alexander, Scanga, & Brown, 2014; Kowalski & Limber, 2013).

Unfortunately, the negative impact of bullying can extend beyond childhood, contributing to negative outcomes throughout youth and adulthood for both victims and bullies. Victims and bullies can both experience challenges resulting from bullying involvement (Bouffard & Koeppel, 2014; Carney & Merrell, 2001). Bullies and victims may experience depression, anxiety, and suicidal ideation as adults, which can lead to

maladaptive coping strategies and hinder their chances at stability. Both childhood victimization and bullying perpetration may interfere with adult health, mental health, employment, education, and may increase the risk for involvement in illegal behaviors or the abuse of drugs and alcohol (Bouffard & Koeppel, 2014; Carney & Merrell, 2001; Wolke, Copeland, Angold, & Costello, 2013).

School-Based Bullying Prevention Programs

It is important to implement clear policies regarding bullying and effective evidence-based bullying prevention programs to mitigate the damage that bullying may pose to youth (Borowsky et al., 2013; Schneider et al., 2012; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Educating school staff, parents, and students may aid in reducing bullying behaviors in schools as it increases awareness of the nature of the problem and provides a common platform for discussion across the entire community. The whole-school approach helps individuals develop skills to prevent, identify, and intervene effectively during bullying incidents (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Craig, Pepler, & Atlas, 2000; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

Given the extent of bullying and its negative implications, it is important to implement evidence-based bullying prevention program in schools, particularly middle schools where bullying is most prevalent (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Some programs that have shown to be effective in reducing bullying or factors related to bullying are the Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP), Steps to Respect, Second Step, Safe Schools Ambassadors Program, and PeaceBuilders (The Committee for Children, 1986, 2001; Embry, Flannery, Vazsonyi, Powell, & Atha, 1996; Olweus & Limber, 2010; Pack et al., 2011).

The OBPP was one of the first programs established which targeted the

individual, classroom, school, and community by increasing supervision on the playground, creating and making decisions within a committee, and inviting parents to get involved (Olweus, 1997; Olweus & Limber, 2010). Like the OBPP, Steps to Respect and PeaceBuilders also use a whole school approach that targets several levels (The Committee for Children, 2001; Flannery, Vazsonyi, Liau, Guo, Powell, Atha, & Embry, 2003). The Second Step program implements sensitivity training and temperament management in the classroom through the use of group work, discussions, and vignettes (The Committee for Children, 1986). Safe Schools Ambassadors Program takes more a student-centered approach by recruiting socially-influential students and training them on how to positively influence their peers in hopes to decrease victimization on campus (Pack et al., 2011). Although these programs vary somewhat, well designed, comprehensive bullying prevention programs do appear to reduce bullying and harassment on school campuses (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Whitted & Dupper, 2005). Given the extent of and challenges associated with school bullying as well as the evidence suggesting schools can implement programs to prevent and reduce bullying, it is important for social workers to seek funding for such programs.

Purpose of the Project

The purpose of this project was to develop a program, identify potential funding resources, and write a grant to fund a bullying prevention program at Woodrow Wilson Middle School in Pasadena Unified School District.

Woodrow Wilson Middle School

Woodrow Wilson Middle School is located within the Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) in Pasadena, California. The Pasadena Unified School District's mission

is "to provide a caring, engaging, challenging educational experience for every student every day" (Pasadena Unified School District, Guide to Schools & Services, 2014). Wilson Middle School is one of six middle schools in PUSD. During the 2013-2014 school year, the school served 569 students, grades 6 through 8. Classrooms are run in 90-minute blocks, and an advisory period is scheduled every Monday so students can build relationships with faculty. PUSD adopted the Excellent Middle Schools reform in 2008, which is a research-based approach to improving and developing high quality middle schools. The purpose of the reform is to guarantee that all middle school students across the district receive equal and quality educational opportunities (PUSD, 2014).

Multicultural Relevance

Bullying is a worldwide challenge. Similar patterns of involvement and outcomes have been found across countries (Chang et al., 2013; Cosma & Baban, 2013; IES, 2011). For example, studies in Romania, Norway, and the United States have found that bullying and victimization tends to peak around seventh grade (13 year olds) and decline after the age of 15 (Cosma & Baban, 2013; Ockerman et al., 2014; Schneider et al., 2012). Studies have reported mixed findings regarding gender differences in the prevalence of bullying. Some studies have reported males are significantly more likely to be involved in bullying (Cosma & Baban, 2013; Olweus, 1996) while others have found no gender differences in bullying prevalence (Chang et al., 2013; IES, 2011; Schneider et al., 2012). Griezel, Finger, Bodkin-Andrews, Craven, & Yeung (2012) found that males had higher rates of being both a bully and a victim of traditional bullying (physical and verbal) than females. There are more consistent findings related to gender differences and types of bullying. Direct bullying, also known as physical bullying, is most

commonly reported among the males (Griezel et al., 2012; Olweus, 1996). In contrast, females are usually more subtle and indirect bullying, meaning they are more likely to emotionally bully other students by excluding them, spreading rumors, and using manipulation as a means to harass than males (Griezel et al., 2012; Olweus, 1996).

The socioeconomic status (SES) of students may also put them at a risk for bullying. Results from the Health Behavior of School-aged Children surveys suggested children and adolescents living below poverty experienced significantly higher victimization levels. Not only were they more at risk for bullying, but they were also bullied more repeatedly than any other students in a school setting (Cosma & Baban, 2013). Outcomes of a meta-analysis of bullying research showed victimization was inversely correlated with SES as low-income youth were more likely to be bullied than their higher income peers. However, bullying perpetration had a significant but weak correlation, indicating that bullies were only slightly less likely to come from higher SES backgrounds (Tippett & Wolke, 2014).

Research also reports mixed findings regarding the relationship between ethnicity and bullying (Langdon & Preble, 2008; Seals & Young, 2003). Seals and Young (2003) studied the relationship between ethnicity and bullying behaviors of White and African American middle school students. The study found no ethnic differences in their experiences of bullying and victimization. On the other hand, Langdon and Preble (2008) concluded that minority students were significantly more likely to report bullying behaviors than non-minority students. Most research suggests that bullying is likely to touch the lives of all types of children and youth (Langdon & Preble, 2008; Seals &

Young, 2003). Given that all youth are at potential risk of bullying, it is especially important that schools develop approaches to reduce bullying behaviors.

Social Work Relevance

School social workers are especially important in the efforts against bullying as they can influence a school's culture to diminish intimidation and harassment. School social workers can speak up for the vulnerable and advocate for improvements in school bullying policies. They can educate students, staff, colleagues, and the community about the negative impact of bullying on students and the school climate to bring awareness of the problem. School social workers have the ability to influence current practices and policies and work collaboratively in a multidisciplinary team to improve them. In addition, social workers can empower staff, individuals, and families to recognize and report bullying and access and effectively use available community resources to overcome the effects of victimization. Most importantly, social workers are trained in mediation and conflict resolution, becoming a great asset in diminishing disagreements among students, improving environments that are free from discrimination and harassment, and promoting healthy peer relationships. Thus, it is important for school social workers to develop and seek funding for bullying prevention programs in the schools.

CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

The worldwide phenomenon, known as bullying, was not a common topic of research until the early 1970s. At that time, efforts to research the topic were mostly limited to Scandinavia. In 1983, three young boys committed suicide in Norway as a result of severe victimization by peers. After the incident, the Norwegian Ministry of Education began a national campaign to raise awareness and prevent bullying behaviors in schools (Olweus, 1997). During the early 1980s, bullying research and efforts to the address this challenge began to spread around the world throughout Asia, North America, and Europe (Olweus, 1997).

Definitions of Bullying

Dan Olweus, a Norway native, was one of the pioneers to examine bullying. He defined the term "bullying," identified its components, and focused on bullying research and the development of bullying prevention and intervention programs (Olweus & Limber, 2010). In 1997, Olweus wrote, "A student is being bullied or victimized when he or she is exposed, repeatedly and over time, to negative actions on the part of one or more other students" (p. 456). He further clarified that, for a student to be a victim of bullying, there had to be intentional infliction or attempt to harm, an imbalance of strength/power, and that the actions must be repeated over time. He noted that negative actions such as playful teasing that did not reoccur did not meet the definition for

bullying, however, teasing qualified if it was repeated, offensive, continuous, and without provocation (Olweus, 1997; Olweus & Limber, 2010).

Although the definition proposed by Olweus is still one of the most commonly used or adapted (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Finkelhor, Turner, & Hamby, 2012; Mimi, 2012; Ockerman et al., 2014), there are those who believe that some bullying incidents are not properly addressed as they do not fall into this definition (Finkelhor et al., 2012; Mimi, 2012). For example, there have been incidents of bullying that occur on a one-time basis yet meet the criteria for intentional infliction of harm and power imbalance. Additionally, the term power imbalance is somewhat unclear given the many ways power can be defined such as popularity, gender or physical strength. This lack of clarity may make it difficult for school staff to determine if bullying did actually occur or if an incident should be classified as bullying. Given these concerns, adopting an exact definition of bullying may be an ongoing challenge as parents, school officials, students, and researchers have varying opinions as to what is or is not considered bullying (Finkelhor et al., 2012; Mimi, 2012).

Types of Bullying

Physical bullying involves any form of aggressive bodily contact against another peer; it can involve hitting, slapping, pushing, or kicking (Ockerman et al., 2014; Olweus, 1996). Out of 5,857 students, ages 2-18, who participated in the National School Crime Supplement (SCS) study, 9% had been pushed, shoved, tripped, or spit on during the 2009-2010 school year. Four percent were obligated to do things they did not want to do and 3% had had their belongings ruined on purpose (IES, 2011). Verbal bullying aims to cause harm to another through verbal aggression, name-calling, and

teasing (Ockerman et al., 2014). Of the SCS students surveyed, 18% stated they had been teased through name-calling and/or offensive insults. Additionally, 16% of students had rumors spread about them, and 6% were verbally threatened with harm (IES, 2011). Social/emotional bullying involves ignoring or isolating the victim (Ockerman et al., 2014). Among the students in the SCS study, 5% stated they were purposely excluded from activities and 1% had experienced exclusion from an online community (IES, 2011).

Cyber-Bullying

The use of media to harass others is a growing concern as youth are becoming more frequent users of technology (Ockerman et al., 2014). Cyber-bullying occurs when there is aggression toward the victim through the use of electronic forms of contact (Bannik et al., 2014). Schneider et al. (2012) found that the overlap between cyber-bullying and school bullying was quite large. According to their study, 60% of the cyber-bullying victims were also bullied at school, and 36% of those victimized in school were also victims of cyber-bullying. About 5,739 students participated in the cyber-bullying questionnaire embedded into the SCS. Two percent reported people had posted hurtful information about them on the Internet, and 7% had received unwanted contact via Internet or text messaging (IES, 2011).

A 2010 study on 2,992 tenth grade students in Taiwan found that one third or more of the students had been involved in cyber-bullying, either as a target or a perpetrator. Of those involved, 18% had been a victim, 6% a bully, and 11% had been both victim and bully; bully-victim (Chang et al., 2013). The most reported type of cyber-bullying in the study was unwanted sexual solicitation. Twelve percent of students

also reported being victims of rude and inappropriate comments online, and 7% had had rumors spread about them via postings on the Internet. Adolescents who had ready access to the Internet were more likely to abuse their privileges, engage in inappropriate online activities, and were at higher risk of becoming involved in cyber-bullying (Chang et al., 2013).

Participants in Bullying

Bullying incidents were traditionally seen as involving two parties, the bully and the victim; or sometimes the bully-victim, depending on the situation. More recent research has indicated that incidents of bullying now extend past the immediate circle of participants to include bystanders as well (Olweus & Limber, 2010; Rigby, 2007; Schwartz, Dodge, Petit, & Bates, 1997). A "bully" is someone who initiates the harassment and plays the role of the leader in the event (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Most researchers believe a bully acts with the premeditated intent to do harm and willfully exerts dominance over a victim (Sercombe & Donnelly, 2013). However, Rigby (2007) identified two types of bullies, malign and non-malign. A malign bully is someone who deliberately and repeatedly attempts to do harm to someone less powerful, without justification, and gets pleasure from playing the role of the dominant aggressor. A non-malign bully is usually not motivated by malice and is unaware of his/her perpetrator role. Non-malign bullies are usually popular and belong to a group of peers that approves of teasing others. They typically bully mindlessly and cause distress to the victim without even realizing the harm they are doing (Rigby, 2007).

A "victim" is someone who is being bullied and usually has difficulty defending him or herself (Olweus, 1997; Olweus & Limber, 2010; Sercombe & Donnelly, 2013).

Victims are often passive and tend to be deemed as weaker than the bully, whether physically, mentally, or emotionally (Olweus, 1997). Aggressive victims are also known as "bully-victims" (Schwartz et al., 1997). Bully-victims are those who are bullied and react to it by bullying others. They are victimized like passive victims; yet they project hostility in their social interactions (Edmondson & Zeman, 2009; Espelage & Horne, 2008). They are usually viewed as "hot-tempered" as they tend to respond with aggression when provoked (Edmondson & Zeman, 2009; Schwartz et al., 1997). Bully-victims tend to justify their own bullying behaviors as an act of self-defense, especially if they believe they are at risk (Edmondson & Zeman, 2009).

Peers who stand by and watch bullying incidents occur are also known as "bystanders" (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Bystanders can be considered as "disengaged onlookers" as they see the bullying event occur but do nothing about it, possibly, for fear of repercussion. There may also be two other types of bystanders, the follower, who joins in on the bullying and the defender, who supports the victim (Barhight, Hubbard, & Hyde, 2013; Olweus & Limber, 2010). Bystanders can be traumatized from their unintended involvement in bullying incidents (Barhight et al., 2013).

Potential Consequences of Bullying

Bullying and peer victimization can negatively impact children and adolescents on many levels and in different aspects of their lives (Borowsky et al., 2013; Chang et al., 2013; Landstedt & Persson, 2014; Schneider et al., 2012). In addition, there are numerous long-term consequences that may result from bullying during childhood and adolescence (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Wolke et al., 2013).

Bullying and Mental Health

Bullying is associated to a greater likelihood of experiencing mental health challenges (Cosma & Baban, 2013; Olweus, 1996; Schneider et al., 2012). Depressive and psychosomatic symptoms in both males and females are highly associated with bullying experiences that derive from being bullied due to body image and discrimination (Chang et al., 2013; Landstedt & Persson, 2014). Landstedt and Persson (2014) investigated the factors contributing to bullying among 13-16 year old students in Sweden. The outcomes demonstrated that females were more likely to be subjected to negative comments about their appearance whereas males were subjected to harassment focused on their physical strength. Bullying related to one's physical appearance significantly increased the likelihood of depressive thoughts and feelings in both genders (Landstedt & Persson, 2014).

Kowalski and Limber (2013) assessed the connection between youth victimization and psychological and physical health using survey data from 931 students in grades 6 through 12. There were significant positive correlations between bullying, anxiety, depression and overall health. Uninvolved students had significantly lower levels of anxiety than bully-victims and less depressive symptoms than victims. The strongest positive correlations were for cyber victimization and depression and traditional victimization and anxiety and health problems (Kowalski & Limber, 2013). Similarly, Schneider et al. (2012), using student data from Boston, found that victims of both cyber and school bullying, reported significantly higher depressive symptoms than non-victims.

Cosma and Baban (2013) studied the psychological effect on bullying on both victims and bullies in Romania. They used a sample ($N = 5{,}404$) from the Health

Behavior in School Children Study from 2006 and 2010 to investigate the occurrence of victimization behaviors between the two waves. They found that bullies and victims were significantly more likely to have low satisfaction with life and mental health concerns than non-involved individuals. Victims were considerably more likely to experience depression and nervousness, and the bullies experienced significantly higher feelings of irritation than their non-involved counterparts (Cosma & Baban, 2013).

Bullying and Suicide Risk Behaviors

Youth who are victimized are significantly more likely to experience suicidal feelings than those who are not involved (Dickerson Mayes, Baweja, Calhoun, Syed, Mahr, & Siddiqui, 2014; Kitagawa, 2014; Raskauskas, 2010). Students who become socially isolated as a result of bullying are especially at risk for committing suicide, possibly due to the lack of peer support (Bannik et al., 2014; Schneider et al., 2012). Children who are bully-victims are significantly more likely to express suicidal thoughts and act upon them compared to bullies, victims, and non-involved students. Yet, bullies and victims have similar levels of suicidal behaviors, which have been found to be higher than non-involved youth (Dickerson Mayes et al., 2014). It appears that students who experience traditional bullying victimization may be considerably more likely to express suicidal views in comparison to students who experience cyber-bullying only (Bannik et al., 2014).

Borowsky et al. (2013) studied students from grades 6, 9, and 12 about bullying involvement and suicidal ideation and attempts. About 130, 900 students participated in the 2010 Minnesota Student Survey. Uninvolved students were significantly less likely to experience suicidal ideation and/or attempts than those who were involved as bullies or

victims. Gower and Borowsky (2013) studied the association between the frequency of bullying and self-harm behaviors. They found that both male and female students who never experienced victimization or experienced it one to two times were significantly less likely to self-harm and to attempt suicide than those who experienced victimization one to two times per week. Furthermore, students who never bullied or bullied only once or twice were significantly less likely to have self-harming behaviors than those students who were regularly bullied or regularly bullied others (Grower & Borowsky, 2013).

Bullying and School Performance

Students who are involved in bullying are likely to display a decreased interest in school, which can contribute to low attendance rates and academic performance (Chang et al., 2013; Feldman et al., 2014; Kowalski & Limber, 2013; Schneider et al., 2012). Kowalski and Limber (2013) discovered that bullies and bully-victims were significantly more likely to miss school which appeared to lead to excessive absences and academic hardships. Youth who are bullied at school usually experience disconnectedness from the environment and, thereby, miss out on educational and social benefits (Eisenberg, Neumark-Sztainer, & Perry, 2003). Eisenberg et al. (2003) studied the correlation between peer harassment and school connectedness using survey data collected from 4,746 students in a Midwestern state. There was a significant negative correlation between peer harassment and feelings toward school. Those who were bullied more frequently reported liking school less. Wang, Vaillancourt, Brittain, McDougall, Krygsman, Smith, Cunningham, Haltigan, & Hymel (2014) used a sample of 1,023 fifth-grade students from 50 schools to study the associations among school climate, peer victimization, and student grade point average (GPA). They found a significant negative

association concerning peer victimization and grades. Those who reported higher levels of victimization had lower grades (Wang et al., 2014).

Similarly, Feldman et al. (2014) completed a longitudinal study that examined the consequences of perpetration and victimization on adolescents in grades sixth, seventh, and eighth ($N = 2483$). The study focused on academic success, discipline referrals, and school attendance outcomes. Perpetration and victimization were significantly negatively correlated with academic success and attendance and positively correlated to discipline referrals. The findings suggested that those who engaged in bullying, regardless of gender or role, were significantly more likely to have lower grades and a higher number of disciplinary referrals than their non-involved peers. The researchers suggested that engagement in bullying may lead to the maladjustment of middle school adolescents entering high school as they tended to face obstacles with academics, attendance, and discipline prior to their transfer from one school to another (Feldman et al., 2014).

Bullying and Self-Esteem

Studies have shown that both cyber and traditional bullying victims have significantly poorer levels of self-confidence than uninvolved youth (Chang et al., 2013; Kowalski & Limber, 2013). Youth who are victims of bullying during grade school tend to face identity problems and develop negative self-perceptions concerning their social skills, physical appearance, self-worth, and athletic competence (Eisenberg et al., 2003; Houbre, Tarquinio, Thuillier, & Hergott, 2006). A strong correlation between being bullied because of weight and having a poor sense of self-esteem seems to be evident (Eisenberg et al., 2003). Patchin and Hinduja (2010) drew a random sample ($N = 1,963$) of middle school students from 30 schools in one of the biggest school districts in the

United States. Their study examined student level of self-esteem and their experiences with cyber-bullying. The results suggested that youth who were both victims and perpetrators of cyber-bullying were significantly more likely to suffer from low self-esteem than those students who were not involved (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010).

Raskauskas (2010) examined student's level of bullying involvement and self-esteem, self-blame, and depressive symptoms. The sample was drawn from six fourth and fifth grade classrooms in a low-income Northern California neighborhood. Victims who experienced two or more types of bullying in the past month reported significantly lower self esteem than non-victims. Additionally, these victims reported significantly higher levels of self-blame and depressive symptoms than non-victims or victims who only experienced one type of victimization in the past month. This is problematic since having a healthy self-esteem is essential in the school environment as it increases the likelihood that students will connect positively with each other and staff, which, in turn, mitigates the risk of violence and bullying (Raskauskas, 2010).

Research has reported mixed findings regarding the self-esteem of the bully (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Olweus, 1996). Olweus (1996) once believed that students who suffered from low self-esteem tended to become bullies as a way to cope with their negative feelings toward themselves. Low-self esteem bullies tended to bully others as a coping mechanism that made them feel better about themselves. However, some studies have found that bullies have a high sense of self-esteem since they may gain popularity from victimizing others (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Mimi, 2012; Olweus, 1996). Bullies tend to believe that they are more privileged than their victims and, therefore, feel the

need to exert dominance to prove their higher social status (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Mimi, 2012).

Potential Long-Term Effects of Bullying

The long-term social, educational, and psychological implications for bullies and victims are frequently overlooked yet potentially serious in nature (Bouffard & Koeppel, 2014; Wolke et al., 2013). Bullying peaks during middle school where youth are developing psychosocially and biologically. This is concerning as victimization in this stage of life may have consequences into adulthood and result in challenges in the areas of illegal behavior, employment, education, mental health, and health (Bouffard & Koeppel, 2014; Carney & Merrell, 2001; Wolke et al., 2013).

Childhood Bullying and Illegal Behaviors in Adulthood

Children who engage in bullying are at significantly more at risk of becoming involved in illegal behaviors as adults (Olweus, 1996; Wolke et al., 2013). According to a study completed by Olweus (1996), the aggressive nature of the bully is an indicator of potential criminal offenses in adulthood. He found that roughly 60% of 6th-9th grade boys who were deemed as bullies had committed at least one officially registered crime and been imprisoned by the age of 24. Noticeably, "as much as 35-40% of former bullies had three or more convictions by this age" (Olweus, 1996, p. 269). Wolke et al. (2013) completed a longitudinal study consisting of three groups of children aged 9, 11, and 13 who were recruited from 11 counties in North Carolina in 1993. The study examined whether bullying involvement during childhood was related to negative outcomes in adulthood. Researchers completed annual interviews until the youth reached the age of 16 and then again at ages 19, 21, and 24 to 26. Depending on their interviews, the

children were initially categorized as "victims only," "bullies only," "bully-victims," or "not involved." Adults who had been involved in bullying during their childhood were significantly more likely to have committed felonies, engaged in substance abuse and been involved in self-reported illegal behavior than those who were not involved (Wolke et al., 2013).

Childhood Bullying and Adult Employment and Education

Adults who participated in bullying incidents as children, both as bullies and victims, tend to have difficulty obtaining higher education, creating stable relationships and maintaining employment (Bouffard & Koeppel, 2014; Wolke et al., 2013). Wolke et al. (2013) discovered that those who were involved in bullying, as bullies and victims, during their youth were significantly more at risk of experiencing difficulty with obtaining and sustaining employment or maintaining social relationships as a result of their prior experiences with bullying. They concluded that bullies and bully-victims were less likely to seek higher education than victims or non-involved adults (Wolke et al., 2013).

Bouffard and Koeppel (2014) also assessed the potential long-term consequences of childhood experiences of victimization using the first six waves of the National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) from 1997. The participants were first interviewed in 1997 when they were between the ages of 12 and 17 and follow up conferences were arranged yearly. The results determined that experiences of victimization in childhood were significantly correlated to having difficulties with school or work due to emotional or mental health behaviors and problems (Bouffard & Koeppel, 2014).

Childhood Bullying and Adult Mental Health and General Health

Victims may face long-term mental health and health-related effects as a consequence of the bullying they endured during their youth (Bouffard & Koeppel, 2014; Carney & Merrell, 2001; Wolke et al., 2013). Some long-term consequences of bullying victimization include depression, anxiety, suicidal ideation, and some may even want to seek revenge (Carney & Merrell, 2001). Wolke et al. (2013) found that adults who were bully-victims in their childhood experienced significantly worse health outcomes (diagnosed with illnesses, psychiatric disorders, smoking regularly, slow recovery from illness) as adults than bullies, victims, or non-involved adults. Additionally, both bullies and victims were significantly more likely to experience psychiatric disorders and smoke regularly than those not involved in bullying (Wolke et al., 2013).

The National Longitudinal Survey of Youth (NLSY) interviewed a random sample of participants between the ages of 18 and 23. Adults who experienced recurrent bullying prior to the age of 12 had significantly more negative opinions about their general health were significantly less likely to have both health insurance as an adult, and to have routine check-ups than individuals who had no or little experience with bullying in their childhood. Adults who experienced victimization during their youth were also significantly more likely to engage in recurrent smoking and alcohol drinking than non-victims. In addition, victims of bullying were significantly more likely to experience additional victimization in adulthood and report homelessness within the last two years than non-victims (Bouffard & Koeppel, 2014). Research has shown that adults who were perpetrators as children are more likely to become offenders of domestic violence and physically punish their children (Roberts, 2000). They also tend to have children who

develop bullying behaviors in their own childhood, therefore, continuing the cycle of aggression from one generation to the next (Carney & Merrell, 2001).

<u>Characteristics of Bullies and Victims</u>

The results of investigations of gender differences in bullying vary greatly (IES, 2011; Schneider et al., 2012). Several studies have documented very little variance, about a 2% difference, between the prevalence of bullying between males and females (Chang et al., 2013; IES, 2011; Schneider et al., 2012). Schneider et al. (2012) reported that cyber-bullying was significantly higher among females (18%) than males (13%) but found rates of school bullying were comparable between females (25%) and males (27%). They also found females were more likely than males to be subjected to both traditional and cyber bullying. Nansel et al. (2001) studied a U.S sample ($N = 15{,}700$) of youth from grades 6 through 10 to determine differences in the prevalence of bullying. They categorized the students into three groups; bullies only, victims only, and bully-victims. The findings suggested that bullying was significantly more prevalent among males than females (Nansel et al., 2001). Similarly, Cosma and Baban (2013) and Olweus (1996) reported that victimization prevalence was significantly higher among male students.

The age of the victim is an additional factor that contributes to bullying. Ockerman et al. (2014) noted that students who were younger and appeared to be weaker tended to be the most vulnerable to bullying. In their study, students, ages 12 to 13, were more likely to report bullying than their older peers (Ockerman et al., 2014). Youth in grades 6 and 7 typically experience victimization more frequently than youth in higher grades (Feldman et al., 2014). The Borowsky et al. study (2013) found that most

bullying incidents peaked between grades eight and nine and slowly declined afterward. Similarly, Nansel et al. (2001) concluded that bullying was more prevalent in middle school than high school. As bullies age, their popularity tends to decrease and bullying appears to decrease along with it around the age of 15 (Carney & Merrell, 2001). Bullying in middle school tends to be most prevalent as youth are in the process of developing their identity, which is largely dependent on what their peers deem socially acceptable. Youth who do not receive social acceptance from their peers tend to become those who are bullied (Patchin & Hinduja, 2010).

Familial Factors

Characteristics related to bullying involvement include family challenges such as physical abuse, sexual abuse, and mental health problems (Borowsky et al., 2013; Carlisle & Rofes, 2007). Bullying tends to be most prevalent among those who have experienced family violence, physical abuse, smoking, and substance abuse (Borowsky et al., 2013; Einsenberg et al., 2003; Schneider et al., 2012). Carney and Merrell (2001) proposed that bullies tend to act toward their peers in the manner in which they are treated or see someone else treated in their home. "Bullies generally tend to come from homes in which discipline is harsh, often corporal in nature and inconsistent. Supervision tends to be minimal, problem solving ability is poor, family conflict level is high and parents are generally un- or under- involved in the child's life, especially with regard to nurturing" (Carney & Merrell, 2001, p. 371). As a result of their troubling home environments, children may learn maladaptive coping skills and project them onto peers at school. These parent behaviors may also contribute to children's lack of social and cognitive skills, which may put them at risk of becoming a target of bullying (Carney &

Merrell, 2001). Some victims tend to wrongly blame themselves for the perpetration because they view themselves as insignificant. Parents and/or family members can contribute to this view because they may not provide enough emotional support for their child to overcome victimization efficiently (Carney & Merrell, 2001; Einsenberg et al., 2003).

Race and Ethnicity

Bullying victimization poses a serious problem for youth from a variety of backgrounds (Estell et al., 2007; Goldweber, Waasdorp, & Bradshaw, 2013; Spriggs, Iannotti, Nansel, & Haynie, 2007). Goldweber et al. (2013) examined bullying involvement and its association to race and geographic location (urban vs. suburban). Data was collected from 10, 254 middle school students and students were categorized as low involvement, victim, and bully victim. Regardless of location, youth who were African American were found to be significantly more likely to be a victim or bully-victim than youth who were Caucasian or Hispanic. African American youth were significantly more at risk of being bullied about their gender, money, clothing, physical appearance, or religion. Furthermore, a youth's geographic location was significantly correlated with the increased probability of being bullied due to their race, as youth who are African American are more likely to originate from low-income communities that are susceptible to violence (Goldweber et al., 2013).

In contrast, Spriggs et al. (2007) found that African American youth reported a significantly lower frequency of bullying than Caucasian and Hispanic youth when they examined associations between bullying and family, peer, and school relations. These contradictory findings, combined with those from other studies, suggest that bullying

involvement may vary by circumstantial factors such as geographic location, familial and social support, and limits of self-disclosure rather than just by race or ethnicity (Estell et al., 2007; Goldweber et al., 2013; Springs et al., 2007).

Sexual Orientation

Youth who identify as lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or questioning (LGBTQ) are more likely to be victims of bullying in comparison to their peers who self-identify as heterosexual (Evans & Chapman, 2014; Patrick, Bell, Jon, Lazarakis, & Edwards, 2013; Schneider et al., 2012). Evans and Chapman (2014) examined the bullying experiences of a diverse sample of elementary, middle, and high school students (*N = 3,379*). Students identified themselves as either LGBTQ or heterosexual. Outcomes showed that there was not a difference in the frequency of bullying between the two groups that experienced bullying, but there were significant variances in the forms of bullying they experienced. Lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, or questioning (LGBTQ) students reported having their property tampered with or destroyed, receiving threats of physical injury, verbal abuse, becoming involved in a physical fight, or being a victim of a violent attack. The authors concluded there was a need for increased support for the vulnerable LGBTQ population and their specific issues should be considered when developing bullying prevention programs (Evans & Chapman, 2014).

Patrick et al. (2013) examined information from the Washington State Healthy Youth Survey (HYS) that was gathered in 2010 from public school students in grades 8, 10, and 12 (*N = 27,752*). The purpose of the study was to analyze the correlation between perceived sexual orientation (PSO), bullying, and the quality of life (QOL) of the youth. Students were categorized as non-involved, victimized because of PSO or

victimized for other reasons. Non-heterosexual students were significantly more likely to experience bullying than heterosexual students. Students, both male and female, who classified themselves as non-heterosexual, were also significantly more likely to have a lower QOL score and increased depression and suicidal ideation than heterosexual students (Patrick et al., 2013).

Children with Disabilities

Children who have physical and/or emotional and cognitive impairments are largely at risk for victimization (Fite, Evans, Cooley, & Rubens, 2014; Maag & Katsiyannis, 2012; Weiner, Day, & Galvan, 2013). Students with Autism, Oppositional Defiance Disorder (ODD), and Attention Deficit Hyperactivity Disorder (ADHD) are especially at risk of becoming a bully-victim. Children these special needs tend to display characteristics of bully-victims as they respond aggressively when provoked as a response to protect themselves in a way that is consistent with their limited skills and experiences (Maag & Katsiyannis, 2012).

Fite et al. (2014) analyzed survey data from a sample of 173 9th-12th grade students in a Midwestern city to examine the impact of ADHD and ODD on bullying in adolescence. Children with ODD characteristics were significantly more likely to engage in both bullying and to have experienced victimization than students with ADHD. Students who experienced a high level of ADHD symptoms were significantly more likely to engage in physical bullying and relational victimization (Fite et al., 2014).

Weiner et al. (2013) analyzed the experiences of 812 deaf and hard of hearing students in 11 large U.S schools. The study examined student perspectives of bullying and compared it to the perspectives of hearing students of a national database. Outcomes

showed that deaf and hard of hearing students were considerably more likely to experience bullying than hearing students. Overall, deaf and hard of hearing students experienced bullying, up to three times more, than hearing students and reported that school staff intervened less often during bullying events. Students with multiple disabilities may also report a negative school climate in comparison to students with only one disability due to their more frequent experience with victimization (Weiner et al., 2013).

School-Based Responses to Bullying

Best Practices in Bullying Prevention

The most effective school-based violence prevention programs are those that integrate a school-wide approach (Atlas & Pepler, 1998; Craig et al., 2000; Pearse, Cross, Monks, Waters, & Falconer, 2011; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Whitted & Dupper, 2005). Well-designed bullying prevention programs need to not only change the behaviors of pupils but also make a positive change in the school climate (Atlas & Pepper, 1998; Whitted & Dupper, 2005). Single-level programs have been shown to be ineffectiveness in reducing victimization in schools due to the complexity of bullying (Pearce et al., 2011). Whole-school approaches are more effective because they usually target the individual level (students), home level (involvement of parents/guardians), classroom level (curriculum), and school level; peer and behavior support/playground improvements, policy, classroom and school climate (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Whitted & Dupper, 2005).

Ttofi and Farrington (2011) completed a comprehensive meta-analysis of anti-bullying programs and established that whole-school programs have demonstrated a

decrease in rates of bullying by 23% and being bullied by 20%. They concluded that the most effective components of the programs were videos, follow-through in disciplinary policy, parent and teacher involvement/training, teamwork among professionals, better playground supervision, school assemblies, classroom rules/management, and clear whole-school anti-bullying policies (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). Thus, it is important to implement comprehensive, evidence-based prevention programs that ensure the training and strategies being applied are applicable, sustainable, and system-wide as anti-bullying programs must target not only victims and bullies but also peer groups, staff members, and parents (Craig et al. 2000). It is also essential to have the commitment of school staff, parents, and the community to foster a positive learning and social environment for students to thrive in (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

Early Intervention: Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP)

The Olweus Bullying Prevention Program (OBPP) was first established in the 1980s as a response to the risk bullying posed for students. Olweus believed that restructuring the school and involving parents and community members might aid in decreasing the bullying behaviors that existed in schools (Olweus, 1997; Olweus & Limber, 2010). The goal of the program was to decrease victimization, prevent the development of bullying, and improve peer relationships. The program used a rewards system and parent-staff partnerships to restructure the school environment. The purpose of the program was to build a sense of community among the school and home to address the bullying issues on campuses (Olweus, 1997; Olweus & Limber, 2010).

The OBPP has four target areas; school, classroom, individual, and community. A Bullying Prevention Coordinating Committee (BPCC), that meets to discuss and train

on effective intervention for student conduct, is established at the school level by staff. They administer the Olweus Bullying Questionnaire (Grades 3–12). The BPCC holds staff discussions and introduces clear policies regarding bullying and the school's supervisory system. They then hold a school-wide event to kick-off the program and invite parents to participate (Olweus & Limber, 2010). At the classroom-level, teachers visibly post the bullying rules and enforce the school policy. Teachers set time aside on a weekly basis to hold class discussions related to bullying topics and hold group discussions with students' parents to ensure the continuous link between the home and school (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Individual-level components include supervising student activities, ensuring that all staff is aware of policies and are intervening appropriately when needed, and meeting with students involved in bullying incidents. The program makes it a point to meet with the bully and victim separately to reduce harm. Staff members then meet with the parents of the students and develop intervention plans as needed (Olweus & Limber, 2010). Community members are invited to participate in the BPCC. Being part of the BPCC gives the community the opportunity to build partnerships with the school and gain support for bullying prevention. It also helps spread knowledge and sensitivity about bullying in and out of school (Olweus & Limber, 2010).

An evaluation completed by Olweus and Limber (2010), which followed 2,500 Norwegian school children after two and a half years of implementation, showed significant decreases in self-reports of vandalism, theft, truancy behaviors and improvements in the school climate. In addition, the frequency of bullying in the schools decreased by approximately 50%. The students surveyed also showed to have more

satisfaction with school, peer relationships, and reported improved discipline as well (Olweus & Limber, 2010).

Bauer et al. (2007) completed a controlled trial of the OBPP in ten Seattle, Washington middle schools to evaluate its effectiveness. Seven middle schools implemented the OBPP while the remaining three chose to implement less formal activities to decrease bullying behaviors such as staff training, assemblies, and increased supervision. There were no differences in physical and relational victimization between the two groups; however, students in schools where the program was implemented were significantly more likely to perceive fellow peers as actively intervening when observing bullying incidents than those in control schools. Sixth graders in intervention schools were also more likely to feel empathy and the need to help victimized peers. White students in intervention schools reported significantly less relational victimization than White students in control schools. The finding did not hold for other ethnic groups (Bauer et al., 2007).

Second Step

A Washington-located non-profit organization, called The Committee for Children, developed Second Step. Second Step is a social-learning program that promotes the building of character and social skills in order to prevent violence in schools (The Committee for Children, 1986). The program is structured to have weekly lessons and follow-up during school time to help reinforce targeted competencies. Second Step includes 28 lessons for each middle school grade level (6th-8th), which is implemented once a week for 50 minutes. The lesson plans are separated into 3 training themes; empathy, impulse control, and anger management. Lessons are taught by teachers in the

classrooms through skill practice, group work, video vignettes, and class discussions. The vignettes serve as a learning instrument for students and allow the teacher the opportunity to guide students on how to appropriately respond to the situation. Teachers reinforce the learning process by using techniques from the training in real life situations in the classrooms as they arise throughout the school year (The Committee for Children, 1986; Cooke, Ford, Levine, Bourke, Newell, & Lapidus, 2007; Espelage et al. 2014).

Grossman, Neckerman, Koepsell, Liu, Asher, Beland, Frey, & Rivara (1997) finalized the first randomized control evaluation of Second Step. Twelve elementary schools were selected and six were unsystematically allocated to the intervention group where they were given the Second Step materials. Parent and teacher reports were used to collect data and students were observed in their natural environment by trained observers. The observers monitored each student over several days in 5-minute intervals until they obtained 45 minutes worth of observation. Observers did not have knowledge of whether or not students had received services. Parent and teacher reports of behavior did not appear to show any significant differences; however, according to observer ratings, children in the intervention group engaged in significantly less physical aggression and more prosocial behaviors than control children at posttest and 6 months later. The implementation of Second Step appeared to have a moderate effect on reducing the bullying behaviors experienced on campuses (Grossman et al., 1997).

Cooke et al. (2007) also examined the impact of Second Step using a city-wide approach. The assessment included 639 students in grades 3-5 in five elementary schools in Meriden, Connecticut from fall to spring of the academic year. The program was applied with high fidelity to the curriculum and staff involvement. Researchers used

student questionnaires, behavioral observations, and disciplinary referral data to assess aggressive-antisocial and prosocial behaviors. Students were given a questionnaire at pre-test in September 2002 and again at post-test in May 2003. The outcomes from pre and post-test showed significant improvement in students' abilities to cope, care, and cooperate with each other, suppress anger, and feel empathy. However, there were no significant changes in aggressive-antisocial behaviors or behavioral observations and disciplinary referrals. Researchers believed this lack of change might have been due to the natural behavior patterns of the age of the children; as children in that age group generally portrays aggressive-antisocial behaviors (Cooke et al., 2007).

Espelage et al. (2014) evaluated the impact of the Second Step program on forms of violence that co-occur together such as bullying, victimization, fighting, homophobic name calling, and sexual harassment. The evaluation involved 36 middle schools in Illinois and Kansas that were randomly dispersed to intervention and control groups. Intervention schools were given the Second Step program to apply while the control schools received only minimal intervention. Data was collected through student surveys and questionnaires for two years. Outcomes of the evaluation indicated that students in intervention middle schools were significantly less likely to be the targets of homophobic name calling than students in control schools. Moreover, students in intervention schools were significantly less likely to report sexual harassment and violence perpetration than students in control schools. However, there were no significant decreases in bullying behavior, physical aggression, or victimization for intervention schools (Espelage et al., 2014).

Safe Schools Ambassadors Program

The Safe Schools Ambassadors Bullying Prevention Program is designed to decrease bullying behaviors and increase positive school climate by recruiting popular leaders of the various cliques and interest groups on campuses. It is expected that, through their peer relationships and friendships, the ambassadors will be able to influence other students' behaviors, thus, making a positive change on school climate (Pack, White, Raczynski, & Wang, 2011). The SSA program is student-centered and educationally based. Student ambassadors attend trainings and orientations on bullying behaviors and intervention techniques and continue to attend supervision/support meetings often throughout the year. Trainings cover conflict resolution, communication skill building, empowerment training, and psychoeducation on the cycle of violence. Ambassadors document every time they intervene in bullying behaviors between peers on Action Logs, which are analyzed by program adults and discussed during supervision for further support (Pack et al., 2011).

The SSA program was evaluated in two different settings, both of which included a control and intervention group. In the first study, the students in the intervention group attended an orientation, trainings, and meetings in regard to bullying prevention practices (Pack et al., 2011). In control schools, key students were selected to match ambassadors from the treatment schools with regard to gender, grade, ethnicity, academic performance, and socioeconomic status. Key students did not receive intervention but contributed by completing surveys and participating in focus groups. The first part of the evaluation was completed in five middle schools using a pre-post-post design following two years of implementation. At pre-test, Friends of Ambassadors originally described

poorer school climate than Friends of the Key Students in control schools. After two years of operation, Friends of Ambassadors reported a significant increase of positive school climate on their campus. Friends of Key Students in control schools also observed a significant increase in active bullying intervention and climate. Analysis of surveys indicated no clear differences that distinguished the SSA from the control schools after intervention. The researchers believed it might be due to the fact that the SSA program was a school-wide program that might need more time to produce better outcomes. (Pack et al., 2011).

The second part of the evaluation focused on modifications in discipline over time and whether it was connected with the fidelity of the implementation of the SSA program using a different sample of schools. Discipline data was collected from 59 identified schools, 19 of which implemented the SSA program with fidelity (Pack et al., 2011). The outcomes showed a statistically significant decrease in suspensions and disciplinary action at the intervention schools versus the control schools. There was a significant decline in suspension rates in intervention schools while the control group remained static. In addition, "the average change in discipline indicator (the larger the number, the greater the increase in discipline incidents) suggested a medium correlation between fidelity of implementation of the SSA program and a decrease in discipline incidents" (Pack et al., 2011, p. 132).

Steps to Respect

The Committee for Children also designed Steps to Respect. It is a research-based program for elementary school students that takes into consideration the socioecological model of bullying which views students as part of a contextual system

that shapes their behavior (The Committee for Children, 2001). The program focuses on fostering positive school climate and norms on the school, classroom, and individual levels. It establishes school-wide policies and protocol regarding bullying and trains staff and parents to respond appropriately. The training of staff and teachers incorporates the monitoring of students, instructions on effective interventions, defines a clear policy regarding bullying, and training on reporting and coaching procedures. The program includes detailed planning and implementation tools, adult training, and classroom resources (The Committee for Children, 2001; Brown, Low, Smith, & Haggerty, 2011).

Through Steps to Respect, students learn to recognize, withdraw, and report incidents of bullying (The Committee for Children, 2001). Lessons in the classroom include communication skill building, recognition of bullying, empathy and social connections, and improvement of assertiveness. The lessons are designed to help children build on their social skills, bullying refusal skills, help seeking skills, and positive bystander behaviors. The aforementioned skills help students defer from bullying, respond appropriately as a bystander, and report situations of bullying (The Committee for Children, 2001; Brown et al., 2011).

Brown et al. (2011) analyzed the impact of Steps to Respect on reducing school bullying and increasing positive attitudes, school climate, and bystander intervention. The study included 33 elementary schools from North-Central California. The schools were paired depending on their geographical location, characteristics, and student enrollment and demographics. The schools were then randomly assigned to either intervention or control groups. Researchers used the School Environment Survey, Teacher Assessment of Student Behavior (TASB), and a student survey to collect pre and

post intervention data. Bullying was most prevalent at intervention schools at baseline. There was a significant increase in school anti-bullying policies, student climate, and staff climate at post-test in intervention schools in relative to control schools. Implementation of the program significantly decreased the prevalence of physical bullying perpetration during the school year. While bullying perpetration increased during the year in both conditions, the increase was significantly smaller in intervention than control schools. However, students from intervention schools reported a significantly better school climate than students from control schools. Significantly greater increases of bullying intervention by students, staff, and teachers and positive bystander behaviors were also found in intervention schools. Overall, this evaluation of Steps to Respect suggested that prevention programs were most effective when interventions were implemented on multiple levels in the school environment (Brown et al., 2011).

PeaceBuilders

PeaceBuilders is a universal school-based violence prevention program that has the flexibility to be incorporated at any school level (Embry et al., 1996; Flannery et al., 2003). The program aims to help students and staff create a positive school climate by implementing rules and activities to improve social competency and decrease aggressive conduct. The program incorporates ongoing, long-term strategies to help schools sustain a positive culture such as teaching students about right and wrong, the importance of praise, and the use of positive advisors and peer influences. The interventions are assimilated into the school's everyday routine rather than presented as a curriculum; therefore, the program is not time limited nor does it have a certain amount of lessons.

PeaceBuilders intends to alter the current negative characteristics of the school that produce aggressive behavior and increase the daily occurrence of prosocial behaviors and cues. It is believed that if there are more prosocial models present in schools and these behaviors are consistently reinforced and rewarded, children's social competence will increase overtime and hostile behaviors will decrease (Embry, Flannery, Vazsonyi, Powell, & Atha, 1996; Flannery, Vazsonyi, Liau, Guo, Powell, Atha, & Embry, 2003).

Flannery et al. (2003) conducted an evaluation of the PeaceBuilders program and its impact on student prosocial behavior and aggression. Eight elementary schools were selected in Pima County, Arizona due to their elevated frequencies of juvenile arrests, suspensions, and expulsions. Schools were blindly assigned to either Immediate Post-baseline Intervention (PBI) or Post-baseline Delayed Intervention (PBD). The evaluation took place in a period of two years where self-reported data was collected from students and teachers. PBI schools received the PeaceBuilders program during Year 1 and 2 and the control group, PBD, received the program only during Year 2. After spring of Year 1, teachers of intervention students in grades K – 2 reported significantly higher levels of social competence in grades K-2 and somewhat higher levels of social competence among 3 – 5 graders than control teachers. Children also reported significantly better peace-building behavior in all grades in PBI schools than those in PBD schools (Flannery et al., 2003).

Intervention students in grades 3 – 5 also reported significantly lower levels of aggression than the PBD counterpart. These effects were sustained in Year 2 for PBI schools. At the beginning of Year 2 (fall), PBD students in grades K-2 showed significantly higher social competence and lower aggression. PBD students in grades 3-5

showed stronger effects than the K-2 students. PBI schools reported significantly higher peace-building behavior for all grades but less self-reported prosocial behavior in grades 3-5 than control teachers. By the end of the evaluation in spring of Year 2, all students in the PBI schools showed a significant increase in social competence and a significant decrease in aggression. A comparison between PBD and PBI schools showed that PBI schools had significantly superior prosocial behavior in grades K-2 but lesser prosocial behavior in grades 3-5 overall. Early intervention has been who to increase prosocial behaviors and skills and decrease program behaviors. These skills are the foundation for students to be successful in school, relationships, and adjustment (Flannery et al., 2003).

Conclusion

Bullying has become a significant issue of public concern given the number of children impacted by it across the nation and the world. With changing times and modern technology, bullying is no longer limited to school and is now becoming a problem that follows children home. As a result of ongoing bullying, there are many possible negative consequences that children may face within the context of their individual, family, school, and community domains. Many bullying prevention programs have been created and implemented as a response to the need for intervention and prevention. The most influential programs are those that integrate a multilevel, multidisciplinary approach. Social workers are essential to these bullying prevention and intervention strategies as they can be the link between all participants, serve as a mediator, provide expertise, and seek funding for preventive and intervention programs.

CHAPTER 3

METHODS

Identification of Potential Funding Sources

The grant writer used several methods to search funding possibilities at the federal, state, and foundation levels. Initially, a web search was conducted to investigate potential funding resources at the federal and state levels on websites such as the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services and Department of Education, the California Department of Education, California Health and Human Services Agency, and grants.gov. There were no funding opportunities available for programs aimed at bullying prevention and intervention on these sites. Although there were some grants for public schools found on the U.S. Department of Education website, none provided funding for bullying prevention and intervention efforts.

Next, the grant writer searched the web using broad terms such as bullying, violence, anti-bullying, public school grants, child development, community development, character development, and foundation funding to locate private funding opportunities. Some foundations that appeared to be appropriate for the proposed project were the Annenberg Foundation, California Wellness Foundation, and the Joseph Drown Foundation. Lastly, the grant writer used FC search, a foundation database, at La Pintoresca Library located in Pasadena, California to search for foundation sources. Key words used for the search included bullying, victimization, middle school, parent

education, public education, violence prevention, youth services, leadership development, and program development. Over 70 possible funding sources were generated using the aforementioned key words but the grant writer excluded foundations that had a history of giving less than $100,000, in order to narrow the search. Other funding resources were excluded based on the specific geographical locations and for not providing funding for the public school, which was to most common reason for excluding foundation sources.

The grant writer narrowed down the FC search to five foundations that seemed to meet the criteria established for the proposed project. The chosen foundations were Cathay Bank Foundation, Joseph Drown Foundation, Majestic Realty Foundation, S. Mark Taper Foundation, and the Weingart Foundation. The grant writer and project advisor used the Internet to complete an in-depth investigation of each of these foundations found through FC search. The mission and goals, funding amount, application requirement, and deadlines were reviewed. Unfortunately, most foundations were eliminated, as they would not provide funding to public schools. Ultimately, the Joseph Drown Foundation was chosen using the following criteria; goodness of fit between the goals of the program and funding source, level of funding available, geographic location, and willingness o support public schools. The goals of the proposed project were a good fit for the goals of the foundation and the amount of funding given along with the submission requirements and deadlines were also reasonable.

The Joseph Drown Foundation

Joseph Warford Drown founded the Joseph Drown Foundation in 1953 as an organized means of making charitable contributions during his lifetime and as a means of leaving behind a legacy for his foundation to continue making grants once he had passed

(Joseph Drown Foundation, n.d.). The foundation reflects the interests of Mr. Drown, who felt strongly about education, medical and scientific research, community, health, and social services, and the arts and humanities. The goal of the foundation is to aid individuals in becoming successful, self-sustaining, contributing citizens. The foundation focuses on providing funding to programs that aim to break down barriers that prevent a person from growing and learning (Joseph Drown Foundation, n.d.).

One of the foundation's focus areas is education for both public and private schools (K-12) in the Los Angeles Area (Joseph Drown Foundation, n.d.). The foundation supports programs that aim to solve problems that schools face by granting money directly to the schools or agencies that work closely with them. Priority is given to programs that serve middle to low-income students who are unable to obtain assistance from other sources. The foundation's goal is to help youth avoid involvement in the juvenile justice system, prosper academically, stay connected to their family and community, and become active members of society (Joseph Drown Foundation, n.d.).

The grant deadlines are spread throughout the year and there is no special form of application. The proposal should incorporate a short narrative of the organization, its history and current programs, statement of need, the amount being requested, and the objectives of the proposed program (Joseph Drown Foundation, n.d.). In addition, to satisfy requirements of this specific project, the grant writer included a program description, budget, budget narrative, and an evaluation element.

Target Population

The proposed bullying prevention program will be implemented at Woodrow Wilson Middle School in Pasadena, California. The program will take a whole-school,

multilevel approach to bullying reduction, incorporating both prevention and intervention elements for all students, staff, and parents. According to the California Department of Education, a total of 569 students in grades six through eight attended Wilson Middle School during the school year 2013-2014. Of those, 66% were Hispanic, 14% were African American, 10% were White, 3% were Asian, 2% were Filipino, and 2% were two or more races. Most (83%) were eligible for free/reduced lunch. About 13% of the students were classified as English Learners, and 12% had some sort of disability. More than half of parents had a high school diploma or less (California Department of Education, Analysis, Measurement, & Accountability Reporting Division, 2014). In regard to the school Academic Performance Index (API), Wilson Middle School dropped from an API of 723 in 2012 to an API of 703 in 2013. The state of California ranks school based on their API on a scale of one (low) to ten (high). As of 2013, Woodrow Wilson Middle School was ranked a 2 statewide and a 1 when compared to similar schools (California Department of Education, Analysis, Measurement, & Accountability Reporting Division, 2014).

Sources for Needs Assessment

Several sources were used to develop a statement of need for the proposed grant project. Sources of demographic information for the needs assessment were drawn from the California Department of Education, which defines the ethnicity, education level, and socioeconomic levels of the school and district being served. Information regarding school rankings, number of English language learners, and number of students who qualify for free and reduced lunch was drawn from the Woodrow Wilson Middle School Student Accountability Report and the California Healthy Kids Survey. Additionally, the

school district website and school website were utilized to gather information regarding existing programs and services.

Consultation with School and School District

The researcher was able to gather valuable information regarding the existing programs on campus and potential support for the proposed program. The grant writer consulted with staff members at Woodrow Wilson Middle School during the grant writing process to identify areas of need. The grant writer also met with the Director of the Child Welfare Attendance and Safety Office of the Pasadena Unified School District to identify current bullying information, prevalence, and protocol for their specific district.

CHAPTER 4

GRANT PROPOSAL

Description of Organization

Pasadena Unified School District (PUSD) is a recognized leader in public education. Our vision is to prepare students for college and career success and to contribute to our democratic society. Students come first at PUSD and decisions on policies, programs, and behaviors are based on what is best for them. Our policies and programs are based on integrity and respect, transparency, equity, accountability, collaboration, and honoring our fiscal responsibility (California School Climate Survey, 2012–2013). Our teaching model integrates the "4C's" from the Common Core State Standards; Think Critically, Communicate Successfully, Collaborate Effectively, and Create and Innovate (PUSD, 2014).

PUSD serves a 76-square mile area that includes Pasadena, Altadena, Sierra Madre, and unincorporated areas of Los Angeles County. During the 2013-2014 school year, there were 19,102 total students enrolled in our district. In terms of ethnicity, 58% are Hispanic, 16% are White, 1% are African American, 6% are Asian American/Pacific Islander and 3% multiracial. The majority (74%) qualify for free or reduced lunch; 17% are classified as English Learners; and almost half of all our parents have a high school diploma or less (California Department of Education, Analysis, Measurement, & Accountability Reporting Division, 2014).

Woodrow Wilson Middle School

Woodrow Wilson Middle School (WMS) was built in 1930 and sits on the east side of the PUSD. Our school serves students from Pasadena, Altadena, and Sierra Madre in grades six through eight. There are about 23 fully credentialed teachers working in the school, with a ratio of 30 students to one instructor (California Department of Education, Analysis, Measurement, & Accountability Reporting Division, 2014). WMS is part of the PUSD Excellent Middle School Initiative. As part of the initiative, students receive instruction in 90-minute blocks in four periods per day Tuesday through Friday. Students also receive 50-minute instructional blocks, attend advisory period, and are dismissed early on Mondays. The advisory periods help student students develop positive relationships with faculty (PUSD, 2014).

All schools that do not meet their targeted Adequate Yearly Progress (AYP) are identified as Program Improvement (PI) schools under the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). WMS was first identified as a PI school in 2010-2011. Although efforts have continually been made toward improvement, our school is now going on its fifth year of PI (California Department of Education, Analysis, Measurement, & Accountability Reporting Division, 2014). Last year, only 41% of our students tested proficient or better in English and less (33%) did the same in math (California Department of Education, Assessment and Accountability Division, 2014). This low level of achievement will make it difficult for our students to successfully transition to high school. Violence between peers also appears to be an ongoing issue in our campus. In the 2013-2014 school year, there were 163 suspensions and three expulsions. About one-third was for violence toward others and 7% were specifically for bullying and

sexual harassment. The suspension rate at our school is almost 3 times more than the Los Angeles County total (California Department of Education Data Reporting Office, 2014).

Current Programs

WMS offers various programs aimed at meeting the needs of our students and families. Students have the opportunity to take engaging elective classes that meet their interests including robotics, music, drama, and world languages. Students are encouraged to get involved in extracurricular activities such as art, dance, drum corp, Lions Head Band, sports, stage crew, and the afterschool program LEARNS. LEARNS is a structured afterschool program, focused on homework and enrichment, which operates daily for three hours. Students at WMS also have access to on-campus counseling and support services. We currently have two counselors, a Child Welfare Attendance and Safety Dropout Prevention Specialist, a health clerk, librarian, nurse, psychologist, Resource Specialist Program (RSP) teacher, Special Day Class (SDC) teacher, teacher aides, speech and language specialist, and a teacher for the severely handicapped. We also partner with Hillsides, a local agency that provides for mental health services on our campus (PUSD, 2014).

Parents are an integral part of student success; therefore, our school makes it a priority to involve parents on our campus. Parents are encouraged to participate in school leadership opportunities such as School Site Council, the Parent Teacher Association (PTA), English Language Advisory Committee (ELAC), African American Parent Council, Instructional Leadership Team, and the School Safety Committee. These committees encourage collaboration between parents and faculty about the priorities and direction of educational plans. Our school established a Parent Center, which gives

parents and staff a place to meet on a regular basis. WMS believes that student success should be a responsibility shared among the administration, faculty, staff, students, and parents (Pasadena Unified School District, 2012-13).

Statement of Need

Due to nationwide concerns over bullying and school safety, our school has adopted a discipline philosophy that promotes respect and acceptance of others and a system of rewards and consequences for conduct. Parents and students at WMS are informed of the discipline guidelines at the commencement of the school year through information packets, student organizers, assemblies, and newsletters (PUSD, 2012-13). Despite our attempts to reduce bullying, the issue still persists. Bullying has shown to have a negative impact on the many things that the Joseph Drown Foundation is concerned about such as education, community involvement and health. Bullying has been shown to increase school truancy (Kowalski & Limber, 2013; Eisenberg et al., 2003) and our truancy rate is 31%, about 6% higher than the rest of the district. Over half (54%) middle school staff in our district believes that student truancy is a continuous problem (California School Climate Survey, 2012–2013). These statistics are concerning to the community given that truancy is strongly related to school dropout, which hinders a youth's chances at reaching their full potential and increases their likelihood of getting involved in the juvenile justice system (Staff & Kreager, 2008).

According to the California Healthy Kids Survey (CHKS), during the 2009-2010 school year, only 17% of 7th graders students in PUSD agreed that they felt very safe at school while 34% had been harassed at school due to their race, ethnicity, religion, gender, sexual orientation, or disability. In addition, 34% of 7th graders had been in a

fight in the past year and 30% admitted they had been afraid of being beaten up at school (California Healthy Kids Survey, 2009-2010). Although our school collaborates well with local law enforcement, only 6% of middle school staff believes there are sufficient resources to create a safe campus (California School Climate Survey, 2012–2013). Indeed, 11% of PUSD 7th graders have carried a weapon on campus and 9% of 7th graders belong to a gang (California Healthy Kids Survey, 2009-2010). The responses of our students are alarming considering that bullying is a predictor of aggression and violent felonies (Ikomi, 2010). Victimization has the potential to lead to violent confrontations, which then causes trauma and pain to the individual, families, and community as a whole (Klein, 2012).

Our staff clearly sees the need for more effective programs to address bullying. Over two-thirds (69%) agree that racial/ethnic conflict among students exists on campus. Furthermore, 29% say harassment or bullying is a problem and 44% identify physical fighting between students as a moderate to severe problem. Over half of our staff believes the schools do not provide enough harassment/bullying prevention for our students (California School Climate Survey, 2012–2013). Students, parents, schools, and professionals are now starting to realize how serious bullying and recognize the need for early intervention to promote the overall success of the individual and community as a whole.

Program Description

The middle school years bring about transition in friends, schools, behaviors and emotions (Eisenberg et al., 2003). We are proposing a bullying prevention program with multiple components. First, Second Step will be implemented with all students. Second

Step is an evidence-based program that has been shown to reduce bullying and is one of the few programs adapted for middle school students. The program is specifically aimed at addressing the adolescent transitions and building upon their social skills, which will aid them as they grow (Cooke et al., 2007). Second, parents and teachers will be trained on the identification of, risk factors for and appropriate responses to bullying and the Second Step curriculum. Finally, school polices toward bullying will be developed and implemented. The proposed bullying program will operate throughout the academic school year and take a school-wide approach, including students, parents, staff, and administration. This type of approach has been shown to be most effective in preventing and reducing school bullying (Pearce et al., 2011; Ttofi & Farrington, 2011).

Program Objectives

Objective 1: Teachers will provide 15 weeks of in-class training using Second Step for all students. The program will be implemented at all grade levels and once a week during advisory periods on Mondays. The goal of Second Step is to improve school climate, peer relationships, and reduce bullying victimization, perpetration, and overall violence on campus. The Second Step curriculum incorporates social skills and character building through interactive discussions and lessons in the classroom. Evaluations of Second Step have shown that students show a decrease in physical aggression, an increase in prosocial behaviors, and a reduction of reports bullying after being in the program (Espelage et al., 2014; Grossman et al., 1997). During the first component of Second Step (Empathy and Communication), students will learn skills to work in groups, compromise, negotiate, and give and get support from peers. In the second component (Bullying Prevention), students will learn to recognize, respond, and

report bullying as well as learn about roles in bullying, cyber bullying, and sexual harassment. During the third component (Emotion Management), students will learn to understand their emotions, how to stay in control, and learn effective coping strategies. Lastly, the fourth component (Substance Abuse Prevention) will discuss substance abuse, types, myths and facts, norms and attitudes, and making good decisions. Each lesson will be taught through an introductory video, class discussion, individual activity, group activity, and group exchange. Teachers will facilitate the lessons and the school social worker will provide ongoing support and coaching. Students will be given homework after each lesson to take home and discuss with their parent, guardian, or trusted adult.

Objective 2: Provide four teacher and four parent trainings on the identification of, risk factors for, and proper interventions to prevent and reduce bullying. Studies show that teachers are more willing to intervene and respond effectively when they are properly trained on the identification, responses, and implications of bullying (Migliaccio, 2015). Thus, teachers will be provided training on these topics and to effectively deliver Second Step to their students. Two trainings will be administered in the summer when teachers are preparing for the school year; a third training will be completed half way through the program, and one at the end. The trainings in the summer will provide an overview of the program, intervention techniques, and each teacher will receive the Second Step curriculum and supplies. The third training will be for troubleshooting, suggestions, and additional support. The last training will be for debriefing and suggestions for changes. The school social worker will also provide ongoing coaching to teachers throughout the process and be available to observe and assist in the classroom. The school social worker will also provide individual or possibly

group sessions or work with families and community resources to better serve students who continue to engage in bullying or be victimized.

Parents play a significant role in bullying education and prevention. They are more likely to respond effectively and promptly if they can identify signs of bullying, understand its implications, and access resources necessary to stop the victimization (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011). The school social worker will hold a parent informational assembly at the beginning of the school year to explain the Second Step program and encourage participation and support. The assembly will include parents, staff, teachers, and students to ensure community collaboration. Parents are key to ensuring that the positive practices being implemented at school are also being implemented and supported in the home. Four trainings will be offered to parents. The trainings will take place once a week for four consecutive weeks. Sessions will be offered in the morning and evening. The trainings will cover topics on policy, social skills, and communication to use at home with their children. Parents will also be given the opportunity to participate in some of the Second Step lessons given to the students during the trainings through the homework component. This will allow parents to gain insight to what the student is learning, enforce the lessons in the home, and enhance interactions between child and parent/caregiver or a positive adult in their life.

Objective 3: Develop and implement school-wide policies on bullying. Clear policies regarding bullying will be developed through the collaboration of faculty and staff. The school social worker will convene with administrators and staff members to develop a clear policy that defines bullying, proper interventions, reporting, and protocol.

Once the policy is developed, the school social worker will coordinate dissemination of the policy to students, parents, and school staff.

Objective 4: Decrease student reports of victimization by 25% and increase their perceptions school climate by 25%. As result of the bullying program components, victimization will be reduced and school climate will be improved.

Objective 5: Significantly decrease school-wide rates of suspensions and expulsions. There will be a decrease in suspension and expulsion rates. A comparison of suspension rates will be made after the first year of implementation.

Program Evaluation

A standardized survey will be given to students at the beginning and end of the school year. The survey will consist of questions regarding perceptions, forms, locations, frequency, and reporting of bullying along with feelings and attitudes regarding bullying and perceived school safety. A school climate survey will also be administered to youth Additional data regarding suspensions and expulsions will be gathered through Aeries, which is the school district's student information system that allows administrative staff access to student information such as grades, attendance, enrollment information, testing, schedules, discipline records, counseling records, interventions, special needs, etc. An outside evaluator will be hired to administer the surveys and collect and analyze the information. They will report on the outcomes in all program areas.

TABLE 1. Line-Item Budget

PROPOSED BUDGET FOR 2015-2016 SCHOOL YEAR

Woodrow Wilson Middle School: Bullying Prevention and Intervention Program

ITEM	YEAR 1	IN-KIND SUPPORT
PERSONNEL		
1 School Social Worker 100% FTE	70,000	
2 BSW Stipend Interns		20,000
TOTAL PERSONNEL COSTS WITHOUT BENEFITS	70,000	
FRINGE BENEFITS 28%	19,600	
TOTAL SALARIES AND FRINGE BENEFITS	89,600	
Equipment	2,077	
Program Supplies	8,487	
Office Supplies	750	
Incentives	500	
TOTAL DIRECT PROGRAM SERVICE COST	11,814	
TOTAL DIRECT COSTS	101,414	
INDIRECT COSTS		
Evaluation @ 10% of Direct Costs	10,141	
TOTAL INDIRECT COSTS	10,141	
TOTAL IN-KIND SUPPORT		20,000
TOTAL PROJECT COST	111,555	

Budget Narrative

Personnel

The total project cost is $111,555. One full-time school social worker will be needed in facilitate the program. The school social worker will have a master's degree in social work and Pupil Personnel Services Credential (1 FTE 100% @ $70,000 salary + $19,600 (28%) in benefits (FICA, unemployment insurance, workers compensation, retirement, medical insurance life insurance, disability). The school social worker will be in charge of facilitating teacher trainings, holding team collaboration meetings to develop clear policies, training parents, and running assemblies, and providing appropriate interventions for students who continue to engage in or be victimized by bullying behaviors. The school social worker will also provide ongoing coaching to teachers and support as needed. The school social worker will also provide supervision to two interns. Two bachelors of social work students will aid the school social worker in setting up trainings, assemblies, and providing in-class support to teachers and students. The estimated in-kind cost of these students is $20,000 (10,000 X 2).

Equipment

Office equipment such as computers, software, a printer, telephone, and 3 two-way radios will be needed. The two computers are valued at $500 each ($500 x 2=$1,000), software is $100, a printer is $150, and a telephone is $300. The school social worker and stipend students will also be equipped with two-way radios in order to communicate and relay information as quickly as possible. A total of 3 two-way radios will be purchased at $159 each, which is a total cost of $477. The office equipment is valued at a total of $2,077.

Program Supplies

The Second Step curriculum will be purchased for every teacher. The curriculum costs $369 per classroom; there are a total of 23 teachers at WMS who will be using the program, therefore, the total cost is $8,487.

Office Supplies

Office supplies, such as paper, ink, postage, and printing will also be used. The program intends to budget at least $75 per month for 10 months, which is a total cost of $750.

Incentives

A budget of $500 will be set aside to purchase incentives for parents and students. Such incentives will include gift cards, classroom parties, and food/beverages for parent meetings. The purpose of the incentives is to encourage parents and students to participate in the trainings that will be provided by the social worker.

Evaluation

The total cost to evaluate the bullying prevention and intervention program at WMS will be $10,141, which is calculated based on 10% of total direct costs ($101,414=$10,141). An outside evaluator will be hired to assess effectiveness of the program on meeting its goals and objectives.

CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION

The purpose of this project was to develop a program, identify potential funding resources, and write a grant to fund a bullying prevention program at Woodrow Wilson Middle School in Pasadena Unified School District. This chapter presents the valuable lessons and skills the grant writer learned and implications for social work practice.

Lessons Learned

Literature Review

The literature review was an important aspect in the development of this project in many ways. The literature review provided the grant writer with knowledge regarding past theories of where the bullying and victimization behaviors originated from and the shift of perceptions that researchers have had over time. The research also guided the grant writer in identifying the risks and consequences youth face as a result of bullying both in their youth and as adults. It was also essential for the grant writer to review evaluations on evidence-based bullying prevention programs. This allowed her to understand the components of programs that were most successful in the reduction of bullying. The grant writer was able to take this information into consideration when deciding which direction to take with the proposed program. By researching thoroughly, the grant writer was able to obtain a comprehensive understanding of the implications and consequences of bullying as well as the needs of the youth, and incorporate this

information into the development of a whole-school approach to bullying prevention and intervention. Thus, it is important to develop skills in research and literature review to truly understand the obstacles faced by the target population in order to increase the likelihood of success for the proposed program.

Identification of Funding Sources

Acquiring a funder for the proposed program was a very challenging obstacle to overcome. The grant writer found it to be time consuming and tedious at times. She researched funding sources on multiple levels including foundation, state, and federal levels. Such research was conducted through grants.gov, California Department of Education, and Health and Human Services Agency. Many educational grants were available but none for the proposed program. Researching the Internet was merely the beginning of the quest to find funding. The grant writer furthered the search by setting up an appointment at La Pintoresca Library in Pasadena, California to use the FC software. It took several times for the grant writer to finally understand the software and navigate through the thousands of funders. A process of elimination was used in to identify foundations that demonstrated a goodness of fit with the proposed project. FC search is definitely a useful tool to learn to use for the future as it accumulates all available funding into one search location and is readily available for those seeking financial assistance.

Through this process, the grant writer learned that, although funding may be available, many foundations are very specific about the amount, geographic location, population, and type of agency they are willing to fund. The grant writer found it especially difficult to find funding for public schools. Although the grant writer

narrowed down the foundations based on interest areas and funding amount, it took several days to finally find the one that was best suited for the intended program. The grant writer took into high consideration the criteria of the foundation, past funding amounts awarded, and its mission in vision. Through the funding research, the grant writer learned how important it is to select a foundation based on goodness of fit and amount of funding. Selecting a foundation that adequately meets the purpose of the project is important because it is highly correlated to the probability that the project will be successfully funded. Learning to investigate and find appropriate funding resources is important in grant writing because the more the foundation and program are congruent, the better the likelihood it will be successfully funded.

Grant Writing

That grant writer learned that writing for a grant takes a certain skill. The terminology used needs to be captivating so that it shows the need for funding, while also offering concrete information that is based on research. Integrating literature and specific statistics regarding the target population allowed the grant writer to show the need for funding for WMS. However, the path to combining such literature and statistics was quite challenging due to its complexity. Writing for a grant is not the same as writing academically. This was the biggest lesson for the grant writer.

Writing for a grant is difficult because all the research and information gathered must be aligned, consistent, and the terminology is sometimes complex. Matching the program goals and objectives to a fit foundation was a learning process. Through this, the grant writer learned the importance of reading into detail and fine print to ensure the foundation and goals of the project were the best fit possible. The grant writer also

learned about the importance of evaluation and types of evaluation techniques. Through the literature review, the grant writer was able to depict the most common and effective evaluating techniques used to examine the success of past programs.

Because of the need for specific statistics regarding WMS, the grant writer learned how to access and gather the information from the California Department of Education. The whole grant writing process proved to be a challenge for the grant writer but the experience was very beneficial as it created and enhanced the grant writer's skills in program design, budget creation, and collaboration.

Budgeting

The grant writer attended a budget workshop held at California State University, Long Beach. At the workshop, the presenter broke down the components of a budget. Prior to this training, the grant writer never realized how much thought process was put into creating a budget and all the components that needed to be considered. The presenter provided the grant writer through a step-by-step lesson on developing a budget. Even though the grant writer wrote down several examples and used them to guide her specific budget, she learned that the budget for this specific proposed project was not going to align perfectly and some changes needed to be made. The grant writer created drafts and was aided by her thesis advisor in creating a budget that would align with WMS, given that it is a public school. Through the process, the grant writer learned that the program drives the budget and figured out in detail what the program was going to need ranging from personnel to basic office supplies, and evaluation. The grant writer learned about the difference between direct and indirect costs and the meaning of in-kind.

Overall, the grant writer found the budget aspect of the grant writing process to be the most enjoyable, which was a surprise to her.

Implications for Social Work Practice

Social workers hold a unique position in the multidisciplinary team that it takes to intervene in bullying. Best practices indicate that taking a school-wide approach and incorporating students, parents, staff, and administration has the best outcomes for prevention and intervention (Ttofi & Farrington, 2011; Atlas & Pepler, 1998). To appropriately serve the school-aged population, school social workers, teachers, parents, and school staff must be conscious of the impact bullying may have on the learning environment for students. Social workers can help teachers, parents and youth identify and take steps to prevent bullying. Taking an ecological approach to prevention is more likely to result in a greater impact on bullying awareness as it ensures that individuals, families, the school, and community are all in agreement. School social workers can provide training for parents and professionals on the appropriate responses to reports of bullying. Having sensitivity toward victims, communication skills, and clear guidelines for bullying situations creates unity between staff members and follow-through in policy. Social workers are able to work on multidisciplinary teams to help define policies, guidelines, provide support to students and staff, and communicate effectively with parents.

Grant writing is essential for social workers to learn as social workers usually work with populations with limited resources and knowledge regarding the services and resources available to them. There is an obvious relationship between the quality of services for youth and financing. A big part of social work practice is networking,

advocating, and brokering, not only for clients but also for themselves and the agencies they work for in order to produce the best services and practices possible. This means researching and bringing in the most possible resources available for the benefit of the people. Grant writing is a also a beneficial tool that has the potential to help social workers keep their employment, advocate for the need of their position, and even fund their position. Having the ability to develop programs through grant writing is a powerful skill and tool not only for the populations in need but also for social workers during the threat of a declining economy. Learning the grant writing process is a component that should be incorporated during the social work education, as it has the potential to become a valuable and empowering tool in the future. It takes a certain type of person with the right type of skills to do what social workers do, not only on a micro level but also on a macro level. Thus, social workers play an endless amount of roles from advocate, educator, facilitator, researcher, organizer, manager, policy/program developer, and even grant writer in order to meet their client's and agency needs.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Atlas, R. & Pepler, D.J. (1998). Observations of bullying in the classroom, *The Journal of Educational Research 92* (2), 86-99.

Bannink, R., Broeren, S., van de Looij-Jansen, P. M., de Waart, F. G., & Raat, H. (2014). Cyber and traditional bullying victimization as a risk factor for mental health problems and suicidal ideation in adolescents. *Plos ONE*, *9*(4), 1-7. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0094026

Barhight, L. R., Hubbard, J. A., & Hyde, C. T. (2013). Children's physiological and emotional reactions to witnessing bullying predict bystander intervention. *Child Development*, *84*(1), 375-390. doi:10.1111/j.1467-8624.2012.01839.x

Bauer, N., Lozano, P., & Rivara, F. P. (2007). The effectiveness of the olweus bullying prevention program in public middle schools: A controlled trial. *Journal of Adolescent Health*, *40*, 266-274.

Borowsky, I., Taliaferro, L., & Mcmorris, B. (2013). Suicidal thinking and behavior among youth involved in verbal and social bullying: Risk and protective factors. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*(1), S4-S12.

Bouffard, L. A., & Koeppel, M. D. (2014). Understanding the potential long-term physical and mental health consequences of early experiences of victimization. *JQ: Justice Quarterly*, *31*(3), 568-587. doi:10.1080/07418825.2012.734843

Brown, E. C., Low, S., Smith, B. H., & Haggerty, K. P. (2011). Outcomes from a school-randomized controlled trial of steps to respect: A bullying prevention program. *School Psychology Review*, *40*(3), 423-433.

California Department of Education. Analysis, Measurement, & Accountability Reporting Division (2014). 2013 academic performance index report. Retrieved from *http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/Acnt2013/2013GrowthSch.aspx?cYear=2005-06&allcds=19-648816058499*

California Department of Education Assessment and Accountability Division. (2014). 2013 STAR test results. Retrieved from *http://star.cde.ca.gov/star2013/ViewReport.aspx?ps=true&lstTestYear=2013&lstTestType=C&lstCounty=19&lstDistrict=64881-000&lstSchool=6058499&lstGroup=1&lstSubGroup=1*

California Department of Education, Data Reporting Office. (2014). *Suspension and expulsion report for 2013-2014*. Retrieved from *http://dq.cde.ca.gov/dataquest/SuspExp/umirsedcode.aspx?cYear=201314&cType=ALL&cCDS=19648816058499&cName=Woodrow%20Wilson%20Middle&cLevel=School&cChoice=sUMIRS&ReportCode=sUMIRS*

California Healthy Kids Survey. (2009-2010). *Pasadena unified secondary 2009-2010 key findings*. San Francisco: WestEd Health and Human Development Program for the California Department of Education. Retrieved from http://www.healthypasadena.org/javascript/htmleditor/uploads/pasadena_sec0910_KF.pdf

California School Climate Survey. (2012–2013). *PASADENA UNIFIED SCHOOL DISTRICT: main report*. San Francisco: WestEd Health & Human Development Program for the California Department of Education.

Carlisle, N., & Rofes, E. (2007). School bullying: Do adult survivors perceive long-term effects? *Traumatology*, *13*(1), 16-26. doi:10.1177/1534765607299911

Carney, A. & Merrell K. (2001) Bullying in schools: Perspectives on understanding and preventing an international problem. *School Psychology International 22*(3): 364-382.

Chang, F., Lee, C., Chiu, C., Hsi, W., Huang, T., & Pan, Y(2013). Relationships among cyberbullying, school bullying, and mental health in taiwanese adolescents. *The Journal of School Health*, *83*(6), 454-462.

The Committee for Children. (1986). *Second Step*. Seattle, WA: Author.

The Committee for Children. (2001). *Steps to Respect: A Bullying Prevention Program*. Seattle, WA: Author.

Cooke, M. B., Ford, J., Levine, J., Bourke, C., Newell, L., & Lapidus, G. (2007). The effects of city-wide implementation of 'second step' on elementary school students' prosocial and aggressive behaviors. *The Journal of Primary Prevention*, *28*(2), 93-115. doi:10.1007/s10935-007-0080-1

Cosma, A., & Baban, A. (2013). The associations between bullying behaviors and health outcomes among Romanian school children. *Cognitive, Creier, Comportment/ Cognition, Brain, Behavior*, *17*(4), 263-276.

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

Dickerson Mayes, S., Baweja, R., Calhoun, S. L., Syed, E., Mahr, F., & Siddiqui, F. (2014). Suicide ideation and attempts and bullying in children and adolescents: psychiatric and general population samples. *Crisis: The Journal of Crisis Intervention and Suicide Prevention*, *35*(5), 301-309. doi:10.1027/0227-5910/a000264

Edmondson, L., & Zeman, L. D. (2009). Hurt people hurt people: Female bully-victims. *Reclaiming Children And Youth*, *18*(3), 24-28.

Eisenberg, M., Neumark-Sztainer, D., & Perry, C. (2003). Peer harassment, school connectedness, and academic achievement. *Journal of School Health, 73*(8), 311-316.

Embry, D. D., Flannery, D. J., Vazsonyi, A. T., Powell, K. E., & Atha, H. (1996). PeaceBuilders: A theoretically driven, school-based model for early violence prevention. *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, *12*(5, Suppl), 91-100.

Espelage, D. & Horne, A. (2008). School violence and bullying prevention: From research-based explanations to empirically based solutions In *Handbook of counseling psychology* (4th ed., pp.588-598) [e-book]. Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.

Estell, D. B., Farmer, T. W., & Cairns, B. D. (2007). Bullies and victims in rural African American youth: Behavioral characteristics and social network placement. *Aggressive Behavior*, *33*(2), 145-159. doi:10.1002/20176

Evans, C. R., & Chapman, M. V. (2014). Bullied youth: The impact of bullying through lesbian, gay, and bisexual name calling. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 84*(6), 644-652. doi:10.1037/ort0000031

Feldman, M. A., Ojanen, T., Gesten, E. L., Smith-Schrandt, H., Brannick, M., Totura, C… & Brown, K. (2014). The effects of middle school bullying and victimization on adjustment through high school: Growth modeling of achievement, school attendance, and disciplinary trajectories. *Psychology in the Schools*, *51*(10), 1046-1062.

Finkelhor, D., Turner, H.A., & Hamby, S. (2012) Let's prevent peer victimization, not just bullying. *Child Abuse & Neglect*. doi:10.1016/j.chiabu.2011.12.001

Fite, P. J., Evans, S. C., Cooley, J. L., & Rubens, S. L. (2014). Further evaluation of associations between attention-deficit/hyperactivity and oppositional defiant disorder symptoms and bullying-victimization in adolescence. *Child Psychiatry and Human Development*, *45*(1), 32-41. doi:10.1007/s10578-013-0376-8

Flannery, D. J., Vazsonyi, A. T., Liau, A. K., Guo, S., Powell, K. E., Atha, H., & Embry, D. (2003). Initial behavior outcomes for the peacebuilders universal school-based violence prevention program. *Developmental Psychology*, *39* (2), 292-308. doi:10.1037/0012-1649.39.2.292

Griezel, L., Finger, L. R., Bodkin-Andrews, G. H., Craven, R. G., & Yeung, A. (2012). Uncovering the structure of and gender and developmental differences in cyber bullying. *Journal Of Educational Research*, *105*(6), 442-455. doi:10.1080/00220671.2011.629692

Goldweber, A., Waasdorp, T., & Bradshaw, C. (2013). Examining associations between race, urbanicity, and patterns of bullying involvement. *Journal of Youth & Adolescence*, *42*(2), 206-219. doi:10.1007/s10964-012-9843-y

Gower, A. L., & Borowsky, I. W. (2013). Associations between frequency of bullying involvement and adjustment in adolescence. *Academic Pediatrics*, *13*(3), 214-221.

Grossman, D.C., Neckerman, H.J., Koepsell, T.D., Liu, P., Asher, K.N., Beland, K… & Rivara, F.P. (1997). Effectiveness of a violence prevention curriculum among children in elementary school: a randomized controlled trial. Journal of the American Medical Association, 277(20), 1605-1611.

Houbre, B., Tarquinio, C., Thuillier, I., & Hergott, E. (2006). Bullying among students and its consequences on health. *European Journal of Psychology of Education 21*(2), 183-208.

Ikomi, P. A. (2010). Juvenile violent felony referrals and high school dropouts: Is there a relationship? *International Journal of Academic Research*, *2*(4), 379-384.

Joseph Drown Foundation. (n.d.). FUNDING GUIDELINES. Retrieved from http://www .jdrown.org/funding/index.html

Kitagawa, Y., Shimodera, S., Togo, F., Okazaki, Y., Nishida, A., & Sasaki, T. (2014). Suicidal feelings interferes with help-seeking in bullied adolescents. *Plos ONE 9*(9), 1-7. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0106031

Klein, J. (2012). The bully society: School shootings and the crisis of bullying in America's schools. New York: The New York University Press.

Kowalski, R., & Limber, S. (2013). Psychological, physical, and academic correlates of cyberbullying and traditional bullying. *Journal of Adolescent Health, 53*(1), S13-S20.

Landstedt, E., & Persson, S. (2014). Bullying, cyberbullying, and mental health in young people. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, *42*(4), 393-399. doi:10.1177/ 1403494814525004

Langdon, S. W., & Preble, W. (2008). The relationship between levels of perceived respect and bullying in 5th through 12th graders. *Adolescence*, *43*(171), 485-503.

Maag, J. W., & Katsiyannis, A. (2012). Bullying and students with disabilities: Legal and practice considerations. *Behavioral Disorders*, *37*(2), 78-86.

Migliaccio, T. (2015). Teacher engagement with bullying: Managing an identity within a school. *Sociological Spectrum*, *35*(1), 84-108. doi:10.1080/02732173.2014. 978430

Mimi, Y. (2012). The social context of bullying. *Encounter*, *25*(4), 20-28.

Nansel, T. R., Overpeck, M., Pilla, R. S., Ruan, W. J., Simons-Morton, B., & Scheidt, P. (2001). Bullying behaviors among US youth: Prevalence and association with psychosocial adjustment. *Journal of The American Medical Association*, *285*(16), 2094-2100. doi:10.1001/jama.285.16.209

Ockerman, M. S., Kramer, C., & Bruno, M. (2014). From the school yard to cyber space: A pilot study of bullying behaviors among middle school students. *Research In Middle Level Education Online*, *37*(6), 1-18.

Olweus, D. (1996). Bullying at school: Knowledge base and an effective intervention program. *Research Center for Health Promotion (HEMIL), 3*(N-5007), 265-276.

Olweus, D. (1997). Bully/victims problems in school: facts and intervention. *European Journal of Psychology of Education, 12*(4), 495-510.

Olweus, D. (2001). *Olweus' core program against bullying and antisocial behavior*: A teacher handbook. Bergen, Norway: Research Center for Health Promotion, University of Bergen.

Olweus, D., & Limber, S. (2010). Bullying in school: Evaluation and dissemination of the OLWEUS BULLYING PREVENTION PROGRAM. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, *80*(1), 124-134. doi:10.1111/j.1939-0025.2010.01015.x

Pack, C., White, A., Raczynski, K., & Wang, A. (2011). Evaluation of the safe school ambassadors program: A student-led approach to reducing mistreatment and bullying in schools. *Clearing House*, *84*(4), 127-133. doi:10.1080/00098655. 2011.564974

Pasadena Unified School District (2012-13). 2012-2013 School accountability report. Retrieved from *http://www.sarconline.org/SarcPdfs/5/19648816058499.pdf*

Pasadena Unified School District (2014). Guide to schools & services 2014-2015. Retrieved from *http://pusd.edge.klrntv.org/pusd_school_guide_2014_en.pdf*

Patchin, J., & Hinduja, S. (2010). Cyberbullying and self-esteem. *Journal of School Health*, *80*(12), 614-621. doi:10.1111/j.1746-1561.2010.00548.x

Patrick, D. L., Bell, J. F., Jon Y., H., Lazarakis, N. C., & Edwards, T. C. (2013). Bullying and quality of life in youths perceived as gay, lesbian, or bisexual in Washington state, 2010. *American Journal of Public Health*, *103*(7), 1255-1261. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2012.301101

Pearce, N., Cross, D., Monks, H., Waters, S., & Falconer, S. (2011). Current evidence of best practice in whole-school bullying intervention and its potential to inform cyberbullying interventions. *Australian Journal of Guidance & Counselling, 21*(1), 1-21. doi:10.1375/ajgc.21.1.1

Pellegrini, A.D. (1998). Bullies and victims in school: A review and call for research. *Journal of Applied Developmental Psychology*, *19*, 165–176.

Raskauskas, J. (2010). Multiple peer victimization among elementary school students: Relations with social-emotional problems. *Social Psychology of Education 13*(4), 523-539. doi:10.1007/s11218-010-9124-0

Rigby, K. (2007). *Bullying in schools and what to do about it*. Melbourne, Austrailia. Council for Education Research.

Roberts, W. B., (2000). The bully as victim. *Professional School Counseling, 4*, 148-156.

Schneider, S., O'Donnell, L., Stueve, A., & Coulter, R. (2012). Cyberbullying, school bullying, and psychological distress: A regional census of high school students. *American Journal of Public Health*, *102*(1), 171-177.

Schwartz, D., Dodge, K.A., Petit, G.S., & Bates, J.E. (1997). The early socialization and adjustment of aggressive victims of bullying. *Child Development*, *68* (4)*, 665-675.*

Seals, D., & Young, J. (2003). Bullying and victimization: Prevalence and relationship to gender, grade level, ethnicity, self-esteem, and depression. *Adolescence*, *38*(152), 735-747.

Sercombe, H., & Donnelly, B. (2013). Bullying and agency: Definition, intervention and ethics. *Journal Of Youth Studies*, *16*(4), 491-502. doi:10.1080/13676261.2012. 725834

Spriggs, A. L., Iannotti, R. J., Nansel, T. R., & Haynie, D. L. (2007). Adolescent bullying involvement and perceived family, peer and school relations: commonalities and differences across race/ethnicity. *Journal Of Adolescent Health*, *41*(3), 283-293. doi:10.1016/j.jadohealth.2007.04.009

Staff, J., & Kreager, D. A. (2008). Too Cool for School? Violence, Peer Status and High School Dropout. *Social Forces*, *87* (1), 445-471.

Tippett, N., & Wolke, D. (2014). Socioeconomic status and bullying: A meta-analysis. *American Journal Of Public Health*, *104*(6), e48-e59. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2014. 301960

Ttofi, M., & Farrington, D. (2011). Effectiveness of school-based programs to reduce bullying: A systematic and meta-analytic review. *Journal Of Experimental Criminology*, *7*(1), 27-56. doi:10.1007/s11292-010-9109-1

U.S Department of Education, National Center for Educational Statistics (2011). Student reports of bullying and cyber-bullying: Results from the 2009 school crime supplement to the national crime victimization survey.

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2006). Alcohol alert: Underage drinking. Retrieved from http://pubs.niaaa.nih.gov/publications/AA67/AA67.pdf

Wang, W., Vaillancourt, T., Brittain, H. L., McDougall, P., Krygsman, A., Smith, D… & Hymel, S. (2014). School climate, peer victimization, and academic achievement: Results from a multi-informant study. *School Psychology Quarterly*, *29*(3), 360-377. doi:10.1037/spq0000084

Weiner, M. T., Day, S. J., & Galvan, D. (2013). Deaf and hard of hearing students' perspectives on bullying and school climate. *American Annals of the Deaf 158*(3) 334-343.

Whitted, K. S., & Dupper, D. R. (2005). Best practices for preventing or reducing bullyi-ng in schools. *Children & Schools*, *27*(3), 167-175.

Wolke, D., Copeland, W. E., Angold, A., & Costello, E. J. (2013). Impact of bullying in childhood on adult health, wealth, crime, and social outcomes. *Psychological Science, 24*(10), 1958-1970.